

# ILLINOIS STATEWIDE NET-TO-GROSS METHODOLOGIES

An outline for discussion with  
stakeholders

October 28, 2014



# The Evaluation Teams

ADM Associates

Cadmus Group

Itron

Navigant Consulting

Opinion Dynamics



# Why this document is being created

---

## Policy Direction from five dockets

<b>Order Docket No / Date</b>	<b>Program Administrator</b>	<b>Pages</b>
<b>13-0495 (1/28/14)</b>	Commonwealth Edison Company	129-130
<b>13-0498 (1/28/14)</b>	Ameren Illinois Company	167, 171
<b>13-0499 (1/28/14)</b>	Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity	20, 23, 49
<b>13-0549 (5/20/14)</b>	Nicor Gas Company	41-42, 78
<b>13-0550 (5/20/14)</b>	North Shore Gas Company and The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company (Integritys)	54-55, 66

## Why this document is being created (2)

---

- Specifically:
  - The Commission hereby adopts Staff's recommendation that consistent IL-NTG Methods be established for use in the evaluations of comparable energy efficiency programs offered by different Illinois program administrators.
  - The Commission notes that the IL-NTG Methods will be flexible and adaptable to multiple program designs and budgets and tailored to appropriately assess the specifics of each of the program administrators' energy efficiency programs, consistent with standard NTG methodologies adopted in other states that were filed in this proceeding.
  
- Evaluation teams providing an outline first to obtain stakeholder input

# Process to date

---

- Collaborative process
  - Several phone meetings
  - All evaluation teams
  - Some interested stakeholders
- C&I Methods Review
  - Several meetings
  - Comparison of surveys and algorithms currently in use
  - Memo on 8/8/14
  - Discussed with larger group of stakeholders on 9/3/14
  - Findings are a starting point for next set of discussions on reaching consensus



## Decisions to date

---

- Create an outline first before spending time and effort on a full document
- Create a methods section that is minimal and does not duplicate work already done elsewhere
- Provide references
- Update document over time and have three programs included before February 2015



# Feedback we need from stakeholders

---

- General topics in outline
  - Keep all?
  - Add any?
- Organization of outline
  - Usable to find information in the future for program folks?
- Depth of information
  - Sufficient?
  - Too much?
- Discuss during meeting and provide written feedback if desired by COB 11/7/14
  - Send to Mary Sutter

[msutter@opiniondynamics.com](mailto:msutter@opiniondynamics.com)



# Next Steps on IL-NTG Methods

---

- Evaluation Teams Responsibilities
  - Obtain feedback from stakeholders
  - Update outline as feasible based on stakeholder comments
  - Create and implement plan to write up IL-NTG Methods document
  - Provide draft IL-NTG Methods document to SAG for review by 1/16/15
- TAC/SAG Member Responsibilities
  - Review outline and provide feedback to evaluation team by 11/7/14
  - Perhaps place discussion of this document on 1/27/15 SAG meeting agenda
  - Review draft document and provide feedback to evaluation team within two weeks of obtaining document (by 1/30/15)
  - Include IL-NTG Methods document in V4.0 of the IL-TRM



**IF TIME**

## Alignment of C&I Methods : Memo



# Purpose of the Memo

---

- Systematically compare the questions and possible closed-ended responses between the DCEO and ComEd/Ameren FR survey batteries
- Analyze redacted data across the three sets of respondents
- Look at how approaches deal with the various concepts of attribution

# High-level Findings

---

- ComEd and Ameren surveys are virtually identical and use the same conceptual framework.
- Many of the questions in the DCEO survey are similar to those in the ComEd/Ameren surveys, but response categories are generally less nuanced.
- The framework to calculate a free rider (FR) value is different between the ComEd/Ameren surveys and the DCEO survey.

# Areas for Reaching Consensus

---

The following questions are a starting point for discussion, not a comprehensive list

- What is the best way of combining the different FR components?
- What level of granularity is desirable?
- How should project timing responses be scored?
- Is a threshold question desirable?
- Should there be consistency checks? If so, on what questions? How should they be used to modify inconsistent responses?
- Should previous experience with the program count to reduce FR?
- How should non-program factors be included in the survey and considered in the FR algorithm?

# Next Steps on C&I NTG Method

---

- Meetings
  - Evaluators to meet several times and work through the areas for reaching consensus shown on previous slide as well as document described below by ADM
- Documentation
  - ADM Associates is drafting a document aimed at facilitating a consensus approach on free ridership assessment methods for the non-residential custom and standard programs. Their intention is to include material including analytical components, numerical weighting scales, and free ridership battery questions.
  - Document results of meetings within IL-NTG Methods, Section III.A. (Attribution within the Commercial, Industrial, and Public Sectors - Standard/Prescriptive Programs)