Unresolved issues/suggestions

This includes topics that have been introduced, but no example language was submitted and Staff was unable to synthesize language based on the input received.

- Market transformation studies
- Methods for resolving disagreements among the parties on the quality of Market Potential Studies.
- Adding specificity to "probable environmental costs"
- Defining "public interest" as it applies to programs not subject to cost effectiveness tests
- Addressing the use of modifiers for predicting behavior, also known as the 'take rate' or 'market adoption method', in a Market Potential Study
- Quantification of energy savings by opt-out customers (all classes)
- Decoupling – Should this be addressed in Docket No. AW-2015-0282?
- DSMore works with 2 cost streams. The Utility avoided costs and the Participant costs. Combinations of these 2 are used for the PCT, UCT, TRC, RIM and SCT (with a 10% adder for NEBS) DSMore cannot have a different cost stream for each of these tests, the amount of analysis would need to be repeated multiple times to account for different costs streams for each test.
- Re-insert the ACEEE RAP and MAP definitions. NAPEE definitions are more applicable to a Resource Standard state, not an IRP driven state. RAP and MAP are more appropriate. Same with Technical Potential and Economic Potential the original definition fits Missouri better.
- EM&V of Net Shared Benefits – currently used for Utility performance incentive, not used for TD. so we have two NSB's deemed and evaluated.
- "Shall" use NEBS this is not agreed upon.
- Need a definition for "All cost effective"

No consensus was reached on the following topics:

This includes topics for issues where one or more versions of language has been developed and debated by the group, but no consensus could be reached.

- Definitions for potential study terms not finalized. NAPEE definitions do not all fit with an IRP state. Suggest still using RAP and MAP
- Avoided Cost definition
- CHP and Distributed Generation inclusion
- NEBS
- Language was offered requiring a percentage of EE funds to be spent on low-income programs.
    - Utilities and industry groups objected to such language, which was originally suggested at 5%

- NHT offered examples from other states, showing a range from 0.2%-10%

- Changing the method of recovery of revenues (prospective vs retrospective)
- Reduction or elimination of EM&V
- Striking goals for demand and energy savings. Likewise no consensus was reached on revising the goals.
- Adding mandatory requirements to MEEIA, and placing the burden of proof on the utility that they had achieved the goals of MEEIA. The proposed language was objected to, based on MEEIA being a voluntary program.
- Adding guidance on conducting Market Potential Studies. Several options were discussed, some were adopted. Ameren disagrees with a Statewide potential study.
- Recognizing non-traditional measures that reduce greenhouse gasses as EE measures
- Developing a default "adder" for non-energy benefits, which would used in cost effectiveness tests. This would have the effect of making more programs pass the cost effectiveness tests. This would be an alternative to quantifying NEBs for a particular program.
- Targets for EE savings

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0.25"