

3-FRPO-OEB Staff-1 & 2

Ref: Exhibit L.OEB Staff.1, pg.1-3

Preamble: In the Introduction, the evidence lays out the challenges with the disincentives for an Investor-Owned Utility (IOU) to pursue conservation of natural gas.

- 1) Please provide examples of jurisdictions and examples where the comprehensive delivery of DSM or conservation programs is provided by a contracted third-party (i.e., not the IOU).
 - a) Are these third parties engaged through RFP?
 - b) Please comment on the pros and cons of a third-party being contracted to provide these services.
 - c) Please comment on the economic effectiveness of a contracted third-party providing these services.

Preamble: Staff evidence provides: *To address the foregone earnings opportunity, some sort of positive return on efficiency investment can be provided. This can be from simply providing the same rate of return (ROR) on efficiency investments as is earned from supply-side investments, putting efficiency and supply on a relatively equal footing.*

We would like to understand this approach respecting different sources of funds.

- 2) Please comment on the appropriateness of providing rate of return on efficiency investments made from ratepayer providing funds versus supply-side investments from shareholder acquired capital.

10-FRPO-SBUA-1 & 2

Ref: Exhibit L.SBUA.1, pg.17-29

Preamble: In the SBUA evidence on Optimal Program Design, many Figures are presented showing program spending, savings, etc. over time. We are interested in reviewing the data behind the figures and some comparative statements on Direct Install offerings.

- 1) For each of the Figures in this section, please provide a reference to the source data used.

Pg. 23: *“While these are all fine measures, there are many more cost-effective measures that could be offered in this program that have broader application, such as adaptive thermostats, boiler tune-ups, and hot water saving measures.”*

- 2) Please provide supporting data or studies to support this submission.

3-FRPO-BOMA-1

Ref: Exhibit L.BOMA.1, pg. 4-5

Preamble: BOMA's evidence emphasizes the importance of close coordination of DSM/CDM and carbon reducing programming. We are interested in understanding the pros and cons of have an independent third-party contracted to administrate and deliver the programs on a P4P basis.

- 1) In the jurisdictional scan or the experience of BOMA's evidence authors, please provide any examples of a jurisdiction that has a third-party contracted to administrate and deliver the programs.
 - a) Based on that/those examples, what are the pros and cons of such a model?
 - b) Notwithstanding if examples are provided, in the opinion of the evidence authors, please comment on the pros and cons of a third-party administrator/delivery model.

3-FRPO-GEC/ED-1

Ref: Exhibit L.GEC.1, pg. 24

Preamble: GEC/ED's evidence provides perspectives on EGI's move to first-year savings including the "potential coordinated or collaborative program delivery...with municipalities or the IESO". We are interested in understanding the pros and cons of have an independent third-party contracted to administrate and deliver the programs on a P4P basis.

- 1) In the experience of GEC/ED's evidence author, please provide any examples of a jurisdiction that has a third-party contracted to administrate and deliver the programs.
 - a) Based on that/those examples, what are the pros and cons of such a model?
 - b) Notwithstanding if examples are provided, in the opinion of the evidence author, please comment on the pros and cons of a third-party administrator/delivery model.