

Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
Coupons	<p><b>Price decreases and increased product selection are turning LEDs into the primary choice for consumers. This could result in higher free-ridership for LED measures</b></p> <p>In Program Year (PY) 2016, retail prices for general purpose and specialty LEDs continued to decrease. In addition, manufacturers expanded the number of models available, which coupled with dropping prices, made these products more of a main-stream option for consumers. In PY2015, shoppers were 30% less likely to report they intended to purchase a CFL in PY2016, which corresponds to a decrease in availability of CFLs across retailers. At the same time, consumers were more likely to report they intended to purchase an LED, indicating LEDs were filling some of the market vacuum as CFLs retreat.</p>	<p>Maintain the current incentive level as a percentage of the retail price may work to maintain the current levels of free-ridership. Monitor product retail prices to ensure that the coupon discount does not drop below an acceptable minimum floor or dollar value that the consumer should pay for the measure. The incentive should strike a balance between being too high, which may result in hoarding by shoppers and depress the installation rate, and too low, which may result in increased freeridership. The current \$3 per single pack discount has contributed to high sales volumes without resulting in high freeridership. Consider the current incentive level (measured as a percentage of the retail price, rather than an absolute dollar value) as the target, and reduce the incentive (whether as an instant discount or a coupon) as needed to maintain the current balance.</p>	High	<p>As the Coupon Program transitions to the Instant Discount "Deal Days Event", all eligible product incentives will be reduced to account for decreased pricing in lighting and other measures, and to maintain current balance.</p>	<p>Instant Discount program addresses this concern. Ongoing activities to understand future pricing of lighting and other measure and market trends</p>
Coupons	<p><b>Changes in the lighting market led to substantial changes in per-unit savings for PY 2016.</b></p> <p>For PY2016 more people claimed an incandescent or halogen baseline than a CFL baseline, the baseline wattage for general purpose LEDs increased by about 9 watts from the PY2015 value. This resulted in an increase for the per-unit kilowatt-hour savings by 74%. Similar baseline shifts led to decreased per-unit savings for specialty CFLs and lighting fixtures.</p>	<p>Goal setting for future program years should account for gradual reductions in per-unit savings from LEDs. The IESO should anticipate that the baseline wattage for general purpose LEDs will decline, over the next 3-5 years, as LEDs become more affordable and familiar to consumers. In addition, changes in the regulated standard for general service lamps in the United States may spill over into Ontario once they take effect in 2020. The new United States regulations may cause large, international manufacturers to phase out some incandescent, halogen or CFL products in favor of more LED options for all North America, even if Canada does not adopt a similar standard. Therefore no PIA change should be made to lighting at this time.</p>	High	<p>Under the Instant Discount Program which commenced in Fall 2017, forecasted preliminary net savings for LEDs assumes a reduction in measure-level NTG ratios. The IESO and the Residential Working Group will continue to monitor per-unit savings from LEDs to ensure the measure is phased out of consumer programs at the appropriate time. All Retailer Participation and vendor agreements related to the new Instant Discount Program allow for changes to the Qualified Product List upon notification to the participating retailers.</p>	<p>Residential Working Group (RWG) continues discussion with EM&amp;V to better understand when baseline shifts occur. EM&amp;V findings for the 2017 Program year are expected to be available mid-2018 and provide indications as to changes to the PIAs and savings associated with this measure. Upon review of the results, IESO &amp; the RWG may consider the removal of general LED lighting incentives if results indicate poor cost-effectiveness</p>
Coupons	<p><b>The addition of rebound analysis to the NTG methodology and survey respondents indicating less instances of spillover led to a decrease in overall NTGs for most regions.</b></p> <p><i>NTG Ratio = 1 - Free Ridership + Spillover - Rebound</i></p>	<p>Related to the recommendation above, if the IESO chooses to attempt more aggressive marketing for non-lighting products, staff should prioritize those measures that already offer higher gross savings (ie, are more popular with consumers) weighed against the measure-level NTG. For example, indoor lighting</p>	Medium	<p>IESO to consider increasing province-wide marketing and promotion of non-lighting products, including leveraging social media channels and retailer promotional activity.</p> <p>All Participating Retailers under the Instant</p>	<p>RWG to increase focus on non-lighting products upon removal of lighting products from Instant Discount program. Upon receipt of preliminary evaluation findings from fall Deal Days event, RWG to</p>

Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
	<p>PY2016 regional NTG estimates decreased by 13% on average from the PY2015 regional values. Two factors accounted for most of the reduction. First, PY2016 survey results indicated less spillover than in previous years. Second, the Cadmus team added analysis of rebound usage to the NTG ratio formula. Rebound usage reduces the NTG ratio, but had not previously been evaluated.</p>	<p>controls are a lighting-related product, but because they serve to reduce lighting usage, there is no rebound effect. Controls accounted for the second highest total gross savings, after fixtures (which do generate rebound) and had a measure level NTG of 133%. Other measures to target include clotheslines, which had high savings relative to other non-lighting measures, and a measure level NTG of 191%, and weather-stripping, which had the highest measure-level NTG, above 200% for both types of weatherstripping (i.e.: V-strip and door frame kits).</p>		<p>Discount Program will be required to implement a minimum of 2 pieces of signage for each product category, ensuring that non-lighting products receive equal attention.</p>	<p>investigate opportunities and strategies for non-lighting product promotions and communications.</p>
<p><b>Coupons</b></p>	<p><b>While there are a variety of program measures, nearly all savings—96%—came from general purpose and specialty LEDs.</b></p> <p>Specialty CFLs, which had previously driven large volumes of savings, only made a negligible contribution in PY2016. Nevertheless, there are separate coupons for 11 additional measures, in different forms (single and multi-packs) that require disproportionate marketing, processing and evaluation efforts compared to the savings they generate.</p>	<p>As the IESO transitions from the Coupons Program to the Instant Discount Program, consider limiting the number of available products to those that generate the most savings.</p> <p>Alternatively, the program could attempt to leverage the popularity of lighting products by putting non-lighting measures nearby and make it easy for customers to purchase those items.</p> <p>Encourage retailers to set up areas or displays for one-stop energy-efficiency shopping with an attractive name like “energy-efficiency solution center.” Include all Coupon eligible products in one convenient location so customers don’t have to look all over the store. Shoppers looking to save energy will likely know to reach for LEDs, and may also be interested in other measures like weather-stripping. To encourage spillover savings, include educational material in the one-stop shopping areas with energy saving checklists/tips, such as those found on <a href="http://saveonenergy.ca">saveonenergy.ca</a> (use ceiling fans, replace filter, vacuum appliances, get energy audit etc).</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Speciality CFL incentives will not be provided during the Instant Discount “Deal Days Event”.</p> <p>IESO’s Retail Specialist has conducted compliance visits at a minimum of 60% of participating bricks and mortar stores during the 2017 Deal Days Event – representatives worked with stores to enhance merchandising of eligible products including but not limited to grouping of products, implementation of signage and customer facing materials. LDC in-store events offer further opportunities to engage and educate customers and encourage spillover savings through promotion of complementary products.</p>	<p>First Deal Days event (Fall 2017) has the most in-store LDC-events since the Coupon program inception – LDCs will focus promotions on potential spill-over products and lighting complementary products</p>
<p><b>Heating &amp; Cooling</b></p>	<p><b>Opportunities exist to expand customer awareness of the program.</b></p> <p>Only 27% of the customers knew about the HVAC Program before contacting a contractor and 19% of</p>	<p>Expand the marketing of program offerings, including new measures offered in PY2017, to include bill inserts and other effective marketing techniques, such as direct mailings. Ensure that contractors have collateral and training to explain the benefits of new</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>After the launch of the enhanced Heating &amp; Cooling Program on July 1 2017, the IESO expanded marketing and promotion efforts to include online, mobile and radio advertising and customer handouts.</p>	<p>OSS will be modified to include fields for capturing early vs. emergency replacements. LDCs to increase advertising and promotion. WG to work with</p>

Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
	<p>customer comments suggested that the program expand its marketing effort. While some customers replaced equipment that was in good working order (34% for Central Air Conditioners (CAC) and 39% for furnaces), most sought to replace either completely broken or malfunctioning equipment. Making customers aware of program offerings and the economic and environmental benefits of efficient heating and cooling equipment could increase the proportion who replaces older and less efficient equipment before it experiences problems.</p> <p>Unit-savings for early replacement measures are higher than for replace on burnout, which would increase realization rate. The program does not currently account for early replacement savings, though early replacement information could be collected during the application process. Additionally, the program might see an increase in evaluated savings due to a decrease in freeridership.</p>	<p>measure offerings in PY2017.</p> <p>Track whether installations are early replacement or replace upon failure. For early replacement installations, track previous equipment age, efficiency, and fuel type (if applicable).</p>		<p>Additionally, two versions of customer leave-behind documents were created for Participating Contractors to leverage for both promotional and customer educational purposes. The leave-behinds focus on the economic and environmental benefits including the benefits associated with early replacements. IESO is also expecting an increase in LDC-led promotions of the program structured via program key messages made available during the July 1 release of program enhancements.</p> <p>The Online Submission System (OSS) (which receives and processes HVAC applications) collects information on existing equipment age, efficiency rating (via manufacturer, brand, model and serial number) and fuel type.</p> <p>IESO to work with Marketing and Sales Working Group to increase messaging on early replacements</p>	<p>LDCs to highlight the importance of early replacements</p>
<p><b>Heating &amp; Cooling</b></p>	<p><b>The program tracking data does not include all the primary inputs necessary for program evaluation.</b></p> <p>Currently, the information collected for the SEER 15 CAC measures are adequate to check whether the equipment qualifies for a program rebate. However, one of the key inputs for the savings evaluation—cooling capacity—is not tracked in the program data. The Cadmus team identified cooling capacities for most equipment rebated through the program based on the recorded Air-Conditioning, Heating &amp; Refrigeration Institute (AHRI reference number, but this process is not always successful).</p>	<p>To accurately report and verify measure savings, include the key specifications for each measure in the program tracking data. These specifications correspond to the key inputs in the energy and demand savings algorithms or approaches. Key specifications for the PY2016 measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Measures                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Previous Cooling Capacity (Tons or Btuh)</li> <li>○ Previous Efficiency (SEER)</li> <li>○ Installed Cooling Capacity (Tons or Btuh)</li> <li>○ Installed Efficiency (SEER)</li> <li>○ Whether installation is an early replacement or burnout for Remaining Useful Life (RUL) savings calculation</li> <li>○ Estimated age of previous equipment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Furnace with ECM Measures                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Previous furnace fuel type</li> <li>○ Previous furnace efficiency</li> <li>○ Installed furnace fuel type</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The Online Submission System (OSS) currently tracks existing equipment age, efficiency rating (via manufacturer, brand, model and serial number) and fuel type. This information should be sufficient for determining the efficiency of the existing equipment (i.e. EER, SEER etc.). All data indicated is collected in the OSS – if evaluator has not received access to sufficient data this information can be made available by the IESO.</p>	<p>See IESO response</p>

Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Installed furnace efficiency</li> <li>○ HVAC End Uses (Heating only, or Heating and Cooling)</li> </ul> <p>As new measures are added to the program, confer with the evaluation team to identify key data specifications to track.</p>			
<b>Heating &amp; Cooling</b>	<p><b>Contractors are a key driver of the program.</b></p> <p>Survey data indicate that most customers hear about the program from a contractor, that most customers replaced equipment with existing problems, that customers seek out contractors that are either known to them or are known to an acquaintance of theirs and that a contractor recommendation is very influential in a customer's decision to upgrade equipment. Customers are likely to continue to engage heating and cooling contractors for specific, existing reasons, and that engagement presents the primary opportunity for a customer to learn about the program and the benefits of energy-efficient equipment.</p>	<p>Prioritize the recruitment of unregistered contractors into the program by identifying unregistered contractors, identifying reasons they have not registered and developing a strategy to bring them into the program.</p> <p>Conduct research to understand if contractors face barriers in marketing the program and identify ways in which the IESO can further assist them to promote program measures and rebates.</p>	Medium	<p>Upon the launch of the Heating &amp; Cooling program enhancements on July 1 2017, all Participating Contractors were required to re-register for the program including completing a new Program Orientation and Training module. IESO's HVAC Specialist HRAI continues to conduct outreach and recruitment activities to facilitate the growth of the contractor network.</p> <p>As part of the July 1 2017 program redesign, feedback from contractors indicated a need for more support materials to assist them in promoting the measures and rebates. The IESO developed the customer leave-behinds (serving to educate customers and promote the benefits of equipment replacements) and required contractors to distribute the leave-behinds to each customer. IESO further reiterated the customer-facing key messages to contractors in the enhanced Training module.</p>	<p>RWG to confirm planned market research activities for 2018 to ensure that insights into why non-participating contractors are not registering are collected.</p>
<b>Heating &amp; Cooling</b>	<p><b>Inconsistencies in the Value Added Services (VAS) report resulted in discrepancies in the total reported program savings.</b></p> <p>Identified inconsistency within the VAS report, specifically regarding the number of significant figures recorded for demand reduction values. Resulted in a final reported demand reduction mismatch of approximately 44 kW compared to the VAS report.</p>	<p>Update the HVAC program tracking database so that each piece of rebated equipment is entered as an individual line item, rather than bundling together measures that are part of the same project. As an example, consider a project that resulted in the installation of a CAC and an ECM. In the current database structure, this is entered as a single measure: "CAC and ECM". However, it's really a project with two measures that should be tracked as two separate database entries. One line would</p>	Low	<p>The July 1 2017 new measure-level prescriptive input assumptions (PIAs) in the OSS tracking database and the resulting reports are formatted in accordance with individual measure items, with assumed preliminary net savings derived from the Business Case developed by the Residential Working Group.</p>	<p>See IESO response.</p>



Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
	<p>Attempting to disaggregate the reported project-level information into measure-level results is prone to error and, as the program begins to offer more measures, this issue will compound.</p> <p>The expected impact on savings is low. However, as the program becomes more complicated, identifying and correcting issues may become a more time-consuming endeavor for the IESO Data &amp; Reporting team</p>	<p>correspond to the CAC and would list all the measure-specific savings and inputs. The second line would correspond to the ECM and would list all the measure-specific savings and inputs.</p> <p>Check the program tracking database for consistency with respect to reported savings assignments and ensure that values match the PIA list.</p>			
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>In PY2016, most ENERGY STAR homes were built by track builders and all EnerGuide homes were built by smaller custom home builders.</b></p> <p>Among the eight participating builders interviewed who constructed ENERGY STAR homes under the RNC Program, four were from a large firm (with 250 employees or more) and three were from a mid-sized firm (with 50 to 250 employees). The ENERGY STAR incentive level proved more relevant to track builders who construct a larger number of homes. Conversely, all five builders who constructed EnerGuide homes under the RNC Program were from a small firm (with less than 50 employees). These small custom builders tend to build fewer but more efficient homes.</p>	<p>Program should address the needs of larger tract builders and smaller custom home builders differently. Materials targeting tract builders should emphasize the benefits of ENERGY STAR and encourage greater market share of ENERGY STAR homes. Materials targeting custom home builders should push innovative technologies and designs that appeal to custom homebuyers, which can reduce free-ridership by increasing program influence.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>The IESO and the Residential Working Group will be redesigning the Residential New Construction Program for release in early 2019 – program changes are likely to focus on opportunities for collaboration with existing Gas programs, and innovative technologies, designs and emerging performance standards (i.e. net zero, passive homes etc.)</p>	<p>RWG will work to ensure that the redesigned RNC program accounts for future changes (building code, standards, technologies etc.). The redesign will take approximately 12 months to complete so few changes are expected to the existing program prior to the re-launch.</p>
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>Free-ridership ranged from 13% for track home builders to 60% for small custom builders due to existing baseline practices.</b></p> <p>The track builders who constructed the most ENERGY STAR homes and implemented the most prescriptive measures under the RNC Program reported that they would have built houses only to code in PY2016 had the program not existed resulting in low free-ridership level for Prescriptive track (13%) and Performance track ENERGY STAR homes (19%). Conversely, Performance track EnerGuide homes had higher free ridership (60%), as custom builders said they likely would have built</p>	<p>Encourage track builders to increase the share of ENERGY STAR homes to 100 percent. In addition, explore opportunities with track home builders to foster the construction of EnerGuide rated homes through various mechanisms such as capacity building and technical support, and revising the incentives.</p> <p>Work directly with small builders to encourage the construction of higher EnerGuide efficiency homes (EnerGuide 85+) and possibly net zero ready homes.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Redesign efforts will explore opportunities to increase share of ENERGY STAR homes and other performance track options.</p>	<p>Redesign will focus on promotion of incremental measures above and beyond performance track incentives. In PY 2018, few changes are expected; province will be limited in marketing and communications to builders as the program is not consistently offered across all LDC territories as this is not viewed as necessary depending on different market needs and conditions.</p>

Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
	homes to the same efficiency level in absence of the program.				
<b>New Home Construction</b>	<p><b>Changes to the verified unit savings across all tracks resulted in lower program savings.</b></p> <p>Despite lower participation in PY2016, the difference in savings from PY2015 is mostly due to changes in the per verified unit savings.</p> <p><b>Prescriptive track</b> unit savings were updated for all measures using new baseline values</p> <p><b>Performance track</b> measure saving were updated to reflect only electricity savings and it was confirmed that EnerGuide 80 should be the baseline for EnerGuide Homes. Unit saving for Energy Star homes was aligned with the Energy Star rating guide.</p>	Moving forward the new unit savings should be used for gross reporting.	Medium	IESO to update unit savings upon verification from EM&V.	See IESO response.
<b>New Home Construction</b>	<p><b>A Prescriptive measure review and adjustments could reenergize participation and increase savings.</b></p> <p>LDCs reported, the RNC Program lags behind the market in terms of the energy efficiency measures offered. In addition, the current Prescriptive track products do not generate significant per-unit savings, especially given the current market baseline identified as part of the PY2016 per-unit savings review. Major energy savings, therefore, can only be achieved if builders install a high number of products. Moreover, some Prescriptive track products (CACs and LED lighting) overlap with Building Option Package (BOP) measures implemented by builders to meet ENERGY STAR certification, further reducing savings opportunities through the Prescriptive track.</p>	<p>Revise and expand the list of eligible products to drive the market beyond current practices and achieve greater per-unit and total savings. For example, the program could offer new Performance track measures, such as those with a higher EnerGuide rating greater than 85. Such an incentive offering would recognize builders who construct houses with higher EnerGuide ratings and encourage other builders to achieve comparable efficiency levels.</p> <p>Eliminate measure overlap between prescriptive and performance tracks such as ENERGY STAR CACs and lighting products.</p> <p>Continue updating the efficiency requirements of Prescriptive track products and remove products from eligibility that have an efficiency level similar to the current market.</p>	Medium	The redesigned program is anticipated to include updated and expanded Performance Track incentives, and may require builders to access Performance or Prescriptive measures (to eliminate instances of overlapping savings).	RWG is limited in updates to program in 2018 as a larger scale redesign is underway and expected to be in market early 2019. RWG will continue to monitor activity in the program and ensure that findings are addressed in redesign.

Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>Participating LDCs do not necessarily have a good understanding of ENERGY STAR and EnerGuide concepts.</b></p> <p>During LDC interviews it was noted that LDCs generally have a low understanding of ENERGY STAR and EnerGuide concepts, despite familiarity with the RNC Program delivery processes. These two certifications, managed by Natural Resources Canada, have specific sets of requirements that are expected to evolve following upcoming changes to the Ontario Building Code. As part of the evaluation, the Cadmus team spoke with ENERGY STAR program officers at NRCAN to better understand the <i>ESNH Standard</i> used for ENERGY STAR-certified homes.</p>	<p>Provide training (i.e. webinar) for LDCs so they can better understand the ENERGY STAR and EnerGuide concepts and minimum certification requirements.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>See RWG response</p>	<p>During the program redesign business case development phase, EnerGuide changes will be harmonized in a new design (if performance track continues to exit) – education and training (for contractors, customers and LDCs) will be a feature of the new program. The intention of redesign is to collaborate with gas utility programs where it makes sense to leverage existing building training/capability building and communication channels.</p>
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>The majority of homes in RNC are heated by natural gas but savings are currently not accounted for.</b></p> <p>Only 14% of Ontario houses are primarily heated with electricity meaning, most houses are heated with natural gas. In addition, all 35 reviewed HOT2000 simulation files represented houses with natural gas as primary heating systems. Despite this, the IESO does not currently track natural gas savings.</p>	<p>Incorporating natural gas and other non-electric energy savings into the evaluation process would significantly increase the reported benefits of the RNC program and positively influence the cost-effective tests</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>The 2018 evaluation plan is intended to incorporate non-electric energy savings into the evaluation process.</p>	<p>Noted – this will be brought forward during redesign discussions.</p>
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>The reduced program scale and savings potential negatively influenced cost-effectiveness.</b></p> <p>Participation dropped significantly in PY2016 with the smaller budgets allocated for the RNC Program by LDCs compared to the previous framework. Furthermore, the current program offerings generated lower per-unit savings—especially given the current market baseline and share of electric savings identified as part of the PY2016 per-unit savings review—resulting in low overall program cost-effectiveness.</p>	<p>Administration costs could be reduced with a more centralized offering. This will be more attractive to builders who operate across multiple LDC regions by reducing variation in the program processes.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Burden on LDC and builders to administer this program is a known issue – and will be addressed through redesign efforts</p>	<p>Central access points for builders (through centralized delivery) with fully automated submission system are a priority for discussion through the redesign of the program.</p>

Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>Reduced networking efforts between LDCs and builders may be negatively impacting participation.</b></p> <p>LDCs shared that they have little contact with builders due to limited staff. In addition, these LDCs reported that they assumed most builders already knew about the program and therefore spent less time reaching out to builders than in the past. However, in PY2016, the number of submitted projects decreased from PY2015. In addition, implemented projects were distributed over fewer LDCs.</p>	<p>Increase networking between program administrators and builders to establish or maintain relationships. Leverage builder networks to reach smaller builders who might not know of the program.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>A redesigned program, with centralized elements, may enable greater communications and promotions between administrators and builders.</p>	<p>Collaboration with gas utilities in the redesigned program may centralize the administrative experience of builders and extend ability and reach of networking and builder engagement.</p>
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>Follow up with builders is insufficient.</b></p> <p>Several participating builders expressed concern regarding sparse communications with LDCs, especially related to preliminary and final applications. Once they submit the required documentation, builders said they did not always receive confirmation that their application was received. Moreover, when receiving payment, builders noted that there was no statement that specified the associated measure(s) to explain the incentive amount.</p>	<p>Confirm application receipt with builders and provide status updates regarding the application process.</p> <p>Consider including an explanatory note with incentive payments to document how the payment amount was determined.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Automated centralized intake systems in the redesigned program should address this finding in 2019.</p>	<p>See IESO response</p>
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>While builders struggle on their own with aspects of the application, delivery agent involvement can facilitate a smooth process.</b></p> <p>Builders identified the paperwork required to complete the application process, especially for the Prescriptive track, as a participation barrier. Specifically, builders said it was complex and cumbersome, especially for track builders who install Prescriptive track products in a high number of homes. Four of the five participating builders we interviewed who installed Prescriptive measures were large track builders. In contrast, builders</p>	<p>Adapt the Prescriptive track document requirements to reflect the business operation process of track builders. Organize a focus group with track builders and gather their input to improve the application process.</p> <p>Consider working more with delivery agents to help LDCs deliver the RNC Program, either at the LDC or regional level. Specifically to support builders through the application process.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>The RWG redesign process to include many stakeholder engagement sessions with builder for the purpose of aligning application requirements with their own business needs and abilities. Expectation is that there will be a central delivery agent for intake and builder support.</p>	<p>See IESO response</p>



Program	Key Findings	2016 EM&V Recommendation	Impact	IESO Response	Working Group Response
	<p>generally reported that the Performance track application process was more convenient and straightforward. For all tracks, builders reported they appreciated when delivery agents helped them complete the application process.</p>				
<p><b>New Home Construction</b></p>	<p><b>Participating LDCs find the RNC Program reporting process labour intensive.</b></p> <p>LDCs said they faced challenges with RNC Program reporting. Smaller LDCs in particular expressed concerns with the time required to complete reporting, and larger LDCs expressed displeasure with the complexity associated with reporting a large number of projects. Specifically, these larger LDCs said the manual data entry made the current reporting process tedious. The Cadmus team noted inconsistencies in the project list, likely due to the manual, burdensome reporting process.</p> <p>The tedious nature of the reporting process is likely reducing LDC satisfaction with the RNC program. Simplification and automation of the process would lead to higher satisfaction, reduced inconsistencies, improve communication between the LDCs and the IESO, and facilitate the evaluation process</p>	<p>Simplify the process of completing the project list for LDCs by adding more input tasks and linking project and measure lists, where applicable. Further automate the reporting process by linking final application forms with the project list. Increased automation would not only facilitate the reporting process, but would reduce inconsistencies in the reported information.</p> <p>Establish an online system to enable LDCs to centralize project documents (e.g., HOT2000 files, receipts, application forms, building permits, certifications). Such a centralized system would facilitate follow up between LDCs and the IESO, while increasing consistency in the information reported and documentation provided. Further, this would ensure that documentation remains readily available and accessible for evaluation purposes.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The program redesign intended to include a central intake system that will also serve as supporting document database and provide reporting functions. This will include any pre and post project HOT 2000 files as required.</p>	<p>See IESO response</p>