

NTG Comparison Exhibit for Ameren Illinois and Confid EPV3

Ameren Illinois P37 Evaluator Recommendations - Summary of Changed Values									
Sector	Program	Notes	EM&V - Final Free Ridership	EM&V - Proposed Non-participant Spillover	EM&V - Final Non-participant Spillover	EM&V - Proposed P37 Electric NTGR Value	EM&V - Final P37 Electric NTGR Value	EM&V - Proposed P37 Gas NTGR Value	EM&V - Final P37 Gas NTGR Value
Residential	Multifamily In-Unit (CFLs)	EM&V Recommendation for electric NTGR changed per discussion, from 0.19 to 0.81	0.19			0.98	<b>0.81</b>	N/A	N/A
Residential	Multifamily In-Unit (Pacot airties)	EM&V Recommendation for electric NTGR changed per discussion, from 0.92 to 0.94	0.06			0.92	<b>0.94</b>	0.92	<b>0.94</b>
Residential	Multifamily In-Unit (Showerheads)	EM&V Recommendation for electric NTGR changed per discussion, from 0.92 to 0.93	0.07			0.92	<b>0.93</b>	0.92	<b>0.93</b>
Business	CAI Programs	EM&V Recommendation for non-participant spillover changed per discussion, from 0.32 to 0.16 to 0.01		0.16 as of 2/24/14 (original proposal was 0.32 as of 2/14/14)	0.01				
Residential	HVAC	EM&V Recommendation for electric non-participant spillover changed per discussion, from 0.26 to 0.22	0.44-0.69	0.26	0.22	0.57-0.82	<b>0.53-0.78</b>		
Residential	Appliance Recycling Window Room AC	EM&V Recommendation for electric NTGR changed per discussion, from 1.0 to 0.5		0.00	0.00	1.0	<b>0.5</b>	N/A	N/A
<p><b>Rationale:</b></p> <p>Evaluator recommended using the Confid NTGR from EPV3, based on primary data, and the conclusion that due to program design, data from tenants is the most appropriate choice.</p> <p>Evaluator recommended using the Confid NTGR from EPV3, based on primary data, and the conclusion that due to program design, data from tenants is the most appropriate choice.</p> <p>Evaluator recommended using the Confid NTGR from EPV3, based on primary data, and the conclusion that due to program design, data from tenants is the most appropriate choice.</p> <p>Evaluator gathered/reviewed additional information on the largest contributing customer in the analysis, and determined that the customer should be removed from the analysis. This reduced the recommended value from 10% to 1%.</p> <p><b>Evaluator:</b> One contractor response dropped based on conflicting responses which reduces electric non-participant spillover.</p> <p>Evaluator recommended using this value as it is the most recent value available based on primary data. Further, Confid and AEC values for AEP have generally been consistent. AG: The NTG of 1.0 is a planning value and not based on any studies. However, Confid evaluated this program and obtained a 0.5 NTG value in P37. Confid and Ameren values have been similar historically, indicating program design is likely a stronger driver/predictor of NTG than differences between the territories.</p>									

Ameren EPV7/GP14 Evaluator Recommendation - Summary of Non-Consensus Values									
Sector	Program	Notes	EM&V - Free Ridership	EM&V - Participant Spillover	EM&V - Non-participant Spillover	EM&V - Proposed EPV7/GP14 NTGR Value	EM&V - Final P37 NTGR Value	Participants Supporting Alternate Value	Rationale of Alternate Value
Residential	HVAC - electric and gas measures	EM&V Recommendation for electric non-participant spillover changed per discussion, from 0.20 to 0.22. No consensus reached	0.44-0.69	0.01	0.14-0.26	0.51-0.82	<b>0.51-0.78</b>	Staff, AG	<p><b>Staff/AG:</b> The non-participant spillover values based on trade ally surveys should be derived by the free-ridership rate. Otherwise it appears the methodology is double counting because it is not incorporating the level of free-ridership of the non-participating trade ally's customers that would have installed high efficiency units without AEC's program existing. <b>Evaluator:</b> One contractor response dropped based on conflicting responses which reduces electric non-participant spillover.</p>

Confid P37 Evaluator Recommendations - Summary of Non-Consensus Values									
Sector	Program	Notes	EM&V - Free Ridership	EM&V - Participant Spillover	EM&V - Non-participant Spillover	EM&V - Proposed P37 NTGR Value	EM&V - Final P37 NTGR Value	Participants Supporting Alternate Value	Rationale of Alternate Value
Residential	Residential Lighting Program - Standard CFL	No consensus reached		0.01	0.003	0.40	<b>0.40</b>	Staff, AG	<p><b>Staff/AG:</b> 3-year average NTG value of 0.55 is more reflective of likely NTG in P37, rather than 3-year average incorporating the NTG from P37 which is pre-EISA and also appears to be an outlier in comparison to all other years. <b>Evaluator/Navigator Response:</b> NTG is based on a three year moving average instead of the most recent year's survey results. The Navigator team proposed this approach for this somewhat stable program to try to smooth out annual swings which may be based on transient factors. Staff is concerned that three years may be too long a period to average over, especially since the last two years' NTG results were identical, and would prefer to average the results over two years. Since the results of the two averaging methods are within 10% of each other, it's not clear to the Navigator team that two year averages are necessarily better than three year averages, and such would be less effective in smoothing out possible one year transient effects.</p>
Residential	Residential Lighting Program - Specialty CFL	EM&V Recommendation changed per discussion, from 0.55 to 0.51. No consensus reached		0.01	0.003	0.55	<b>0.51</b>	Staff, AG	<p><b>Staff/AG:</b> 3-year average NTG value is more reflective of likely NTG for P37, rather than 3-year average proposed by Navigator. The P37 NTG included in the 0.55 NTG 3-year average proposed by Navigator is not representative of the NTG for specialty CFLs in P37 and it should be removed. <b>Evaluator/Navigator/Staff Response:</b> Agree with Staff in part. Agree that the P37 NTG is not representative of specialty CFLs and instead propose to apply an adjustment factor to the P37 NTG for standard CFLs and then average it with the P37 and P37 NTG for specialty CFLs.</p>
Residential	Multifamily Program - CFLs	No consensus reached	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.98	<b>0.98</b>	Staff, AG	<p><b>Staff:</b> The 0.98 NTG value is unreasonably high considering the in-store intercept survey NTG results for CFLs; these NTG rates in the range of 0.84 and 0.55, consider using P37 evaluated NTG value of 0.81 from tenant surveys. <b>Staff/AG:</b> Tenant surveys are more reliable than property manager surveys. Property manager information is not relevant to the likely free-ridership of tenants purchasing CFLs. <b>Evaluator/Navigator Response:</b> NTG is estimated on the basis of building owner survey results instead of participant survey results. Navigator thinks this program is different from other residential programs in two key respects: the highly transient nature of many centers, and the fact that CFLs are only being installed in permanent fixtures that previously contained incandescent lamps. Given these somewhat unique program features, we think that building owners provide a better source of information than renters would, and that the 98% NTG result is a defensible result in these circumstances.</p>
Residential	Multifamily Program - Comprehensive projects	EM&V Recommendation changed per discussion, from retrospective to 0.95. No consensus reached		In the NTG	In the NTG	Retrospective	<b>0.95</b>	Staff	<p><b>Confid:</b> It was not clear if the Multi-family Comprehensive projects recommendation was for retrospective determination, but the intent of the framework was to have prospective values. Confid feels the nature of these MF projects would be very similar to SBES, and should have a similar NTG. <b>Evaluator/Navigator:</b> No research completed for this NTG value. Small Business is the most similar program with completed research, using a NTG value of 0.95 based on trade ally surveys. <b>Staff:</b> Concerned with using small business NTG value for this program based on trade ally survey values.</p>
Residential	Complete System Replacement	No consensus reached	0.25	0.12	0.20	0.99	<b>0.99</b>	Staff, AG	<p><b>AG/Staff:</b> Trade ally input should be used with a grain of salt in this instance. They have a vested interest in exaggerating the programs impact on their sales. While they certainly influence customer decisions, they may not know what the customers were originally intending. Given the relatively high free-ridership values for the measures in general, it seems likely that a significant portion of these customers might have been considering high efficiency units despite the trade ally thinking it was only because of them.</p>
Business	Small Business	No consensus reached	0.05	0	0	0.95	<b>0.95</b>	Staff	<p><b>Staff:</b> Evaluation relies on trade allies rather than small business customers to assess NTG for small business customers. Trade allies involved in survey may not be representative of trade allies the small business generally would do business with which does into question the validity of the trade ally survey results. Trade allies have a vested interest in exaggerating the programs impact on their sales. Indeed, the primary driver of the trade ally NTG estimate is based on a small number of trade allies that installed the vast majority of measures in businesses in which they had not sold energy efficiency products to in the past. While trade allies certainly influence customer decisions, they may not know what the customers would have done without the program and whether the customer would have hired a contractor, other than the interviewed trade ally, to install energy efficiency products without the program. Given the small business customers' estimated free-ridership values are 17% for electric saving projects, it seems likely that a portion of these customers might have been considering high efficiency units despite the trade ally thinking it was only because of them and the program. Adopting the 5% free-ridership value based on trade ally input and ignoring the participating small business customers' responses showing 17% free-ridership in this program is not appropriate. <b>Evaluator/Navigator Response:</b> NTG is estimated based on trade ally survey results. Navigator thinks this program is different from other CAI programs in two key respects: the higher incentives offered, and considerable anecdotal evidence that vendors didn't previously target such customers for efficiency retrofits, but mainly sell them products when the old ones fail. Given that customers probably don't understand what products they'd be offered without the program, we think that trade allies are the best source of NTG estimates. We've been using this approach for a couple of years now, so we don't regard this approach as anything new at this point.</p>

Confid P37 Evaluator Recommendations - Summary of Changed Values									
Sector	Program	Notes	EM&V - Free Ridership	EM&V - Participant Spillover	EM&V - Non-participant Spillover	EM&V - Proposed P37 NTGR Value	EM&V - Final P37 NTGR Value	Participants Supporting Change	Rationale
Residential	Residential Lighting Program - Specialty CFL	EM&V Recommendation changed per discussion, from 0.55 to 0.51		0.01	0.003	0.55	<b>0.51</b>	Evaluator/Navigator/Staff	<p><b>Navigator/Staff:</b> Agree with Staff in part. Agree that the P37 NTG is not representative of specialty CFLs and instead propose to apply an adjustment factor to the P37 NTG for standard CFLs and then average it with the P37 and P37 NTG for specialty CFLs.</p>
Business	Business New Construction Program	EM&V Recommendation changed per discussion, from 0.54 to 0.59	0.46		0.05	0.54	<b>0.59</b>	Evaluator/Navigator/Confid	<p><b>Confid:</b> NTG methodology used in P37 does not accurately represent the programs' influence on participants. The P37 value being proposed should be re-evaluated, especially in terms of related spillover. <b>Evaluator/Navigator:</b> Reviewed secondary research for spillover estimates and believes the 0.05 is a conservative value to deem for spillover for this program.</p>
Residential	Appliance Recycling Refrigerators	EM&V Recommendation changed per discussion, from 0.56 to 0.17 and 0.79	0.83 and 0.21	0.00	0.00	0.56	<b>0.17 Retailers; 0.79 Non-Retailers</b>	Evaluator/Navigator/Confid/Staff	<p><b>Confid:</b> The NTG recommendations for FFRR should be separated between IACO pickups and retail channels. Confid is still formulating comments on the retail aspect of evaluation, but feels free-ridership has been overestimated. The local retailer in the program had an evaluated free-ridership of 90% (prior to increasing free-ridership due to Program Induced Replacement of 7% for refrigerators). Confid has questions around the 90% free-ridership, which is based on surveys, and what level of verification was conducted on actual disposals by 3rd Parties. Confid is also reviewing whether to keep that specific retailer #1 in the program, which if eliminated would then skew the recommended NTG to remaining participants. Going forward, retail channel participation will be monitored, but differences in results are considerable between participant types. <b>Evaluator/Navigator/Staff:</b> Does not agree to separate out each retailer specific NTG due to confidentiality concerns. Agrees to separate into general retailer category.</p>
Residential	Appliance Recycling Freezers	EM&V Recommendation changed per discussion, from 0.52 to 0.21 and 0.59	0.79 and 0.41	0.00	0.00	0.52	<b>0.21 Retailers; 0.59 Non-Retailers</b>	Evaluator/Navigator/Staff/Confid	<p><b>Same comments as Refrigerators</b></p>
Residential	Multifamily Program - Comprehensive projects	EM&V Recommendation changed per discussion, from retrospective to 0.95. No consensus reached		In the NTG	In the NTG	Retrospective	<b>0.95</b>	Evaluator/Navigator/Confid	<p><b>Confid:</b> It was not clear if the Multi-family Comprehensive projects recommendation was for retrospective determination, but the intent of the framework was to have prospective values. Confid feels the nature of these MF projects would be very similar to SBES, and should have a similar NTG. <b>Navigator:</b> No research completed for this NTG value. Small Business is the most similar program with completed research, using a NTG value of 0.95 based on trade ally surveys. <b>Staff:</b> Concerned with using small business NTG value for this program based on trade ally survey values which are normally higher than participant makes.</p>