

## *Multi-Distributor Consumer Pay-for-Performance (MDC P4P)*

---

Notes from Engagement Webinar July 21, 2016

Robert Smith, Incentive Programs Advisor

July 28, 2016

---

### **KEY QUESTIONS FOR ENGAGEMENT PARTICIPANTS:**

- What features of the proposed program do you find appealing?
  - integrated program across multiple LDCs
  - centrally administered by the IESO to provide a consistent experience for projects across the province and a single program point of contact
  - the IESO will coordinate with the individual LDCs to allocate energy savings toward their CDM targets
  - program designed to encourage customers to become more engaged in energy conservation
  
- What might dissuade businesses from participating in the program?
  - availability of hourly data
  - cost for energy modeling
  - minimum threshold of 2,000,000 kWh
  - incentive rate of \$0.04/kWh
  
- Do you foresee any challenges with any of the eligibility criteria?
  - Yes, see answers to previous question
  
- What are your thoughts on the proposed minimum annual building energy consumption of 2,000,000 kWh?
  - restricts virtually all school boards in Ontario from participating
  - no potential for small or medium school boards to participate

- Should IESO permit customers to aggregate a number of smaller buildings to achieve the 2,000,000 kWh threshold energy use?
    - Yes, see previous question
    - A typical secondary school might average 1 to 1.5 million kWh annually and the potential for savings can be significant over several schools combined
  
  - NRCan's ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager has established itself as a popular energy benchmarking tool that provides greater value as the pool of enrolled buildings grows. Should IESO require enrollment in Portfolio Manager as a condition of program participation?
    - No, the Ministry of Education developed a similar database for all school boards in Ontario and making Portfolio Manager a mandatory requirement would double the work in order for the school board to participate in P4P
    - A non-prescriptive approach would allow more participation
  
  - Should buildings participating in MDC P4P be eligible for Save on Energy incentives through:
    - Audit Funding? - Yes
    - Energy Managers? - Yes
- 

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

- Hourly metered data available for a building.
  - obtaining hourly data will be a major hurdle for some applicants and could restrict enrollment in the program
  - not all LDCs provide data in the same format – example, loss factor may or may not be included in the data

- On an annual basis, for up to four consecutive years (i.e. for the duration of the Conservation First Framework), participants receive \$0.04/kWh for savings achieved that year.
  - At \$0.04/kWh saved school boards would be better off applying for the Retrofit Program incentives
  - examples from the July 21, 2016 webinar suggest a potential annual incentive of about \$14,000, (a 10% annual energy savings) however this incentive would have to be put toward the cost for energy modeling which could exceed the incentive amount
  - $2,000,000 \text{ kWh} \times 5\% \times \$0.04/\text{kWh} = \$4,000$
  - represents 100,000 kWh saved
  - at \$0.16/kWh that translates to \$16,000 annual cost savings
  
- Based on the program requirements for minimum annual energy usage and reporting, school boards would benefit more from the Retrofit Program incentives
  - incentives are better
  - administrative time is less
  
- Coordination with natural gas distributors is highly recommended

---

The Incentive Programs Advisor (IPA) assists school boards in accessing public funding for energy efficient projects. As part of their Energy Management Initiative, the Ministry of Education created the role of the Incentive Programs Advisor to reduce the barriers that school boards experienced in leveraging incentives that support the implementation of energy efficient equipment in schools. The IPA services are offered at no cost to all school boards in Ontario.

Since 2009 the IPA has submitted more than 600 applications on behalf of school boards, worth an estimated \$7,000,000.