



Trend Analysis: Administration of Energy Efficiency Programs

Prepared by:

Diane Munns, Executive Director

Retail Energy Services Department

September 2008

© 2008 by the Edison Electric Institute (EEI).

All rights reserved. Published 2008.

Printed in the United States of America.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system or method, now known or hereinafter invented or adopted, without the express prior written permission of the Edison Electric Institute.

Attribution Notice and Disclaimer

This work was prepared by the Edison Electric Institute (EEI). When used as a reference, attribution to EEI is requested. EEI, any member of EEI, and any person acting on its behalf (a) does not make any warranty, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of the information, advice or recommendations contained in this work, and (b) does not assume and expressly disclaims any liability with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, advice or recommendations contained in this work.

The views and opinions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect those of EEI or any member of EEI. This material and its production, reproduction and distribution by EEI do not imply endorsement of the material.

Published by:

Edison Electric Institute

701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004-2696

Phone: 202-508-5000

Web site: www.eei.org

Trend Analysis: Administration of Energy Efficiency Programs

September 2008

As interest in energy efficiency is renewed as a means to mitigate rising costs, meet increasing demand and address climate challenges, the threshold issue of how energy efficiency programs should be delivered is being debated again.

Three main models have emerged: utility-delivered programs, independent third-party administrators, and state-administered programs. While these models are not mutually exclusive, most of the money spent is usually deployed through one primary model, and most of the consideration falls between utility and third-party administrator programs.

A hybrid approach that allocates resources based on function is also seeing some traction. Some participants in the debate argue that consumer education and low-income programs should be administered by a third-party administrator or the state, while individualized programs, dependent on service territory and customer class, should be left to the utilities.

We are seeing increasing scrutiny of the effectiveness of these models for delivery of efficiency programs. These reviews come in a variety of forms, including legislative, but seem to be most often discussed in informal dockets, workshops and inquiries designed to review a host of efficiency issues.

We have found varying levels of inquiry into the issue of who should deliver efficiency programs in the following states: California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin.

While most states have not changed from the utility-delivered model, they have stated they will continue to monitor programs to assure they are getting best value. There appears to be an understanding that the success of a program is not inherent in the model. A well-designed and administered program can attain success under any of the models.

Conversely, poorly designed or implemented programs without proper oversight and monitoring and verification of results will fail. The arguments go to strengths and weaknesses within each model and their effectiveness within the state. The National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency does not endorse a particular model.

Third Parties Are Used in Vermont, Oregon

The attractiveness of third-party administration is due in large part to the reported successes of two longstanding programs, Efficiency Vermont (est. 2000) and the Energy Trust of Oregon (est. 2001). Proponents of these programs have been vocal about their successes. In fact, in 2003 Efficiency Vermont received the Innovations in American Government award from Harvard University and used the \$100,000 cash award to inform and advise other states.

In Vermont, energy efficiency programs are designed and delivered through this independent third-party “energy efficiency utility.”

This approach is somewhat distinguishable in that prior to Efficiency Vermont’s creation, 22 utilities bore the responsibility for administering energy efficiency programs in a state with a population of roughly 600,000. Inefficiencies that arose from the multitude of mostly small service territories were seen as costly barriers. The approach was created under the premise that statewide, coordinated delivery of cost-effective energy efficiency programs would be more efficient and effective than delivery by 22 distribution utilities.

Pros and Cons Are Widely Debated

Arguments advanced for and against each model appear consistently in state dockets across the United States. In support of utility-administered administration it is argued that:

- Utilities generally understand their customers and the unique infrastructure aspects in their service area.
- Utilities have data on their customers and a longstanding relationship that is usually perceived to be positive. People turn to their utilities when they have questions.
- Utilities already have the staffing and contracting capabilities and back-office systems necessary to administer the programs.
- Only the utilities will be able to use energy efficiency to address system needs and to optimize system resources. If energy efficiency is to be viewed as a means to meet growing demand, it must be a part of any resource planning process, which is difficult to do if it is removed from the utility.
- Utilities have an obligation to serve. If ability and authority to meet customer needs through efficiency is removed and efficiency goals are not realized, the question remains how responsibility will be allocated. Does the utility retain the ultimate obligation to serve?
- Regulators have a clearly defined oversight role and well-understood authority over the utilities to ensure only cost-effective programs are pursued and only savings achieved are compensated.

Those in favor of third party administration argue:

- Energy efficiency is the only focus. There is no regulatory incentive to increase sales or bias toward supply-build options that increase rate base.
- The costs of implementing energy efficiency measures may be lower because recovery of lost margins is not an issue and additional monies in the form of incentives are not necessary.
- Having one statewide program run by a third party reduces inefficiencies due to the confusion of multiple programs run by different utilities.

Recent Decisions Are Noteworthy

Several recent debates and actions bear watching. First is the decision by the Delaware legislature to create the Delaware Sustainable Energy Utility (SEU). The SEU is a competitively selected nonprofit entity under contract to the Delaware Energy Office to coordinate and promote the sustainable use of energy in Delaware.

What is different about this decision is that the SEU goes beyond energy efficiency programs and targets residential, commercial, industrial and transportation energy end-users in all energy markets, including electricity, heating fuels, green buildings, clean vehicles, customer-sited renewable energy, and affordable energy.

The District of Columbia followed Delaware's lead and established a sustainable energy utility charged with implementing renewable and efficiency programs. As energy issues become front and center, it bears watching the enticement to link all of these issues and wrap responsibility into one agency.

Another recent decision is by the New York Public Service Commission (PSC). New York has used a single provider model since 1999. The New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, or NYSERDA, is a state-chartered corporation that administers energy efficiency programs for the state. The corporation was created by the state legislature, and NYSERDA's board of directors and executive officer are appointed by the governor.

NYSERDA's administration of programs is based on an inter-agency memorandum of understanding with the PSC, which receives guidance from an independent advisory group.

In a recent "straw proposal," the PSC proposed a significant reshuffling of responsibilities. It proposed to include utilities as significant players in the field and suggested a cooperative hybrid model in which both the utilities and NYSERDA play significant roles. The reasons cited for an expanded role of utilities included their access to customers, ability to leverage outside funding, and the potential to integrate energy efficiency with overall resource planning.

The commission was particularly interested in the potential value in "on-bill" financing. It claimed "[i]t can eliminate a major barrier to participation in efficiency programs for customers that lack ready access to capital; and it can, in the long run, reduce reliance on ratepayer-funded programs to achieve the State's efficiency goals, thereby mitigating any disparities between total bills of participants and non-participants."

Inherent Strengths Are Key Focus

If you presently administer energy efficiency programs, you stand in a better position than those who do not have significant programs in place.

There are valid arguments about the time and money necessary to disengage from the utility and start the program anew, including building expertise in the efficiency arena. The start-up issues should be compelling even where programs are new in that the utilities maintain many of the necessary functions and personnel. Each model has advantages, strengths and weaknesses.

If you wish to administer efficiency programs or maintain the programs you have in effect, the most effective advocacy will play on the inherent strengths of the utility. An additional step of reviewing coordination between utility programs offered in the state as well as promotion of cooperative relationships will assist in maintaining control over efficiency programs.