# ComEd Programs NTG Approach for EPY5 and EPY6

# **DRAFT**

March 2, 2013

# **Table of Contents**

Business Standard Incentive	2
Custom	3
Data Centers Efficiency	5
Smart Lighting Discounts	<i>6</i>
Industrial Systems (Compressed Air in EPY4)	8
MidStream Incentives Lighting	9
Business New Construction Service (Joint)	10
Retro-Commissioning (Joint)	12
Small Business Energy Savings (Joint)	13
Elementary Energy Education (Joint)	14
Home Energy Savings (Single Family Retrofit) (Joint)	15
Fridge Freezer Recycling Rewards	18
Multifamily Home Energy Savings (Joint)	20
Clothes Washer Rebate	22
Complete System Replacement (HEER) (Joint)	23
Residential New Construction (Joint)	24
Other Programs	25
C&I Behavioral Agentis	25
Home Energy Report	25
RFP-RLD C&I Thermostats	25
RFP-RSG Computers	25
RFP-Efficiency 2.0	25
Commercial Real Estate	25

D	Durain and Chandles and Incompline
Program	Business Standard Incentive
NTG EPY1	NTG 0.67
	Free ridership 33%
	Spillover 0%
	Method: Customer self-report. 95 interviews completed covering 101 projects
	from a population of 455 projects.
NTG EPY2	NTG 0.74
	Free ridership 27%
	Spillover 1%
	Method: Customer self-report. 90 interviews completed covering 114 projects
	from a population of 1,739 projects.
	Enhanced method. Ten trade allies called for 11 participants and their responses
	factored in to the customer free ridership calculation.
NTG EPY3	NTG 0.72
	Free ridership 28%
	Spillover 0%
	Method: Customer self-report. 108 interviews completed covering 292 projects
	from a population of 3,794 projects.
	Enhanced method. Two trade allies and three account managers were called for
	five participants and their responses factored in to the customer free ridership
	calculation.
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.70
	Free ridership 31%
	Spillover 1%
	Method: Customer self-report. 110 interviews completed covering 166 projects
	from a population of 4,603 projects.
	Enhanced method. Two trade allies called for two participants and their
	responses factored in to the customer free ridership calculation.
	NTGR (free-ridership only): All lighting =0.70 (90/±5%); Lighting, no T12s
	reported in base case 0.66 (90/±9%); Lighting, T12s reported in base case 0.80
	$(90/\pm14\%)$ Non-Lighting = 0.63 $(90/\pm16\%)$ .
EPY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: EPY3 NTG of 0.72.
	Justification:
	<ul> <li>Program change: No material change.</li> </ul>
	Market change: No material change.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
EPY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: EPY4 NTG of 0.70.
	Justification:
	Program change: No material change.
	Market change: No material change.
	New Program: No
	<ul> <li>Previous EM&amp;V NTG exists: Yes</li> </ul>

Program	Custom
NTG EPY1	NTG 0.72
	Free ridership 28%
	Spillover 0%
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 24 surveys completed from a population of 88.
NTG EPY2	NTG 0.76
	Free ridership 24%
	Spillover 0%
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 20 surveys completed from a population of 345.
NTG EPY3	NTG 0.56 for kWh and 0.46 for kW
	Free ridership 28%
	Spillover 0%
NITC EDV4	Method: Customer self-report. 67 surveys completed from a population of 887.
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.61 for kWh and 0.64 for kW
	Free ridership 39% Spillover 0%
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 63 surveys completed from a population of 367.
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: Participant self-report survey
recommendation	Justification:
	Program change: Yes. Reduction/change in Custom program scope as
	specific market segments/end-uses are assigned to new programs (e.g.,
	Industrial Systems, Data Centers and Commercial Real Estate). Change in
	Incentive levels for lighting projects.
	Market change: Yes. Addition of three new business programs (Industrial
	Systems, Data Centers and Commercial Real Estate) which include Custom
	element reduces the scope of the markets addressed by the Custom
	program, due to the elimination of these segments.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
	Other: The very nature of the Custom program makes it a poor candidate
	for deeming NTG values. Year to year, the Custom program is comprised
	of a unique and changing mix of sizes and types of Custom projects. A few
	large, unique projects can dominate NTG values in a given year. As a
PY6 EM&V	result, no one year can be said to be representative of subsequent years.
Recommendation	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: Participant self-report survey.  Justification:
	Program change: Yes. Reduction/change in Custom program scope as
	specific market segments/end-uses are assigned to new programs (e.g.,
	Industrial Systems, Data Centers and Commercial Real Estate). Change in
	Incentive levels for lighting projects.
	Market change: Yes. Addition of three new business programs (Industrial)
	Systems, Data Centers and Commercial Real Estate) which include Custom
	element reduces the scope of the markets addressed by the Custom
	program, due to the elimination of these segments.
	New Program: No

- Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
- Other: The very nature of the Custom program makes it a poor candidate for deeming NTG values. Year to year, the Custom program is comprised of a unique and changing mix of sizes and types of Custom projects. A few large, unique projects can dominate NTG values in a given year. As a result, no one year can be said to be representative of subsequent years.

Data Centers Efficiency
Program did not exist
Program did not exist
Program did not exist
NTG 0.43 for kWh and 0.63 for kW (EPY4 pilot program)
Free ridership 57%
Spillover 0%
<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 2 surveys completed from a population of 2.
Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Source: Participant self-report survey
Justification:
Program change: Yes
Market change: Yes
New Program: Yes (Since EPY4 was a pilot program and had only two
participants in the program)
Previous EM&V NTG exists: No (EPY4 Program NTG result is not
representative due to the very small sample size – the EPY4 NTG results
were based on only two participants. No EM&V NTG exists in EPY3)
Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Source: Participant self-report survey.
Justification:
Program change: Yes. (EPY4 was a pilot program)
Market change: Yes (Since EPY4 did not include any IT equipment (e.g. servers) type projects)
New Program: Yes (Since EPY4 was a pilot program and had only two participants in the program)
Previous EM&V NTG exists: No (EPY4 Program NTG result is not
representative due to the very small sample size – the EPY4 NTG results were based on only two participants)
Other: The very nature of the Data Centers program makes it a poor
candidate for deeming NTG values. Year to year, the program is expected
to comprise of changing mix of measures, sizes and types of projects. For
example, in one year the projects may be dominated by IT equipment
(server) type projects and another year may consist of HVAC type
projects. A few large projects can dominate NTG values in a given year. As
a result, no one year can be said to be representative of subsequent years.

Program	Smart Lighting Discounts
NTG EPY1	NTG 0.69
	Free ridership 38%
	Spillover 7%
	Method: Customer self-report. Based on phone surveys with 100 coupon
	participants and 56 Gen Pop identified participants.
NTG EPY2	NTG 0.58
	Free ridership 48%
	Spillover 6%
	Method: Average of two customer self-report methods (based on general
	population survey [201 completes] and in-store intercept surveys [381 completes]).
	A supplier self-report method (22 surveys) and a revealed preference demand
	model method were also employed and resulted in lower NTGR estimates but
	were believed to be less accurate methods.
NTG EPY3	NTG 0.71
	Free ridership 31%
	Spillover 2%
	<b>Method</b> : A customer self-report method based on in-store intercept surveys [496
	completes]. A supplier self-report method (13 surveys) and a multi-state regression
	model was also employed and resulted in lower NTGR estimates but were
	believed to be less accurate methods.
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.55 (Standard), 0.44 (Specialty), 0.54 (Other - Fixture/LEDs)
	Free ridership 47% (Standard), 58% (Specialty), 48% (Other - Fixture/LEDs)
	Spillover 2%
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report method based on in-store intercept surveys (719
DVE EN 40 V	intercept surveys).
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: EPY5 End-user self-report survey
	<ul><li>Justification:</li><li>Program change: No material changes. Fixtures sales being reduced.</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>Market change: EISA extended to include both 75W and 100W standard</li> </ul>
	bulbs and some specialty bulbs. Currently there is uncertainty regarding
	how the EISA standard changes are going to impact customers' purchasing
	decisions. If change does occur it is likely going to decrease the NTG with
	customers moving to CFLs on their own due to the disappearance of
	incandescents. Due to this uncertainty we recommend a retrospective
	NTG.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes, but EPY3 likely too high due to EISA
	changes.
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio. Source: EPY6
Recommendation	End-user self-report survey
	Justification:
	Program change: No known material change.
	Market change: EISA extended to 40W and 60W standard (and some
	specialty) bulbs. Again, uncertainty regarding how the EISA standard
	changes are going to impact customers' purchasing decisions. If change

does occur it is likely going to decrease the NTG with customers moving to
CFLs on their own due to the disappearance of incandescents. Due to this
uncertainty we recommend a retrospective NTG.
New Program: No
<ul> <li>Previous EM&amp;V NTG exists: Yes</li> </ul>

Program	Industrial Systems (Compressed Air in EPY4)
NTG EPY1	Program did not exist
NTG EPY2	Program did not exist
NTG EPY3	Program did not exist
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.67 for kWh and 0.72 for kW (EPY4 Compressed Air)
	Free ridership 33%
	Spillover 0%
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 7 surveys completed from a population of 9.
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: Participant self-report survey
	Justification:
	Program change: Yes. Addition of three new end uses. In addition to
	compressed air type projects, the program now consists of industrial
	refrigeration, process cooling and process heating end uses. Gas projects are also identified and provided incentives. (Need to confirm that gas
	projects are also included in this program).
	Market change: Addition of three new industrial systems and customers.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: No (EPY4 NTG is based on Compressed Air
	end use only and no NTG exists in EPY3 )
	Other: The very nature of the Industrial Systems program makes it a poor
	candidate for deeming NTG values. Year to year, the program is expected
	to comprise of changing mix of measures, sizes of projects and projects per
	end use. A few large, unique projects from one end use can dominate NTG
	values in a given year. As a result, no one year can be said to be
	representative of subsequent years.
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: Participant self-report survey.
	Justification:
	Program change: Yes. Addition of three new end uses. In addition to
	compressed air type projects, the program now consists of industrial
	refrigeration, process cooling and process heating end uses. Gas projects
	are also identified and provided incentives. (Need to confirm that gas
	projects are also included in this program).
	Market change: No material change.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: No (EPY4 NTG is based on Compressed Air
	end use only and no EM&V NTG exists in EPY3 )
	Other: The very nature of the Industrial Systems program makes it a poor
	candidate for deeming NTG values. Year to year, the program is expected
	to comprise of changing mix of measures, sizes of projects and projects per
	end use. A few large, unique projects from one end use can dominate NTG
	values in a given year. As a result, no one year can be said to be
	representative of subsequent years.

Program	MidStream Incentives Lighting
NTG EPY1	N/A No Program
NTG EPY2	N/A No Program
NTG EPY3	N/A Pilot Program – no data collection
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.63
	Free ridership 39%
	Spillover 2%
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 51 surveys completed from a population of about 5,000 (contact information available for only a small subset of participants).
	11 Trade ally surveys also conducted resulting in a NTG of 0.56 but this result
	was not factored in to the customer free ridership calculation.
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.
Recommendation	Source: EPY5 End-user self-report survey
	Justification:
	Program change: Program expanded to new measures in EPY5.
	<ul> <li>Market change: EISA extended to 75W standard (and some specialty) bulbs.</li> </ul>
	New Program: Yes
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes, but small sample
PY6 EM&V Recommendation	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio. Source: EPY6 End-user self-report survey
	Justification:
	Program change: TBD  Market all areas: FISA extended to 40 and 60W standard (and come).
	<ul> <li>Market change: EISA extended to 40 and 60W standard (and some specialty) bulbs.</li> </ul>
	New Program: Relatively
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes, but unsure size of EPY5 sample

Program	Business New Construction Service (Joint)
NTG EPY1	NTG was not evaluated for EPY1 because program began in EPY2.
NTG EPY2	NTG 0.59
NIGLIIZ	Free ridership 41%
	Spillover 0%
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 14 projects were assessed from a population of 16.
	Enhanced method. NTG scores were adjusted for standard design national retail
	stores.
NTG EPY3	NTG 0.65 (0.69 for Systems Track and 0.54 for Comprehensive Track)
	Free ridership 35%
	Spillover 0%
	Method: Customer self-report. 13 interviews with individuals representing 15
	projects out of population of 37 projects.
	Enhanced method. NTG scores were adjusted for standard design national retail
	stores.
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.57 (0.69 for Systems Track and 0.52 for Comprehensive Track)
	Free ridership 43%
	Spillover 0%
	Method: EPY3 value for Systems Track projects. Customer self-report for
	Comprehensive Track projects. Interviews with individuals representing 5 of 6
	Comprehensive Track projects.
	Enhanced method. Enhanced method. NTG scores were adjusted for standard
	design national retail stores and LEED projects.
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio for Systems Track projects and
Recommendation	retrospective application of the NTG ratio for Comprehensive Track projects.
	Source: EPY3 NTG of 0.69 for Systems Track projects. Participant self-report
	survey for Comprehensive Track projects.
	Justification:
	<ul> <li>Program change: Systems Track projects are being phased out and relatively few are expected in EPY5. Comprehensive Track projects have</li> </ul>
	begun to include custom industrial process savings.
	<ul> <li>Market change: Illinois adopted new commercial building energy code,</li> </ul>
	IECC 2012, effective January 1, 2013. This change will gradually begin to
	affect program throughout EPY5/GPY2 and EPY6/GPY3. No material
	change by the end of EPY5.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio for both Systems Track projects
Recommendation	and Comprehensive Track projects.
	Source: EPY4 NTG of 0.56 for Systems Track projects and 0.52 for Comprehensive
	Track projects.
	Justification:
	Program change: No material change anticipated.
	Market change: Illinois adopted new commercial building energy code,
	IECC 2012, effective January 1, 2013. This change will gradually begin to

affect program throughout EPY5/GPY2 and EPY6/GPY3. No material
change by the end of EPY6.
New Program: No
<ul> <li>Previous EM&amp;V NTG exists: Yes</li> </ul>

Program	Retro-Commissioning (Joint)
NTG EPY1	NTG 0.8
IVIO EI II	Free ridership 0%
	Spillover 0%
	<b>Method</b> : Program <i>ex ante</i> assumption.
	Customer self-report. Two completed surveys from a population of four
	participants bracketed the assumed NTG. Basic method.
NTG EPY2	NTG 0.916
NIGLIIZ	Free ridership 8.4%
	Spillover 0%
	Method: Customer self-report. Five surveys completed from an attempted
	census of a population of thirteen. Basic method.
NTG EPY3	NTG 0.713
NIG EF 13	
	Free ridership 28.7%
	Spillover 0%  Method: Customer self report Fight survives completed from an attempted
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. Eight surveys completed from an attempted
NITC EDV4	census of a population of 34 participants. Basic method.
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.916
	Free ridership 0%
	Spillover 0%
	<b>Method</b> : Program <i>ex ante</i> assumption and stipulated for EPY4. NTG based on
	EPY2 research. EPY3 research rejected due to small ratio of completed surveys.
	Basic method.
PY5 EM&V	NTG 1.04
Recommendation	Free ridership 9.7%
	Spillover 13.6%
	Method:
	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.
	Source: EPY4 NTG of 1.04. Customer and service provider self-report. NTG
	based on EPY4 research – 25 of 39 participants and eight of nine service
	providers surveyed.
	Enhanced method. Participant and Service Provider spill-over researched.
	Justification:
	Program change: No material change.
	Market change: Market evolving with service providers reaching out-
	side of the program for work and increasing resources to deliver.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio for EPY5 and EPY6 based on
Recommendation	EPY4 research. Research NTG again in EPY6 for prospective deeming in future
	years – two years at a time
	Justification:
	Program change: No material change.
	Market change: No material change.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes

Program	Small Business Energy Savings (Joint)
NTG EPY1	NA
NTG EPY2	NA NA
NTG EPY3	NA NA
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.95
	Free ridership 5%
	Spillover 0%
	Method: Customer self-report. 84 NTG surveys completed from a population of
	181. Basic method of NTG analysis was used. No spillover was found. Customer participant self-reported free-ridership was 17 percent for ComEd. Individual trade ally responses to free-ridership questions were weighted by their respective fuel-
	specific program savings contributions and combined for a fuel-specific overall
	free-ridership rate. This approach resulted in an evaluation estimate of 5 percent
	free-ridership for electric measures and was used to calculate the NTG of 0.95 for
	this ComEd program.
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio for EPY5 based on EPY4 results.
Recommendation	Justification:
	Program change: No material change.
	Market change: No material change.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio for EPY6 based on EPY4 results.
Recommendation	Justification:
	<ul> <li>Program change: No material change, assuming the program size does not change significantly.</li> </ul>
	Market change: No material change.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes

Program	Elementary Energy Education (Joint)						
NTG GPY1/EPY4	Measure	Research Findings Nicor Gas- only FR	Research Findings Nicor Gas- only SO	Research Findings Nicor Gas-only NTG	Research Findings Nicor Gas- ComEd FR	Research Findings Nicor Gas- ComEd SO	Research Findings Nicor Gas- ComEd NTG
	Showerheads	39%	7%	68%	22%	19%	96%
	Kitchen Aerators	33%	2%	69%	18%	14%	97%
	Bathroom Aerators	35%	7%	71%	22%	9%	87%
	CFLs	NA	NA	NA	53%	31%	78%
GPY2/EPY5	NTG 0.68 - 0.96 (varies by measure and participant group) Free ridership 18-53% Spillover 7-19% Method: Customer self-report, 223 surveys completed from a population of 9,972.						
*	Evaluation recommer			G ratio.			
EM&V Recommendation		Research Findings Nicor Gas-	Research Findings Nicor Gas-	Research Findings Nicor	Research Findings Nicor Gas-	Research Findings Nicor Gas-	Research Findings Nicor Gas-
	Measure	only FR	only SO	Gas-only NTG	ComEd FR	ComEd SO	ComEd NTG
	Showerheads	39%	7%	68%	22%	19%	96%
	Kitchen Aerators	33%	2%	69%	18%	14%	97%
	Bathroom Aerators	35%	7%	71%	22%	9%	87%
	CFLs	NA	NA	NA	53%	31%	78%
	Source: GPY1/EPY4.  Justification:  • Program change: No material change.  • Market change: No material change.  • New Program: No  • Previous EM&V NTG exists.						
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.						
Recommendation	Source: GPY1/EPY4, a	ıs above.					
	Justification:						
	<ul> <li>Program char</li> </ul>	-		-			
	Market change		terial chan	ige.			
	New Program						
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes						

Program	<b>Home Energ</b>	Home Energy Savings (Single Family Retrofit) (Joint)					
NTG EPY1	NTG 0.80						
	Free ridership 0.2						
	Spillover NA						
	-	Program Assumption.	The EP	Y1 evalı	ıation d	id not estimate the	
		The value of 80% is dr					
	ComEd's 2008-202	10 Energy Efficiency ar	nd Dem	and Res	ponse F	Plan (November 15,	
	2007). Page D-2 of	the ComEd plan prov	ides a f	ootnote	stating	the net to gross	
	ratio of 80% is dra	ratio of 80% is drawn from the California Energy Efficiency Policy Manual,					
	version 2 (2003).						
NTG EPY2	NTG 0.87						
	Free ridership 26°	%					
	Spillover 3.5%						
	Method: Custome	er self-reports. 130 surv	eys cor	npleted	from a	population of 760.	
			NTG				
		Measure	Ratio	FR	SO		
		CFL	0.72	34%	6.4%		
		Kitchen Aerators	0.97	3%	0.0%		
		Bathroom Aerators	0.97	3%	0.0%		
		Showerheads	0.93	8%	0.5%		
		Pipe Insulation	1.02	7%	9.0%		
		Total Direct Install	0.87	26%	3.5%		
NTG EPY3	NTG 0.74						
	Free ridership 27°	%					
	Spillover 4%	pillover 4%					
		er self-reports. 122 full					
		easures) and direct ins	-	_	_	-	
	from a population	of 413 full participant				only participants.	
		Measure	NTG	FR	SO		
İ			NIG		50	•	
		Compact Fluorescent Bulbs	0.68	34%	3%		
		_				-	
		Bulbs	0.68	34%			
		Bulbs Air Sealing	0.68	34% 8%		-	
		Bulbs Air Sealing Attic Insulation	0.68 0.99 0.98	34% 8% 9%		-	
		Bulbs Air Sealing Attic Insulation Floored Attic Insulation	0.68 0.99 0.98 0.98	34% 8% 9% 9%			
		Bulbs Air Sealing Attic Insulation Floored Attic Insulation Exterior Wall Insulation Sloped Insulation	0.68 0.99 0.98 0.98 0.96	34% 8% 9% 9% 11%	3%	-	
		Bulbs Air Sealing Attic Insulation Floored Attic Insulation Exterior Wall Insulation Sloped Insulation Knee Wall Insulation	0.68 0.99 0.98 0.98 0.96	34% 8% 9% 9% 11% 11%	3%	-	
		Bulbs Air Sealing Attic Insulation Floored Attic Insulation Exterior Wall Insulation Sloped Insulation Knee Wall Insulation Crawl Space Insulation	0.68 0.99 0.98 0.98 0.96 0.96 0.96	34% 8% 9% 9% 11% 11% 11%	3%	-	
		Bulbs Air Sealing Attic Insulation Floored Attic Insulation Exterior Wall Insulation Sloped Insulation Knee Wall Insulation Crawl Space Insulation Duct Insulation	0.68 0.99 0.98 0.98 0.96 0.96 0.96 0.99	34%  8%  9%  9%  11%  11%  11%  8%	3%		
		Bulbs Air Sealing Attic Insulation Floored Attic Insulation Exterior Wall Insulation Sloped Insulation Knee Wall Insulation Crawl Space Insulation	0.68 0.99 0.98 0.98 0.96 0.96 0.96	34% 8% 9% 9% 11% 11% 11%	3%		

#### NTG EPY4

Overall NTG\* 0.83 (Preliminary)

Overall Free ridership\* 18% (Preliminary)

Overall Spillover\* 1% (Preliminary)

\*A final draft of the report has not been submitted yet, thus these values may change.

**Method**: Customer self-reports. 54 full-participant (direct Install and weatherization measures) surveys completed from a population of 1,081 audits and 320 full-participants.

articipan	ts.			
	Measure	NTG*	Free Ridership*	Spillover*
	9 Watt CFL	0.79	0.25	0.04
	14 Watt CFL	0.79	0.25	0.04
	19 Watt CFL	0.79	0.25	0.04
	23 Watt CFL	0.79	0.25	0.04
	9 Watt Globe CFL	0.79	0.25	0.04
	Low Flow Shower Head	0.93	0.07	0.00
Direct-	Kitchen Aerator	1.00	0.01	0.01
Install Measures	Bathroom Aerator	1.00	0.01	0.01
	Hot Water Temperature Setback	0.88	0.12	0.00
	Pipe Insulation	0.89	0.18	0.07
	Programmable Thermostat	0.85	-	-
	Programmable Thermostat Education	0.85	-	-
	Attic Insulation	0.75	0.27	0.02
	Wall Insulation	0.78	0.22	0.00
Retrofit Measures	Floor Insulation (Other)	0.76	0.24	0.00
	Duct Insulation & Sealing	0.80	-	-
	Air Sealing	0.84	0.16	0.00
Overall Program		0.83	0.18	0.01
	he report has not been	submitted	yet, thus these v	alues may ch

## PY5 EM&V Recommendation

Evaluation recommends retrospective application of the NTG ratio.

Source: Participant and trade ally self-report survey.

Justification:

- Program change: Incentive levels have changed. New program partner promoting the program in a new way.
- Market change: No material change.
- New Program: No
- Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes

PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio based on EPY5 NTG research.		
Recommendation	Source: EPY5 NTG.		
	Justification:		
	Program change: Assuming no material change.		
	<ul> <li>Market change: Assuming no material change.</li> </ul>		
	New Program: No		
	<ul> <li>Previous EM&amp;V NTG exists: Yes</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>NTG was retrospective in EPY5 and so the EPY4 NTG is no longer the</li> </ul>		
	best reflection of the appropriate NTG rate to apply prospectively.		

Program	Fridge Freezer Recycling Rewards
NTG EPY1	NTG 0.70 for refrigerators, 0.83 for freezers, 1.0 for Room AC units
INTO EL TI	Free ridership 30% for refrigerators, 17% for freezers, 0% for Room AC units
	Spillover 0% for all measure types
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 100 surveys completed (70 refrigerator
	respondents, 30 freezers), from attempted calls with 498 respondents
NTG EPY2	NTG 0.73 for refrigerators, 0.82 for freezers, 0.72 for Room AC units
IVIO LI 12	Free ridership 27% for refrigerators, 18% for freezers, 28% for Room AC units
	Spillover 0% for all measure types
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 152 surveys completed – 114 Refrigerator, 38
	Freezer, 30 Room AC Recyclers, from attempted calls with 744 respondents
NTG EPY3	NTG 0.67 for refrigerators, 0.75 for freezers, 0.70 for Room AC units
NIG LI 10	<b>Free ridership</b> 33% for refrigerators, 25% for freezers, 30% for Room AC units
	Spillover 0% for all measure types
	<b>Method</b> : Customer self-report. 202 surveys completed – 151 Refrig., 51 Freezer, 30
	Room AC Recyclers, from attempted calls with 1,369 respondents
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.73 for refrigerators, 0.77 for freezers, and 0.58 for Room AC units
NIGLI 14	Free ridership 27% for refrigerators, 23% for freezers, 42% for Room AC units
	Spillover 0% for all measure types
	<b>Method</b> : Customer and participating retailer self-reports. Weighted average from
	combining results from both sources. 200 surveys completed with participating
	customers –150 Refrig., 50 Freezer, 19 Room AC Recyclers, from attempted calls
	with 2,225 respondents
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends partially deeming the NTG ratio, based on EPY3 results.
Recommendation	However, an additional term will be added in EPY5 to account for program-
recommendation	induced replacements, as specified in the TRM. This term was not included in the
	EPY3 evaluation.
	Source: EPY3 results of 0.67 for refrigerators, 0.75 for freezers, 0.70 for Room AC
	units to account for all program effects except for program-induced replacements,
	This latter term will require additional research during EPY5 to establish a value
	for it.
	Justification:
	Program change: No material change.
	Market change: No material change.
	New Program: No
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
	Other: Need to add term for program induced replacements (specified in
	TRM)
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio, based on EPY4 results for all
Recommendation	program effects except for program-induced replacements, plus a EPY5 program-
	induced replacements factor. This term was not included in the EPY4 evaluation.
	Source: Sum of EPY4 results of 0.73 for refrigerators, 0.77 for freezers, and 0.58 for
	Room AC units to account for all program effects except for program-induced
	replacements, plus EPY5 program-induced replacements factor.
	Justification:
İ	Program change: No material change.

Market change: No material change.
New Program: No
Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
Other: Need to include term for program induced replacements (specified in TRM)

Program	Multifamily Home Energy Savings (Joint)
NTG EPY1	NTG 0.80
	Free ridership n/a
	Spillover n/a
	Method: ComEd planning documents. (No EMV NTG analysis).
NTG EPY2	Program NTG 0.88
	Measure Specific:
	CFLs NTG 0.81
	CFLs Free Ridership 27%
	CFLs Spillover 18%
	Water Efficient Showerheads NTG 0.93
	Water Efficient Showerheads Free Ridership 9%
	Water Efficient Showerheads Spillover 2%
	Water Efficient Aerators NTG 0.94
	Water Efficient Aerators Free Ridership 6%
	Water Efficient Aerators Spillover 0%
	Method: Participant Self-Report. CATI telephone survey with 75 participating
	tenants (90/9).
NTG EPY3	Program NTG 0.90
	Measure Specific:
	CFLs NTG 0.81
	CFLs Free Ridership 20%
	CFLs Spillover 1%
	Water Efficient Showerheads NTG 0.93
	Water Efficient Showerheads Free Ridership 7%
	Water Efficient Showerheads Spillover 0%
	Water Efficient Aerators NTG 0.94
	Water Efficient Aerators Free Ridership 6%
	Water Efficient Aerators Spillover 0%
	Method: Participant self-report. CATI telephone survey with 140 participating
	tenants (90/10).
NTG EPY4	Verification report:
	Program NTG 0.83
	Measure Specific:
	CFLs NTG 0.81
	Water Efficiency Measures (Aerators + Showerheads) NTG 0.93
	Verification Method: Applied EPY2 evaluation findings according to NTG
	Framework.
	Research Findings:
	Program NTG 0.97
	CFLs NTG 0.98
	Water Efficiency Measures (Aerators + Showerheads) NTG 0.92
	Water Efficient Showerheads NTG 0.91
	Water Efficient Aerators NTG 0.93
	Research Method: Participant self-report. CATI telephone survey with
	participating decision-makers (37 property managers)

EPY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: EPY3 NTG		
	CFLs NTG 0.81		
	Water Efficient Showerheads NTG 0.93		
	Water Efficient Aerators NTG 0.94		
	Justification:		
	Program change: No material change.		
	Market change: No material change.		
	New Program: No		
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes		
EPY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: EPY4 NTG		
	CFLs NTG 0.98		
	Water Efficiency Measures (Aerators + Showerheads) NTG 0.92		
	Justification:		
	Program change: No material change.		
	Market change: No material change.		
	New Program: No		
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes		

Program	Clothes Washer Rebate		
NTG EPY1	Program did not exist		
NTG EPY2	Program did not exist		
NTG EPY3	Program did not exist		
NTG EPY4	NTG 0.678		
	Free ridership 32.2%		
	Spillover 0%		
	Method: Customer self-reports. 140 interviews completed covering 120 single		
	family participants and 20 multi-family participants.		
	Enhanced method. Two trade allies called for two participants and their		
	responses factored in to the customer free ridership calculation.		
EPY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: EPY4 NTG of 0.678.		
	Justification:		
	Program change: Possible program structural changes.		
	Market change: No material change.		
	New Program: No		
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes (EPY4)		
EPY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: EPY4 NTG of 0.678.		
	Justification:		
	Program change: No material change.		
	Market change: No material change.		
	New Program: No		
	<ul> <li>Previous EM&amp;V NTG exists: Yes</li> </ul>		

Program	Complete System Replacement (HEER) (Joint)		
NTG EPY1	CSR program not offered in EPY1		
NTG EPY2	CSR program not offered in EPY1		
NTG EPY3	CSR program not offered in EPY1		
NTG EPY4/GPY1	NTG: 59%		
	Free-ridership: 41%		
	Spillover: 0%		
	Method: Customer self-report.		
EPY5/GPY2 EM&V	Evaluation retrospective application of the NTG ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: Participant self-report survey with trade ally input		
	Justification:		
	<ul> <li>Program change: Program ramp-up; program only offered from</li> </ul>		
	January, 2012 through end of program year in EPY4/GPY1.		
	Market change: No material change.		
	New Program: No		
	Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes		
EPY6/GPY3 EM&V	Evaluation recommends deeming the NTG ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: EPY5/GPY2 NTG		
	Justification:		
	Program change: No material change.		
	Market change: No material change.		
	New Program: No		
	<ul> <li>Previous EM&amp;V NTG exists: Yes</li> </ul>		
	Other: Since EPY4/GPY1 is first year of program, EPY5/GPY2 will		
	be more representative of program going forward		

Program	Residential New Construction (Joint)		
NTG EPY1	N/A No Program		
NTG EPY2	N/A No Program		
NTG EPY3	N/A No Program		
NTG EPY4	NTG not evaluated. Program just launched. No impact evaluation.		
PY5 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of net-to-gross ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: Participating builder self-report survey.		
	Justification:		
	New Program		
	Previous EM&V NTG does not exist		
PY6 EM&V	Evaluation recommends retrospective application of net-to-gross ratio.		
Recommendation	Source: Participating builder self-report survey.		
	Justification:		
	<ul> <li>Program change: No planned material change. However given the program is ramping up in EPY5, the EPY5 NTG value may not provide an accurate reflection of the future NTG value.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Market change: IECC 2012 came into effect as residential energy code in January, 2013. This was part of the way through EPY5, and EPY6 will be the full program year under the new code.</li> <li>Previous EM&amp;V NTG exists: Yes</li> </ul>		

# **Other Programs**

## **C&I Behavioral Agentis**

EM&V impact analysis (regression) will create net savings, not adjusted gross therefore it will always be retrospective.

#### **Home Energy Report**

EM&V impact analysis (regression) will create net savings, not adjusted gross therefore it will always be retrospective.

#### **RFP-RLD C&I Thermostats**

This is a third party program where the contractor is paid on net savings and so NTG will always be retrospective.

## **RFP-RSG Computers**

This is a third party program where the contractor is paid on net savings and so NTG will always be retrospective.

### RFP-Efficiency 2.0

This is a third party program where the contractor is paid on net savings and so NTG will always be retrospective. EM&V impact analysis (regression) will create net savings, not adjusted gross therefore it will always be retrospective.

#### **Commercial Real Estate**

As we understand it, this is more a target for program outreach than a program. It is new for EPY5, we have no evaluation NTG results, and we do not yet know whether the projects will be reported through Standard or Custom program.