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# Residential Program

## Retail Products Initiative

### LEDs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.73 | N/A | Only Illinois specific value available | PY7 in-store intercept study conducted for ComEd  | PY7 ComEd Lighting Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | All LEDs – 0.69 | N/A | N/A | Free-ridership and spillover estimated from in-store lighting customer interviews (n=853). | PY8 Evaluation  |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | Omnidirectional LEDs: 0.58Directional LEDs: 0.60 | N/A | Most recent Illinois specific value available | PY8 in-store intercept study conducted for ComEd  | PY8 ComEd Lighting Evaluation |
| 2018 | Recommended | 0.70 | N/A | Most recent AIC-specific value available | See PY8 | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | 0.69 | N/A | Most recent AIC-specific value available | See PY8 | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 0.69 | N/A | Most recent AIC-specific value available | See PY8 | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.69 | N/A | Most recent AIC-specific value available | See PY8 | PY8 Evaluation |

### LEDs (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### LEDs (Food Bank Community Distribution)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Advanced Thermostats

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2019 | Recommended | N/A | N/A | Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2020 | Recommended | N/A | N/A | Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2021 | Recommended | Cooling – 0.80Heating – 0.90 | Heating – 0.90 | Evaluation team recommendation | N/A | See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)a |

a <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf>

### Advanced Thermostats (Income Qualified)

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2019 | Recommended | N/A | N/A | Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2020 | Recommended | N/A | N/A | Deemed savings in the IL-TRM are based on billing analysis and are inclusive of net effects | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | 1.00 | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Pool Pumps

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | Value Applied | 0.80 | N/A | Default value given lack of existing data for this measure | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2019 | Recommended | 0.80 | N/A | Default value given lack of existing data for this measure | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 0.76 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available | Participant self-report based on 65 surveys completed from a population of 197 | 2018 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.76 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available | Participant self-report based on 65 surveys completed from a population of 197 | 2018 Evaluation |

### Pool Pumps (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | 1.00 | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Tier 1 Advanced Power Strips

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | Value Applied | General Population - 0.86Income Eligible – 1.00 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus | Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117 | PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible |
| 2019 | Recommended | General Population - 0.86Income Eligible – 1.00 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus | Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117 | PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible |
| 2020 | Recommended | General Population - 0.86Income Eligible – 1.00 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus | Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117 | PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.86 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available; SAG Consensus | Participant Self Report based on 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117 | PY4 Evaluation for the General Population; SAG Consensus for Income Eligible |

### Tier 1 Advanced Power Strips (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Refrigerators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.65 | N/A | SAG consensus | 2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report | 2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey |

### Refrigerators (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Freezers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.63 | N/A | SAG consensus | 2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report | 2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey |

### Freezers (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Clothes Washers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.63 | 0.63 | SAG consensus | 2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report | 2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey |

### Clothes Washers (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | 1.00 | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Clothes Dryers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.67 | N/A | SAG consensus | 2018 ComEd Evaluation Participant Self-Report | 2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey |

### Clothes Dryers (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Air Purifiers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.79 | N/A | Most recent IL-specific value available | Participant Self-Report | 2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey |

### Air Purifiers (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Dehumidifiers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.67 | N/A | Most recent AIC-specific value available | Participant Self-Report | PY4 REEP Evaluation |

### Dehumidifiers (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Bathroom Vent Fans

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.66 | N/A | Most recent IL-specific value | Participant Self-Report | 2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey |

### Bathroom Vent Fans (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

### Water Dispensers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.67 | N/A | Most recent IL-specific value | Participant Self-Report | 2018 (FR) & PY8 (SO) ComEd ES Rebate participant survey |

### Water Dispensers (Income Qualified)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

## Income Qualified Initiative

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1 | N/A (no program) |
| PY2 | N/A (no program) |
| PY3 | N/A (no program) |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| 2018 | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| 2019 | Recommended | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| 2020 | Recommended | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.0 | 1.0 | Other: Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |

## Public Housing Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2019 | Recommended | 1.00 | 1.00 | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |
| 2020 | Recommended | 1.00 | 1.00 | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 | 1.00 | Consensus that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A | SAG Consensus |

## Home Efficiency (Non-Income Qualified)

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | Air Sealing - 0.90All Other Measures – 0.80 | Air Sealing - 0.90All Other Measures – 0.80 | Evaluation team recommendation for Air SealingDefault value for all other measures  | N/A | Air Sealing: See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)aAll other measures: Default value |

a <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf>

## Behavioral Modification Initiative

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1 | No Program |
| PY2 | No Program |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| 2018 | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| 2019 | Recommended | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| 2020 | Recommended | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |
| 2021 | Recommended | N/A | N/A | * Net savings determined through billing analysis
 | Billing analysis | N/A |

## HVAC Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | N/A - No program |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | 0.63 | 0.49 | Retrospective application  | Secondary research | Secondary research |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.59 | Furnaces - 1.01Boilers - 1.02 | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report for FR and SO: 150 surveys completed from a population of 14,127. Drop out contractor self-report for non-participant spillover, 20 surveys completed from a population of 165.  | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 2/2012) | 0.59 | Furnaces - 1.01Boilers - 1.02 |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.59 | Furnaces 1.01Boilers 1.02 | No market or program change. Previous IL EM&V NTG exists | See PY3 | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results  | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 0.59 | Furnaces 1.01Boilers 1.02 | No market or program change. Previous IL EM&V NTG exists | See PY3 | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 3/2013) | <SEER 16 CAC/HP (RB) - 0.69SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) - 0.76<SEER 16 CAC/HP (ER) - 0.57SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) - 0.82ECM - 0.70 | 97% Furnace or Boiler - 0.6495% Furnace - 0.52 | N/A | Participant customer surveys for free ridership and participant spillover (n=210), and a non-participant contractor survey (n=65) for non-participant spillover. | PY5 Evaluation |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.59 | Furnace 0.77Boiler 0.79 | * Program change: Efficiency levels and incentive amounts have changed; gas measures dropped
 | See PY3 | PY3 Evaluation Electric/ Revised PY3 Deemed Results for Gas |
| NTG Research Results(available 1/2014) | SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) - 0.60SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) - 0.64SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) - 0.63SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) – 0.76Brushless Motors - 0.76 | N/A | N/A | PY6 Participant customer surveys for free ridership (n=204). PY5 nonparticipant contract surveys for spillover. | PY5/PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | <SEER 16 CAC/HP (RB) - 0.65SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) - 0.72<SEER 16 CAC/HP (ER) - 0.53SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) -0.78ECM - 0.66 | N/A | Most recent values available for the program based on primary data. | See PY5 | PY5 Evaluationa |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) - 0.60SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) - 0.64SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) - 0.63SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) - 0.76Brushless Motors - 0.76 | N/A | Most recent values available for the program based on primary data. | See PY6 for FR estimates;See PY5 for SO. | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) 0.60SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) 0.64SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) 0.63SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) 0.76Brushless Motors 0.76 | N/A | Most recent values available for the program based on primary data. | See PY6 for FR estimates;See PY5 for SO. | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| 2018 | Recommended | SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.60SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.64SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.63SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.76Brushless Motors 0.76 | N/A | Most recent values available for the program based on primary data. | See PY6 for FR estimates;See PY5 for SO. | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| 2019 | Recommended | SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.60SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.64SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.63SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.76Brushless Motors 0.76 | N/A | Most recent values available for the program based on primary data. | See PY6 for FR estimates;See PY5 for SO. | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| 2020 | Recommended | SEER < 16 CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.60SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.64SEER < 16 CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.63SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.76Brushless Motors 0.76 | N/A | Most recent values available for the program based on primary data. | See PY6 for FR estimates;See PY5 for SO. | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| 2021 | Recommended | SEER 16+ CAC/HP (ER) [Ducted] 0.74SEER 16+ CAC/HP (RB) [Ducted] 0.82Brushless Motors 0.76Heat Pump Water Heaters 0.76Advanced Thermostats (Cooling) - 0.80Advanced Thermostats (Heating) – 0.90 | Advanced Thermostats - 0.90  | Most recent AIC-specific values available;Most recent-IL-specific value available for heat pump water heatersEvaluation team recommendation for advanced thermostats (heating) | 2020 Participant Self-Report for CAC/HP;See PY6 for brushless motor FR and PY5 for SOEvaluation judgement for advanced thermostats | 2020 Evaluation;PY5 and PY6 Evaluations;2019 ComEd EvaluationAdvanced Thermostats: See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)b |

a Note: PY5 values adjusted per SAG discussion in February 2013 revising spillover from 26% to 22%.

b <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf>

## Midstream HVAC Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | Air Conditioners 0.80Heat Pump Water Heaters 0.80 |  N/A | Default value given lack of existing data for this measure | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |

## Appliance Recycling Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.51Freezer 0.53 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report. 93 surveys completed from a population of 2,876. | PY1 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 09/2009) | Refrigerator 0.51Freezer 0.53 | N/A |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.79Freezer 0.82Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report. 159 surveys completed from a population of 11,211. | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 9/2010) | Refrigerator 0.79Freezer 0.82Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.79 Freezer 0.82Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A | * Program or Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY2 | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.64 Freezer 0.65Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 141 surveys completed from a population of 14,232. | PY4 Evaluation not including induced replacement |
| NTG Research Results(available 02/2013) | Refrigerator 0.64 Freezer 0.65Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.79Freezer 0.82Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY2 | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 11/2013) | Refrigerator 0.56Freezer 0.62 Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A | N/A | Customer self-report. 140 refrigerator surveys completed from population of 8,780; 70 freezer surveys from population of 2,899 | PY5 Evaluation |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.63Freezer 0.63Room Air Conditioner 1.0 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY4; PY5 evaluation for induced replacement | PY4 & PY5 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results(available – 12/2014) | Refrigerator 0.52Freezer 0.62 | N/A | N/A | Customer self-report. 140 surveys completed from population of 9,260 | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.56Freezer 0.62Room Air Conditioner 0.50 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY5 for freezers and refrigerators; AC units from PY5 ComEd evaluation | PY5 Evaluation (AIC and ComEd) |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62Room Air Conditioner 0.50 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY6. AC units from PY5 ComEd evaluation | PY6 Evaluation & PY5 ComEd Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY6 NTG research  | PY6 Evaluation |
| 2018 | Value Applied | Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY6 NTG research | PY6 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | Refrigerator 0.52 Freezer 0.62 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY6 NTG research | PY6 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | Refrigerator 0.71Freezer 0.64 | N/A | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See 2018 NTG research | AIC 2018 Participant Survey Memo |
| 2021 | Recommended | Refrigerator - 0.47Freezer - 0.54Room Air Conditioner Recycling – 0.50 | N/A | Most recent AIC-specific values available for refrigerators and freezers, most recent IL-specific values for room air conditioners | Participant Self-Report | AIC 2019 Participant Survey Memo (refrigerators and freezers), PY5 ComEd evaluation (Room AC) |

##  Direct Distribution of Efficient Products Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1 – PY5 | No program |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | CFLs - 0.71 Showerheads - 0.77Faucet aerators - 0.46 Water Heater Temp Adjustment - 0.46 | N/A | * Similar to IPA program for rural kits
 | N/A - Deemed | Docket 12-0544 (IPA filing) |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | CFLs - 0.85 Showerheads - 0.95Faucet aerators - 1.00Hot water card thermometer – 1.00  | Faucet aerator – 1.00Showerhead – 0.95Hot water card thermometer – 1.00 | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | Secondary research: 2013 unpublished Midwest utility’s evaluation of a very similar program (participant survey, n=91). | Secondary research |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | CFLs - 0.83 Showerheads - 1.05Faucet aerators - 1.04Water heater Setback – 1.00 | Showerheads - 1.05Faucet aerators - 1.04Water heater Setback – 1.00 | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | This value is based on the average of results from three similar programs (NIPSCO, Nicor Ryder 29, and Nicor Gas GPY1), and is consistent with ComEd values. | Secondary research |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | CFLs - 0.83 Showerheads - 1.05Faucet aerators - 1.04Water heater Setback – 1.00 | Showerheads 1.05Faucet aerators 1.04Water Heater Setback 1.00 | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | Water Heater Setback: Secondary researchAll others: Avg. of values from similar programs. See PY8. | Secondary research |
| NTG Research Results | CFLs: 0.61Showerheads – 0.84Kitchen faucet aerators – 0.84Bath aerators – 0.87Water heater Setback – 0.88 | N/A | N/A | Participant self-report with 75 respondents out of a population of 9,499.  | PY9 Evaluation |
| 2018 | Value Applied | CFLs - 0.83 Showerheads - 1.05Faucet aerators - 1.04Water heater Setback – 1.00 | Showerheads 1.05Faucet aerators 1.04Water Heater Setback 1.00 | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | Water Heater Setback: Secondary researchAll others: Avg. of values from similar programs. See PY8. | Secondary research |
| 2019 | Recommended | LEDs – 0.84Showerheads - 1.00Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00Bath aerators - 1.00Water heater Setback – 1.00 | Showerheads - 1.00Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00Bath aerators - 1.00Water heater Setback – 1.00 | LEDs: Most appropriate IL value; Other Measures: SAG consensus value on education kits | LEDs: PY9 ComEd HEA EvaluationAll Others: N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation/SAG Consensus |
| 2020 | Recommended | LEDs – 0.84Showerheads - 1.00Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00Bath aerators - 1.00Water heater Setback – 1.00 | Showerheads - 1.00Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00Bath aerators - 1.00Water heater Setback – 1.00 | LEDs: Most appropriate IL value; Other Measures: SAG consensus value on education kits | LEDs: PY9 ComEd HEA EvaluationAll Others: N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation/SAG Consensus |
| 2021 | Recommended | LEDs – 0.84LEDs (IQ) – 1.00Showerheads - 1.00Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00Bath aerators - 1.00Water heater Setback – 1.00 | Showerheads - 1.00Kitchen faucet aerators - 1.00Bath aerators - 1.00Water heater Setback – 1.00 | LEDs: Most appropriate IL value; Other Measures: SAG consensus values on education kits and low income | LEDs: PY9 ComEd HEA EvaluationAll Others: N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation/SAG Consensus |

## Multifamily Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | 0.76 | N/A | Retrospective application | N/A – Deemed Value | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | In-Unit 1.0Common Areas: 0.8 | N/A | Retrospective application | Deemed for in-unit measures. For common areas, surveyed 10 participants from a population of 12 projects. | Deemed & PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available -12/2010) | In-Unit 1.0Common Areas: 0.8 | N/A |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | In-Unit 1.0Common Areas: 0.8 | N/A | Application of most recent research available | See PY2 | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | In-Unit 1.0Common Areas 0.8Major Measures 0.93 | In-Unit 1.0Major Measures 0.93 | * Program or Market change: No
* New Program: No
 | See PY2 and HEP PY3 entry for Major Measures | PY2 Evaluation and PY3 HEP Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | In-Unit 1.0Common Areas 0.8Major Measures 0.94 | In-Unit 1.0Major Measures 0.94 | * Program change: In PY4, the program began offering the Major Measures Component
 | See PY2 for CAL and In-Unit; MM retro. application | PY2 and PY5 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results(available 2/6/2014) | Major Measures 0.94 | Major Measures 0.94 | N/A | Property manager survey (n=14) and participant self-report. | PY5 Evaluation |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | Common Areas 0.80In Unit 1.00Major Measures 0.94 | Common Areas 0.80In Unit 1.00Major Measures 0.94 | * No market or program change
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY2 and PY5 | PY2 and PY5 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results(available – 11/25/14) | Common Area – 0.83In-Unit:CFLs – 0.95Faucet Aerators – 1.06Showerhead – 1.00Programmable T-Stat – 1.04 | In-Unit:Faucet Aerators – 1.00Showerhead – 0.60Programmable T-Stat – 1.00 | N/A | Customer self-report based on interviews with property managers (n=33) for common area lighting, major measures and some in-unit measures, and tenants (n=82) for in-unit CFLs. | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | Common Area – 0.80Major Measures:Insulation – 0.96Air Sealing – 0.88In-Unit:CFLs – 0.81Faucet Aerator – 0.94Showerhead – 0.93Water Temp. – 1.00Programmable T-Stat – 1.00 | Major Measures:Insulation – 0.81Air Sealing – 0.75In-Unit:Faucet Aerator – 0.94Showerhead – 0.93Water Temp. – 1.00Programmable T-Stat – 1.00 | * No market or program change
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | Common Area from PY2; Major Measures from PY5; In Unit from ComEd’s EPY3 Evaluation, as well as PY2. | PY2, PY5 NTG Research |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | In-Unit:CFLs – 0.95Faucet Aerator – 1.06Showerhead – 1.00Programmable T-Stat – 1.04CAL: 0.83Insulation: 0.88Air sealing: 0.96 | In-Unit:Faucet Aerators – 1.00Showerhead – 0.94Programmable T-Stat – 0.98Insulation: 0.71Air sealing: 0.81 | * No market or program change; IL values exists.
 | See PY5 and PY6 | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results(available – 1/5/2017) | Major measuresInsulation – 0.86Air Sealing – 0.86In unit: Programmable thermostats – 0.79Faucet aerators – 0.79Showerheads – 0.79 | Major measuresInsulation – 70.7Air Sealing – 80.0In unit: Programmable thermostats – 1.00Faucet aerators – 1.00Showerheads – 1.00 | * N/A
 | Customer self-report based on interviews with property managers (n=57) for major measures and in-unit measures out of a population of 402. | PY8 Evaluation |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | In-Unit:CFLs – 0.95Faucet Aerator – 1.06Showerhead – 1.00Programmable T-Stat – 1.04CAL: 0.83Insulation: 0.88Air sealing: 0.96 | In-Unit:Faucet Aerators – 1.00Showerhead – 0.94Programmable T-Stat – 0.98Insulation: 0.71Air sealing: 0.81 | * No market or program change; IL values exists.
 | See PY5 and PY6 | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| 2018 | Values Applied | Major measuresInsulation – 0.86Air Sealing – 0.86In unit: LEDs: 0.77Programmable thermostats – 0.79Advanced thermostats – N/AFaucet aerators – 0.79Showerheads – 0.79Pipe wrap – 0.79Advanced power strips – 0.79CAL – 0.83 | Major measuresInsulation – 0.71Air Sealing – 0.80In unit: Programmable thermostats – 1.0Advanced thermostats – N/AFaucet aerators – 1.0Showerheads – 1.0Pipe wrap – 0.79 | * N/A
 | See PY6 and PY8 Multifamily and PY8 Midstream Lighting under C&I Standard for LEDs | PY6 and PY8 Evaluations |
| 2019 | Recommended | LEDs: 0.77Programmable thermostats – 0.79Advanced thermostats – N/AFaucet aerators – 1.00Showerheads – 1.00Pipe wrap – 0.79Advanced power strips – 0.79Common area lighting – 0.77 | Programmable thermostats – 1.00Faucet aerators – 1.00Showerheads – 1.00Pipe wrap – 1.00 | Most recent AIC specific values available and appropriate for application  | See PY8 Multifamily and PY8 Midstream Lighting under C&I Standard for LEDs and Common Area Lighting | PY8 Evaluations |
| 2020 | Recommended | LEDs: 0.96Programmable thermostats – 0.79Advanced thermostats – N/AFaucet aerators – 1.00Showerheads – 1.00Pipe wrap – 0.79Advanced power strips – 0.79Common area lighting – 0.77 | Prog. thermostats – 1.00Faucet aerators – 1.00Showerheads – 1.00Pipe wrap – 1.00Advanced thermostats – N/A | Most recent AIC specific values available and appropriate for application | See AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8 Multifamily Evaluation Report | AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8 |
| 2021 | Recommended | LEDs (In-Unit) - 0.96Programmable thermostats – 0.79Advanced Thermostats Cooling – 0.80Advanced Thermostats Heating – 0.90Faucet aerators – 1.00Showerheads – 1.00Pipe wrap – 0.79Advanced power strips – 0.98Common area lighting – 0.77Shower Restrictor Valve – 0.80Air Sealing – 0.86Air Sealing (when insulation is also installed) – 0.93 | Prog. thermostats – 1.00Faucet aerators – 1.00Showerheads – 1.00Pipe wrap – 1.00Advanced Thermostat Cooling – 0.80Advanced Thermostat Heating – 0.90 Shower Restrictor Valve – 0.80Air Sealing – 0.80Air Sealing (when insulation is also installed) – 0.90 | Most recent AIC specific values available and appropriate for application.Evaluation team recommendation  | See AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8 Multifamily Evaluation Report | AIC Multifamily 2018 NTG Memo and PY8 Multifamily Evaluation ReportFor air sealing, See Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)a |

a <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf>

## Residential Program-Level Non-Participant Spillover

| Program Year | Type | Net Savings Multiplier\* | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2019 | Recommendation | 103.1% | 104.4% | Most recent AIC value available | Participant Self-Report with 350 AIC customer from a sample frame of 4.997. | PY9 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommendation | 103.1% | 104.4% | Most recent AIC value available | Participant Self-Report with 350 AIC customer from a sample frame of 4.997. | PY9 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommendation | 103.1% | 104.4% | Most recent AIC value available | Participant Self-Report with 350 AIC customer from a sample frame of 4.997. | PY9 Evaluation |

\* This value is a multiplier on net savings and is not additive to NTGRs.

# Business Program

## Standard Initiative

The Standard Initiative has a number of distinct components as outlined in this section. The evaluation team has recommended values for each in Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, and 2.1.5.

### Core Standard Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | 0.62 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report. 17 surveys completed from a population of 34. Basic method. | [PY1](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Annual%20Reports%20EPY1/APPX_3_AIU_PY1_Business_Portfolio_Evaluation_Report.pdf) Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 11/30/09) | 0.62 | N/A |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | 0.78 (program-level) | N/A | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report. 80 surveys completed from a population of 414. Enhanced method. Trade allies and key account executives called for 7 participants and their responses factored in to FR.  | [PY2](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY2/AIU%20EPY2%20Final/AIU_C%26I_Electric_EE_Programs_Impact_and_Process_Eval_Report_PY2.pdf) Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 1/28/11) | Lighting – 0.78Grocery – 0.76HVAC – 0.47Motors – 0.63Refrigeration – 0.90(0.76 program-level) | N/A |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.75 (program-level)DI Aerators – 0.76 | N/A | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 178 Standard surveys completed from a population of 913. Enhanced method. Trade allies and key account executives called for 3 participants.  | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 12/19/11) | Lighting – 0.76Agriculture – 0.76HVAC – 0.78Motors – 0.76Refrigeration – 0.82(0.75 program-level) | N/A |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.76 (program-level)0.80 Direct Install | 0.76 (program-level)0.80 Direct Install | No program or market change | See PY2; Updated NTGRs for Staffing Grant participants | [PY2](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY2/AIU%20EPY2%20Final/AIU_C%26I_Electric_EE_Programs_Impact_and_Process_Eval_Report_PY2.pdf) Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | Lighting – 0.62Agriculture – 0.76HVAC – 0.43Motors – 0.80Refrigeration – 0.83Kitchen – 0.54 | HVAC – 0.60Kitchen – 0.53Water Heater – 0.73 | N/A | Customer self-report. 195 Standard surveys completed from a population of 933 for Core. Enhanced method utilizing 2 interviews with key account executives and trade allies. | [PY](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY2/AIU%20EPY2%20Final/AIU_C%26I_Electric_EE_Programs_Impact_and_Process_Eval_Report_PY2.pdf)4 Evaluation |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 0.75 (program-level) | 0.75 (program-level) | No program or market change | See PY3; Updated NTGRs for Staffing Grant participants | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results (available 2/6/2014) | Lighting – 0.77 | Steam Trap – 0.90 | N/A | Customer self-report method. Lighting surveys (n=68) completed from a population of 560 contacts and steam traps (n=6) completed from a population of 21 contacts. Enhanced method utilizing interviews with trade allies. | PY5 Evaluation |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | Lighting – 0.62Agriculture – 0.76HVAC – 0.43Motors – 0.80Refrigeration – 0.83Kitchen – 0.54 | HVAC – 0.60Kitchen – 0.53Water Heater – 0.73 | No program or market change | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | Lighting – 0.77HVAC – 0.43Motors – 0.80Specialty – 0.82 | Steam Trap – 0.90HVAC – 0.60Specialty – 0.70 | No program or market change | See PY5 for lighting and steam traps, and PY4 for other measures | PY4 and PY5 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | Lighting – 0.78HVAC – 0.56Leak Survey – 0.70Specialty – 0.85VFD – 0.83 | Steam Trap – 0.61HVAC – 0.49Specialty – 0.68 | N/A | Customer self-report method. Lighting interviews (n=70) completed from a population of 638 contacts. Remaining interviews (n=65) completed as attempted census by end-use from population of 204 contacts. | PY7 Evaluation |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | Lighting – 0.78HVAC – 0.44Motors – 0.81Specialty – 0.83 | Steam Trap – 0.90HVAC – 0.80Specialty – 0.90 | Previous EM&V NTG exists | PY5 and PY4 values with NPSO included. | PY4 and PY5 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | Lighting – 0.78HVAC – 0.56Leak Survey – 0.70Specialty – 0.85VFD – 0.83 | Steam Trap – 0.61HVAC – 0.49Specialty – 0.68 | Most recent AIC specific value | See PY7; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7). | PY7 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| 2018 | Value Applied | Lighting – 0.78HVAC – 0.56Leak Survey – 0.70Specialty – 0.85VFD – 0.83 | Steam Trap – 0.61HVAC – 0.49Specialty – 0.68 | Most recent AIC specific value | See PY7; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7). | PY7 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | Lighting – 0.78HVAC – 0.56Leak Survey – 0.70Specialty – 0.85VFD – 0.83 | Steam Trap – 0.61HVAC – 0.49Specialty – 0.68 | Most recent AIC specific value | See PY7; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7). | PY7 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | Lighting – 0.84HVAC – 0.68Leak Survey & Repair – 0.85Specialty – 0.85VFD – 0.83 | Steam Trap – 0.61HVAC – 0.43Specialty – 0.68 | Most recent AIC specific value | See AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 Standard Program Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019). | AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | Lighting – 0.84HVAC (Thermostats only) – 0.84HVAC (all other measures) – 0.68Leak Survey– 0.85Specialty – 0.85Steam Trap – N/AVFD – 0.83 | Steam Trap – 0.61HVAC (thermostats only) – 0.71HVAC (all other measures) – 0.43Specialty – 0.68 | Most recent AIC specific values | See AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 Standard Program Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019).Evaluation team recommendation for thermostats | AIC 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo and PY7 EvaluationFor thermostats, see Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)a |

a <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf>

### Online Store

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | N/A – Not offered |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | 0.80 | N/A | Initial launch and limited participation | Deemed planning value | AIC |
| NTG Research Results(available 11/30/09) | 0.80 | N/A |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.64 | N/A | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 88 surveys completed from a population of 17,596. Basic method. | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 11/30/09) | 0.64 | N/A |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.80 | N/A | No program or market change | See PY2 | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 11/30/09) | 0.83 | N/A | Expansion of target population for participation | Customer self-report. 213 surveys from the Online Store population of 24,623 | PY4 Evaluation |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 0.64 | N/A | No program or market change | See PY3 | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | Updated IL value available | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | No program or market change | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | 0.83 | N/A | N/A | Customer self-report. 131 surveys from a population of 1,333. | PY8 Evaluation |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| 2018 | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value | See PY8 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7).  | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | 0.83 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value | See PY8 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7).  | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 0.83 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value | See PY8 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019).  | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | Thermostats – 0.88All Other Measures – 1.16 | Thermostats - 0.88 | Evaluation team recommendation for thermostats Most recent AIC specific value for all other measures | Participant self-report. 60 surveys from a population of 908 for all other measures | 2019 EvaluationFor thermostats, see Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)a |

a <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf>

### Green Nozzles

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | N/A – Not offered |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | N/A – Not offered |
| PY3(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | N/A – Not offered |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.89 | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 101 surveys from a population of 514 for Green Nozzles | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | 0.92 | 0.89 |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.89 | Updated IL value available | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.89 | No program or market change | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.89 | No program or market change | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.89 | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.89 | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| 2018 | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.89 | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7) | PY4 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | 0.92 | 0.89 | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in PY7) | PY4 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 0.92 | 0.89 | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019) | PY4 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.92 | 0.89 | Previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY4 and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019) | PY4 Evaluation |

### Instant Incentives

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.68 CFLs0.77 LEDs | N/A | Most recent Illinois specific value available. | Customer self-report approach based on the end-user telephone surveys of 282 participants and in-depth interviews with 9 BILD end-user participants. 2. Supplier self-reports based on in-depth interviews with program lighting distributors. | ComEd PY6 BILD Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | 0.77 (Linear LEDs, Specialty LEDs, Standard LEDs, CFLs, and Occupancy Sensors) | N/A | N/A | Customer self-report approach based on participant telephone surveys with 27 participants out a population of 273. | PY8 Evaluation |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | 0.64 CFLs0.78 LEDs | N/A | Most recent Illinois specific value available at the time recommendations were due. | Customer self-report approach based on the end-user telephone surveys of 224 participants, web surveys with 159 participants, and in-depth interviews with 5 BILD end-user participants. Supplier self-reports based on web surveys with 61 program lighting distributors. | ComEd PY7 BILD Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | 0.92 Linear LEDs0.92 Specialty LEDs0.92 Standard LEDs | N/A | N/A | Customer self-report approach based on participant internet surveys with 160 participants out of a population of 1,603. | PY9 Evaluation |
| 2018 | Recommended | 0.77 (Linear LEDs, Specialty LEDs, Standard LEDs, CFLs, and Occupancy Sensors) | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value  | See PY8 Evaluation | PY8 Evaluation  |
| 2019 | Recommended | 0.92 Linear LEDs0.92 Specialty LEDs0.92 Standard LEDs | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value  | See PY9 Evaluation and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019). | PY9 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 0.92 Linear LEDs0.92 Specialty LEDs0.92 Standard LEDs0.80 Non-lighting products | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value for lighting; default value for non-lighting  | See PY9 Evaluation and Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019). | PY9 Evaluation; default |
| 2021 | Recommended | TBD Linear LEDsTBD Specialty LEDsTBD Standard LEDs0.88 Thermostats0.80 Notched V-Belts0.89 Air Conditioners0.89 HP Water Heaters | 0.88 Thermostats  | SAG consensus to delay deeming of lighting values until 2020 research is complete in NovemberEvaluation team recommendations for other measures | Participant self-report, secondary research | 2020 Part Self-Report research for FR and PSO forthcoming, 2018 Evaluation - NP Self-Report for NPSOXcel Energy Colorado Cooling Efficiency Product 2017 Evaluation for midstream AC and HPWHFor thermostats, see Joint Evaluator Presentation: Appropriate NTG Treatment for IL-TRM Measures Characterized with Consumption Analysis (Sept 25., 2020)a |

a <https://ilsag.s3.amazonaws.com/Consumption-Analysis-NTG-Evaluator-Presentation-2020-09-25.pdf>

### Small Business Direct Install

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.90 | N/A | IPA Program | AIC Planning Value | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results (available 3/1/14) | 0.89 | N/A | N/A | Participant self-report conducted in PY6. Surveyed 70 contacts from a population of 445 participants. | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 0.90 | N/A | IPA Program | AIC Planning Value | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results  | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.89 | N/A | Previous EM&V NTGR Exists | See PY6 | PY6 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results (available 12/1/16) | 0.96 | N/A | N/A | Customer self-report. 77 completed interviews out of a population of 649 participants. | PY8 Evaluation |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | 0.89 | N/A | Previous EM&V NTGR Exists | See PY6 | PY6 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results  | No research conducted |
| 2018 | Value Applied | 0.96 | 0.96 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY8 | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | 0.96 | 0.96 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY8 | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 0.91 | 0.91 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo | 2018 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.91 | 0.91 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo | 2018 Evaluation |

### Small Business Refrigeration

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.86 | N/A | Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists | Combined refrigeration NTG results from the PY4 and PY6 C&I Standard evaluation | PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | 0.86 | N/A | Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists | See PY8 | PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.86 | 0.86 | Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists | See PY8 | PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.86 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY8 | PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |

### Small Business Building Envelope

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2021 | Recommended | 0.91 | 0.91 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See 2018 Standard Initiative NTG Research Memo | 2018 Evaluation |

## Custom Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | 0.77 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report. 14 surveys completed from a population of 34. Basic method. | [PY1](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Annual%20Reports%20EPY1/APPX_3_AIU_PY1_Business_Portfolio_Evaluation_Report.pdf) Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 11/30/09) | 0.77 | N/A |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | 0.69 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report. 56 surveys completed from a population of 146. Enhanced method. Trade allies and key account executives called for 7 participants and their responses were factored in to the customer free ridership calculation. | [PY2](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY2/AIU%20EPY2%20Final/AIU_C%26I_Electric_EE_Programs_Impact_and_Process_Eval_Report_PY2.pdf) Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 1/28/11) | 0.69 | N/A |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.75 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Electric: Customer self-report. 47 surveys completed from a population of 125. Enhanced method. Trade allies and key account executives called for 5 participants and their responses were factored in to the customer free ridership calculation. | PY[3](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY2/AIU%20EPY2%20Final/AIU_C%26I_Electric_EE_Programs_Impact_and_Process_Eval_Report_PY2.pdf) Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 12/19/11) | 0.75 | N/A |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.69 | 0.69 | * Program or Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY2. Also supplemented by Staffing Grant participant interviews, new projects NTGR score used if higher than PY2 Recommended NTGR.  | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 0.75 | 0.81 | * Program or Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY3; also supplemented by Staffing Grant participant interviews (8 of 16, 81% of kWh savings), new NTGR score used if higher than PY3 Recommended NTGR. Affected 7 respondents and 11 custom projects. | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 2/6/2014) | 0.74 | 0.74 | N/A | Customer self-report. 41 surveys completed from a population of 82. Enhanced method, however no respondents required interviews with trade allies or key account executives.  | PY5 Evaluation |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.75 | 0.81 | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY3 for Electric; Deemed Value for Gas. Also supplemented by Staffing Grant participant interviews, new projects NTGR score used if higher than PY3 Recommended NTGR. | PY3 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available – 3/11/2015) | N/A | 0.83 | N/A | Customer self-report. 8 surveys completed from a population of 24. Enhanced method, however no respondents required interviews with trade allies or key account executives. | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 0.75 | 0.74 | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY5 for FR and participant SO | PY5 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.75 | 0.83 | * Program or Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY5 for Electric & PY6 for Gas (FR and SO); See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO. | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | Core Custom: 0.82New Construction Lighting: 0.82  | Core Custom: 0.94New Construction Lighting: 0.94 | N/A | Customer self-report. 36 completed surveys from a population of 105 participants. Enhanced method, however no respondents required interviews with trade allies or key account executives. | PY8 Evaluation |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | 0.74 | 0.83 | * Program or Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY5 for Electric & PY6 for Gas (FR and SO); See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO. | PY5 and PY6 Evaluations |
| 2018 | Value Applied | Core Custom: 0.82New Construction Lighting: 0.82  | Core Custom: 0.94New Construction Lighting: 0.94 | * Most recent AIC specific value available
 | See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO.  | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | Core Custom: 0.82New Construction Lighting: 0.82  | Core Custom: 0.94New Construction Lighting: 0.94 | * Most recent AIC specific value available
 | See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO. | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | Core Custom: 0.82New Construction Lighting: 0.82  | Core Custom: 0.94New Construction Lighting: 0.94 | * Most recent AIC specific value available
 | See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019). | PY8 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | Core Custom: 0.82New Construction Lighting: 0.82  | Core Custom: 0.94New Construction Lighting: 0.94 | * Most recent AIC specific value available
 | See PY8 Evaluation; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO (updated in 2019). | PY8 Evaluation |

## Retro-Commissioning Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | 1.0 | N/A | Pilot with only 1 project. | Deemed | PY1 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | 0.8 | N/A | Retrospective application  | AIC planning Value  | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.58 | N/A | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 17 surveys completed from a population of 18 participant contacts. Basic method. | [PY3](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY3/AIU%20C%26I%20Electric%20EE%20Programs%20Evaluation%20PY3.pdf) Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 04/01/12) | 0.58 | N/A |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.95 | 0.95 | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 14 surveys completed from a population of 32 participants. Service Provider self-report. 9 surveys completed from a population of 12 participants. Enhanced method. Participant and Service Provider spillover researched. | [PY](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY3/AIU%20C%26I%20Electric%20EE%20Programs%20Evaluation%20PY3.pdf)4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 01/24/13) | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 0.95 | 0.95 | * Program change: No
* Market change: Market evolving with service providers reaching outside of the program for work and increasing resources to deliver.
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY4 | [PY](http://ilsagfiles.org/SAG_files/Evaluation_Documents/Ameren/AIU%20Evaluation%20Reports%20EPY3/AIU%20C%26I%20Electric%20EE%20Programs%20Evaluation%20PY3.pdf)4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No Research Conducted |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.96 | 0.95 | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY4; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO. | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available – 3/12/2015) | 0.92 | 0.91 | N/A | Customer self-report. 6 surveys completed from a population of 26. See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO. | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 0.96 | 0.95 | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY4; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO. | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.92 | 0.91 | * Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY6 for FR and participant SO; See Section 2.6 for non-participant SO. | PY6 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | 0.91 | 0.91 | * Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY6 for FR and participant SO; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO (updated in PY7). | PY6 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | 0.89 | 0.89 | N/A | Customer self-report. 11 surveys completed from a population of 21. See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO. | PY9 Evaluation  |
| 2018 | Value Applied | 0.91 | 0.91 | Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes | See PY6 for FR and participant SO; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO (updated in PY7). | PY6 Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | 0.89 | 0.89 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY9 for FR and participant SO; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO (updated in PY7). | PY9 Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 0.89 | 0.89 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY9 for FR and participant SO; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO (updated in 2019). | PY9 Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | Compressed Air RCx and Industrial Refrigeration RCx 0.82;Large Facilities RCx and RCx Lite 0.94Virtual Commissioning 1.00 | Compressed Air RCx and Industrial Refrigeration RCx 0.75;Large Facilities RCx and RCx Lite 0.94Virtual Commissioning 1.00 | Average of recent AIC-specific research given small sample sizes;ComEd research for Large Facilities and RCx Lite given limited AIC participation to dateSAG Consensus for Virtual Commissioning | Average of PY9 and 2019 AIC Part Self Report for CARCx/IRRCx; PY9 ComEd Research for Large Facilities and RCx Lite; See Section 2.6 for electric non-participant SO (updated in 2019);  | PY9 Evaluation2019 EvaluationPY9 ComEd Research |

##  Streetlighting Initiative

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| 2018 | Value Applied | 1.00 | N/A | Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2019 | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation |
| 2020 | Recommended | 1. – Utility-Owned Streetlighting

0.80– Municipality-Owned Streetlighting | N/A | Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance;No AIC-specific research available | N/A | Evaluation Team Recommendation;Default value |
| 2021 | Recommended | 1.00 – Utility-Owned Streetlighting0.69 – Municipality-Owned Streetlighting | N/A | Participants have no ability to implement without AIC assistance;Most recent AIC specific value available | N/A;Participant self-report | Evaluation Team Recommendation;2019 Evaluation |

## Combined Heat and Power

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Recommended | N/A – Project Specific | N/A – Project Specific | * New Program: Yes
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project. | Annual Evaluation Efforts |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | N/A – Project Specific | N/A – Project Specific | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project. | Annual Evaluation Efforts |
| 2018 | Recommended | N/A – Project Specific | N/A – Project Specific | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project. | Annual Evaluation Efforts |
| 2019 | Recommended | N/A – Project Specific | N/A – Project Specific | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project. | Annual Evaluation Efforts |
| 2020 | Recommended | N/A – Project Specific | N/A – Project Specific | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project. | Annual Evaluation Efforts |
| 2021 | Recommended | N/A – Project Specific | N/A – Project Specific | * New Program: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | The evaluation team will determine NTGRs on a per-project basis upfront. The value assigned to each project will be valid for the life of that project. | Annual Evaluation Efforts |

## Business Program-Level Non-Participant Spillover

| Program Year | Type | Non-Participant Spillover | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | Electric - 0.01 | * Based on IL specific primary data collection
 | During the PY5 Standard Evaluation, we examined spillover using responses to the non-participant telephone survey and found that 1.2% of the decision-makers took action and attributed it to the ActOnEnergy Business Program. Overall, we completed surveys with 251 respondents from a sample frame of 5,500. We conducted a similar study during PY3 and completed surveys with 245 respondents.For both studies, we developed estimates of the savings associated with these measures based on an engineering analysis of participant survey responses, as well as follow-up interviews performed by engineering staff. Based on the information gathered, we were able to perform engineering-based calculations or use the Statewide TRM to calculate savings. The most common type of equipment installed outside the program was efficient lighting, followed by water heating and cooling equipment. | PY5 and PY3 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | 0.00 | N/A | During the PY7 Standard Evaluation, we examined spillover using responses to the non-participant telephone survey, and found that none of the interviewed customers took un-incented energy efficient actions and attributed them to the Ameren Illinois Business Program. | PY7 Evaluation |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | Electric - 0.01 | * Based on IL specific primary data collection
 | See PY7 value applied | PY5 and PY3 Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Value Applied | Electric - 0.00 | * Based on IL specific primary data collection
 | See PY7 NTG research results | PY7 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| 2018 | Value Applied | Electric - 0.00 | * Based on IL specific primary data collection
 | See PY7 NTG research results | PY7Evaluation |
| 2019 | Recommended | Electric - 0.00 | * Based on IL specific primary data collection
 | See PY7 NTG research results | PY7Evaluation |
| 2020 | Recommended | Electric – 0.0002Gas – 0.0000 | * Based on IL specific primary data collection
 | See 2018 Non-Participant Research | 2018Evaluation |
| 2021 | Recommended | Electric – 0.0002Gas – 0.0000 | * Based on IL specific primary data collection
 | See 2018 Non-Participant Research | 2018Evaluation |

1. Recommendations for Past AIC Program Offerings

#### Residential Lighting (CFLs)

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | 1.0 | N/A | Retrospective application | Customer self-report of CFL purchase rates of AIC customers and customers in non-program areas. | PY1 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results (available 10/09) | 1.0 | N/A |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10)  | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Average NTG results from two methods: 1) supplier self-report surveys from 16 suppliers representing 97% of CFL sales and 2) a multistate model based on 92 site visits of random Ameren Illinois customers using CFLs compared to site visits in areas without programs or programs with different levels of maturity. | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results (available 10/09) | 0.83 | N/A |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | Application of most recent research available | See PY2 | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | * Program or Market change: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY2 | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13)  | Value Applied | 0.83 | N/A | * Program or Market change: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY2 | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 2/6/2014) | 0.47 | N/A | * N/A
 | Free-ridership estimated from in-store lighting customer interviews conducted in January 2013, and spillover estimated from 2012 in-home lighting study.  | PY5 Evaluation |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.47 | N/A | * Program or Market change: No
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY5 | PY5 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available – 12/23/14) | Std. CFL – 0.63Spec. CFL – 0.72 | N/A | N/A | Free-ridership estimated from in-store lighting customer interviews conducted in January 2014 (n=439), and spillover estimated from 2014 in-home lighting study (n=225).  | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 0.47 | N/A | Most recent value available for the program based on primary data | See PY5 | PY5 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | Std. CFL – 0.63Spec. CFL – 0.72 | N/A | Most recent value available for the program based on primary data | See PY6  | PY6 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results (available 11/1/2016) | All CFLs – 0.63 | N/A | N/A | Free-ridership and spillover estimated from in-store lighting customer interviews (n=853). | PY8 Evaluation |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | Std. CFL – 0.63Spec. CFL – 0.72 | N/A | Most recent value available for the program based on primary data | See PY6  | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | All CFLs – 0.63 | N/A | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY8 | PY8 Evaluation |

#### Small Business Refrigeration

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 0.86 | N/A | Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists | Combined refrigeration NTG results from the PY4 and PY6 C&I Standard evaluation | PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | 0.86 | N/A | Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists | See PY8 | PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.86 | 0.86 | Some previous EM&V NTGR results exists | See PY8 | PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |

#### Small Business Exterior Lighting

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.96 | N/A | Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program | See SBDI PY8 NTG research | PY8 SBDI Evaluation |

#### Small Business Linear LED Lighting

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.96 | N/A | Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program | See SBDI PY8 NTG research | PY8 SBDI Evaluation |

#### Small Business Lit Signage

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.96 | N/A | Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program | See SBDI PY8 NTG research | PY8 SBDI Evaluation |

#### Small Business Whole Building

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | Refrigeration Measures - 0.86All Other Measures – 0.96 | Refrigeration Measures - 0.86All Other Measures – 0.96 | Based on AIC-specific values | Combined refrigeration NTG results from the PY4 and PY6 C&I Standard evaluation, as well as PY8 SBDI evaluation | PY8 SBDI Evaluation & PY4 and PY6 Standard Evaluations |

#### Private Sector Enhanced HVAC Optimization

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.96 | 0.96 | Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program | See SBDI PY8 NTG research | PY8 SBDI Evaluation |

#### Public Sector Enhanced HVAC Optimization

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.96 | 0.96 | Based on AIC-specific values for a similar program | See SBDI PY8 NTG research | PY8 SBDI Evaluation |

#### Demand-Controlled Ventilation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Recommended | 0.89 | 0.89 | There is no viable secondary data for this measure. However, based on the team’s knowledge of the measure, we believe the NTGR used in AIC’s analysis is reasonable | N/A – Planning Value | Deemed |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | 0.89 | 0.89 | There is no viable secondary data for this measure. However, based on the team’s knowledge of the measure, we believe the NTGR used in AIC’s analysis is reasonable | N/A – Planning Value | Deemed |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.89 | 0.89 | There is no viable secondary data for this measure. However, based on the team’s knowledge of the measure, we believe the NTGR used in AIC’s analysis is reasonable | N/A – Planning Value | Deemed |

#### ENERGY STAR New Homes

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | No program |
| NTG Research Results |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | No program |
| NTG Research Results |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.80 | 0.80 | * Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.
 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | 0.80 | 0.80 | * Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.
 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | 0.80 | 0.80 | * Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.
 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | 0.80 | 0.80 | * Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and does not justify EM&V dollars to estimate NTG.
 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results(available 12/12/2014) | Overall - 0.42 SF Only – 1.01 | 1.01 | N/A | Customer self-report. Interviews with 5 builders out of around 42 builders who built single-family homes representing 27% of single- family homes. | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | 0.80 | 0.80 | * Program is a small percentage of the portfolio and updated AIC specific value not yet available.
 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | Overall - 0.42 SF Only – 1.00 | 1.01 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY6 NTG research results | PY6 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | SF Homes –0.57 | SF Homes –0.54 | N/A | Customer self-report. Interviews with 13 builders out of 72 builders who participated in the program. | PY8 Evaluation |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | SF Only – 1.00 | 1.01 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY8 NTG research results | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | SF Homes –0.57 | SF Homes –0.54 | Most recent AIC specific value available | See PY8 NTG research results | PY6 Evaluation |

#### Home Efficiency Standard

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | 0.76 | N/A | Retrospective application  | N/A – Deemed Value | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | Insulation – 0.63Air Sealing – 1.00CFLs – 0.75Aerators – 0.99Showerheads – 0.97Pipe Wrap – 0.93 | N/A | Retrospective application  | Customer self-report for CFLs, faucet aerators, low flow showerheads, pipe wrap; 72 surveys completed from a population of 2,987. Secondary research for insulation and air sealing. | PY2 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 1/28/11)  | Insulation – 0.63Air Sealing – 1.00CFLs – 0.75Aerators – 0.99Showerheads – 0.97Pipe Wrap – 0.93 | N/A |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | Insulation – 0.92Air Sealing – 0.99CFLs – 0.75Aerators – 0.99Showerheads – 0.97Pipe Wrap – 0.93 | Insulation – 0.97Air Sealing – 1.04Aerators – 1.04Showerheads – 1.01Pipe Wrap – 0.98 | Application of most recent research available | Deemed from PY2 for CFLs, faucet aerators, low flow showerheads, pipe wrap; Updated secondary research for insulation and air sealing. | PY2 Evaluation & Secondary Research |
| NTG Research Results | Insulation – 0.92Air Sealing – 0.99 | Insulation – 0.97Air Sealing – 1.04 | Updated secondary research from PY2 to include spillover.  |
| PY4 (6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | Insulation – 0.88Air Sealing – 0.88CFLs – 0.97Aerators – 0.86Showerheads – 1.05ESHP – 0.92 | Insulation – 0.80Air Sealing – 0.83Aerators – 0.75Showerheads – 0.82T-Stat – 0.87\*ESHP – 0.80 | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 201 surveys completed from a population of 4,627. \*The thermostat value is based on a deemed planning assumption given that there were insufficient participants to develop a new value. | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | Insulation – 0.88Air Sealing – 0.88CFLs – 0.97Aerators – 0.86Showerheads – 1.05 | Insulation – 0.80Air Sealing – 0.83Aerators – 0.75Showerheads – 0.82T-Stat – 0.87 |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | Insulation – 0.88Air Sealing – 0.88CFLs – 0.97Aerators – 0.86Showerheads – 1.05ESHP – 0.92 | Insulation – 0.80Air Sealing – 0.83Aerators – 0.75Showerheads – 0.82T-Stat – 0.87ESHP – 0.80 | * No program change or market change
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research performed |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | Insulation – 0.88Air Sealing – 0.88CFLs – 0.97Aerators – 0.86Showerheads – 1.05 | Insulation – 0.80Air Sealing – 0.83Aerators – 0.75Showerheads – 0.82T-Stat – 0.87 | No program or market change | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.71CFLs – 0.82Aerators – 0.92Showerheads – 0.86 | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.72Aerators – 0.94Showerheads – 0.91T-Stat – 0.87 | N/A | Customer self-report. 238 surveys completed from a population of 2,997.  | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | Insulation – 0.88Air Sealing – 0.88CFLs – 0.97Aerators – 0.86Showerheads – 1.05 | Insulation – 0.80Air Sealing – 0.83Aerators – 0.75Showerheads – 0.82T-Stat – 0.87 | Most recent AIC value available  | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.71CFLs – 0.82Aerators – 0.92Showerheads – 0.86T-Stat – 0.87 | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.72Aerators – 0.94Showerheads – 0.91T-Stat – 0.87 | Most recent AIC value available | See PY6 | PY6 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.71CFLs – 0.82Aerators – 0.92Showerheads – 0.86T-Stat – 0.87 | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.72Aerators – 0.94Showerheads – 0.91T-Stat – 0.87 | Most recent AIC value available | See PY6 | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.71CFLs – 0.82Aerators – 0.92Showerheads – 0.86T-Stat – 0.87 | Insulation – 0.78Air Sealing – 0.72Aerators – 0.94Showerheads – 0.91T-Stat – 0.87 | Most recent AIC value available | See PY6 | PY6 Evaluation |

#### Moderate Income Kits

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | 1.0 | 1.0 | Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | 1.0 | 1.0 | Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 1.0 | 1.0 | Consensus reached between ICC and AIC that program design merits NTGR of 1.0 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |

#### Rural Efficiency Kits

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1 – PY5 | N/A - No program |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | CFLs - 0.71 Showerheads - 0.77Faucet aerators - 0.46 Water heater temp adjustment - 0.46 | N/A | * IPA Program
 | N/A - Deemed | Docket 12-0544 (IPA filing) |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Value Applied | CFLs - 0.85Showerheads - 0.95 Faucet aerators - 1.00Water heater temp adjustment - 1.00 | N/A | Not a new Program, but no previous EM&V NTG exists | Secondary research: 2013 unpublished Midwest utility’s evaluation of a very similar program (participant survey, n=91). | Secondary research |
| NTG Research Results(available 1/7/2016) | 14-watt CFLs – 0.6323-watt CFLs – 0.541.75gpm Showerhead – 0.921.0gpm Bath F. Aerator – 1.082.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator – 0.99Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.13 | 1.75gpm Showerhead – 0.831.0gpm Bath F. Aerator – 0.992.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator – 0.90Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.04 | N/A | Customer self-report method. 70 interviews completed from a population of 9,781 contacts. | PY7 Evaluation |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Value Applied | CFLs - 0.85Showerheads - 0.95Faucet aerators - 1.00Water heater temp adj. - 1.00 | N/A | Not a new Program, but no previous EM&V NTG exists | See PY7 value applied | Secondary research |
| NTG Research Results | No research conducted |
| PY9(6/1/16-5/31/17) | Recommended | 14-watt CFLs – 0.6323-watt CFLs – 0.541.75gpm Showerhead – 0.921.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator – 1.082.0gpm Kitchen Faucet Aerator – 0.99Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.13 | 1.75gpm Showerhead – 0.831.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator – 0.992.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator – 0.90Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.04 | Most recent AIC values available | See PY7 NTG research results | PY7 Evaluation |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 14-watt CFLs – 0.6323-watt CFLs – 0.541.75gpm Showerhead – 0.921.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator – 1.082.0gpm Kitchen Faucet Aerator – 0.99Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.13 | 1.75gpm Showerhead – 0.831.0gpm Bath. Faucet Aerator – 0.992.0gpm Kitchen F. Aerator – 0.90Hot Water Temp Card Therm. – 1.04 | Most recent AIC values available | See PY7 NTG research results | PY7 Evaluation |

#### Elementary Education Kits

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | LEDs – 0.83Showerheads – 1.05Faucet Aerators – 1.04Water Heater Setback – 1.00Other Non-Lighting Measures – 1.00 | Showerheads – 1.05Faucet Aerators – 1.04Water Heater Setback – 1.00Other Non-Lighting Measures – 1.00 | No Illinois-specific value available  | Avg. of Values from Similar Programs (SAG consensus values for PY9 School Kits Program) | Secondary research |

#### Online Assessment Kits

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | LEDs – 0.70Other Non-Lighting Measures – 0.90 | Other Non-Lighting Measures – 0.90 | No Illinois-specific values available for this delivery mode. This value is Illinois-specific, and unpublished evaluations of similar programs for another Midwestern utility indicate that this is a reasonable assumption. | Secondary research: Evaluation of an Online Kits Program offered by another Midwestern utility | Secondary research |

#### LED Awareness Kits

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | LEDs – 0.85 | N/A | Delivery mode of this program is new, but is similar to a combination of existing programs | Avg. of values from similar programs | Combination of Rural Kits, School Kits, CFL Distribution, and Moderate Income Kits values |

#### Savings through Efficient Products (STEP)

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 0.90 | 0.90 | Most recent Illinois specific value available | Secondary research | Most recent DCEO evaluation of this program |

#### Community LED Distribution

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | 1.00 | N/A | Best available secondary data | N/A – Planning Value | 2013 Ameren Missouri Evaluation |

#### Single-Family Moderate Income

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY10(1/1/18-12/31/18) | Recommended | LEDs – 0.91Faucet Aerators – 0.96Showerheads – 0.93Air Sealing – 0.86Insulation – 0.89 Programmable Thermostat – 0.94Smart Thermostat – N/AOther Non-Lighting Measures – 0.90  | LEDs- N/AFaucet Aerators – 0.97Showerheads – 0.96Air Sealing – 0.86Insulation – 0.89 Programmable Thermostat – 0.94Smart Thermostat – N/AOther Non-Lighting Measures – 0.90 | At this time, it is unclear whether this program would include only low to moderate income customers or allow some higher-income customers to participate. Given the possibility of a more heterogeneous participant population, we recommend these values. However, if the final program design ultimately limits program participants to those meeting low or moderate income requirements, the evaluation team will apply a NTGR of 100% for these measures. | Avg. of values from similar programs | Average of PY9 HES and HEIQ |

#### Large C&I

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Recommended | 0.72 | 0.72 | * New Program: Yes
* Previous EM&V NTG exists: No
 | Developed NTGR based on existing values from large customers who participated in the C&I Custom Program in PY3 and PY5. Original values are based on participant self-report. Overall, the data are from 28 surveys completed from a population of 96. See the Custom section for additional details on the overall methodology. | PY3 and PY5 Custom evaluation data |

#### All Electric Homes

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1 – PY5 | N/A - No program |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | CFLs 0.88Showerhead 0.82Faucet Aerator 0.73Water Heater Setback 1.00Air sealing 1.00 (at audit) and 0.80Insulation 0.77HVAC Measures 0.90 | N/A | * IPA Program
 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results(available – 2/28/2014) | Single-Family Low-Impact 0.76Single-Family High-Impact 1.02Single-Family Overall 1.00Multifamily High-Impact 1.00 | N/A | N/A | Participant self-report. 22 surveys completed from population of 69. | PY6 Evaluation |
| PY7(6/1/14-5/31/15) | Recommended | CFLs 0.88Showerhead 0.82Faucet Aerator 0.73Water Heater Setback 1.00Air sealing 1.00 (at audit) and 0.80Insulation 0.77HVAC Measures 0.90 | N/A | * IPA Program
 | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| PY8(6/1/15-5/31/16) | Recommended | Single-Family Low-Impact 0.76Single-Family High-Impact 1.02Single-Family Overall 1.00Multifamily High-Impact 1.00 | N/A | * Updated to reflect primary research
 | See PY6 | PY6 Evaluation |

#### Residential Efficient Products

| Program Year | Type | NTGR | Justification | Method | Source |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Electric | Gas |
| PY1(6/1/08-5/31/09) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | No program |
| NTG Research Results |
| PY2(6/1/09-5/31/10) | Value Applied | N/A | N/A | No program |
| NTG Research Results |
| PY3(6/1/10-5/31/11) | Value Applied | 0.80 | 0.80 | In PY3, this program was part of Lighting and Appliances, and NTG was deemed at 0.80 for appliances. | N/A - Deemed | Deemed |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY4(6/1/11-5/31/12) | Value Applied | Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86 | 0.90 | Retrospective application | Customer self-report. 190 surveys completed from a population of 12,117. | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results(available 12/12) | Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86 | 0.90 |
| PY5(6/1/12-5/31/13) | Value Applied | Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86 | 0.90 | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
| PY6(6/1/13-5/31/14) | Value Applied | Room AC/Dehumidifier/Air Purifier 0.78 Thermostat—Elec Heat/Thermostat—AC/Power Strips/H.P. Water Heater 0.86 |  | * Program change: No
* Market change: No
* New Program: No
* Previous IL EM&V NTG exists: Yes
 | See PY4 | PY4 Evaluation |
| NTG Research Results | N/A | N/A | No research conducted |
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