

**Illinois EE Stakeholder Advisory Group
Market Transformation Savings Working Group**

Tuesday, June 29, 2021 (Q2 Meeting)

10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Teleconference

Attendees and Meeting Notes

Meeting Materials

- Posted on the [June 29 meeting page](#):
 - [June 29, 2021 Market Transformation Savings Working Group Agenda](#)
 - ENERGY STAR Retail Products Platform:
 - [ComEd Update Presentation](#)
 - [Ameren Illinois Update Presentation](#)
 - [Retail Products Platform Evaluation Collaboration \(Guidehouse and Opinion Dynamics\)](#)
 - [Retail Products Platform Coordination: IL-TRM Attachment C Overview](#)
 - [Retail Products Platform Natural Market Baseline \(NEEA\)](#)
 - [Thin Triple Windows – Market Transformation Program Update \(Nicor Gas\)](#)
- Visit the [SAG Market Transformation Working Group](#) page for information on the Working Group and prior meetings.

Attendees (by webinar)

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

Greg Ehrendreich, Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA) – Meeting Support

Matt Armstrong, Ameren Illinois

Meghan Bean, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA)

Shonda Biddle, Walker-Miller Energy Services

Michelle Bruchs, Ecometric Consulting

Madeline Caldwell, CLEAResult

Hannah Collins, Leidos

Kegan Daugherty, Resource Innovations

Naomi Davis, Blacks in Green

John Davis, PSD Consulting

Nick Dreher, MEEA

Julie Drennen, Center for Energy & Environment

Gabe Duarte, CLEAResult

Allen Dusault, Franklin Energy

Ross English, Resource Innovations

Jeff Erickson, Guidehouse

Emma Farquharson, ComEd

Jim Fay, ComEd

Scott Fotre, CMC Energy

Michael Frischmann, Ecometric Consulting

Margie Gardner, Resource Innovations

Jean Gibson, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas

Kevin Grabner, Guidehouse

Molly Graham, MEEA

Vince Gutierrez, ComEd
Scott Hackel, Slipstream
Tim Hanrahan, Center for Energy & Environment
Sue Hanson, Tetra Tech
Jeff Harris, NEEA
Brian Hedman, Cadmus Group
Hannah Howard, Opinion Dynamics
Laura James, Cadmus Group
Liz Kelley, ILLUME Advising
David Kilgore, Ameren Illinois
John Lavalley, Leidos
Jeannette LeZaks, Slipstream
Sharon Lewis, Meadows Eastside Community Resource Organization
Alison Lindburg, MEEA
Beth Littlehales, NEEA
Thomas Manjarres, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas
Kate Merson, Resource Innovations
Jeff Mitchell, NEEA
Jennifer Morris, ICC Staff
Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, on behalf of NRDC
Rob Neumann, Guidehouse
Randy Opdyke, Nicor Gas
Stacey Paradis, MEEA
Michael Pittman, Ameren Illinois
Patricia Plympton, Guidehouse
Sean Reed, SEEL
Jill Reynolds, NEEA
Zach Ross, Opinion Dynamics
Leah Scull, CLEAResult
Rita Siong, Resource Innovations
Christina Steinhoff, NEEA
Mark Szczygiel, Nicor Gas
Rick Tonielli, ComEd
Taso Tsiganos, IL Attorney General's Office
Carla Walker-Miller, Walker-Miller Energy Services
Paul Wasmund, Opinion Dynamics
Brittany Zwicker, CLEAResult
Joel McManus, TRC Companies
Chris Vaughn, Nicor Gas

Meeting Notes

Follow-up items and next steps are indicated **in red** and summarized at the end of the notes.

Opening and Introductions

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

The purpose of the June 29th (Q2) Meeting:

1. To educate the Working Group on Retail Products Platform MT initiatives and provide an overview of the approach to evaluation; and
2. To educate the Working Group on the Thin Triple Pane Windows MT initiative

ENERGY STAR Retail Products Platform (RPP) MT Initiative

Rick Tonielli, ComEd

Michael Pittman, Ameren Illinois

Paul Wasmund, Opinion Dynamics & Patricia Plympton, Guidehouse

Beth Littlehales and Christina Steinhoff, NEEA

ComEd Update

- RPP is an initiative that ComEd joined last year. Utilities across the country influencing retailers and manufacturers to offer more efficient appliances. First foray into the MT space for ComEd. In 2021, doing the same appliances as last year: Clothes Washers & Refrigerators. Participating retailers shown in slides.
- Product strategies options: Midstream incentives to retailers – encourage them to sell more EE options of appliances and to purchase them upstream to influence manufacturers. RPP also does other approaches to influence market – working with ENERGY STAR, encourage standards to be more efficient, to address flaws in test procedures and performance measurement/reporting, and to identify emerging technologies.
- Snapshot of what we are doing this year – not much change from last year. RPP views front and top loading washers as different categories. Most customers are using top-load and most are not ES certified. That's the opportunity for us. For front loading machines, ES most efficient is widely prevalent in market so no incentive needed there.
- For refrigerators, have stepped up the demand for them compared to last year. This year using ES Most Efficient as the basic tier and working with EPA to try to bring a European technology to the advanced tier - units 30% more efficient than the federal standards.

Ameren Illinois Update

- Ameren Illinois just started participation in ES RPP. Same products. Started paying incentives in April. Historical data gathering right now. Waiting on 2019 data to try to build better baseline. Working with Resource Innovations on business plan. Logic model is developed and ODC is reviewing for evaluability. Participating in national committees including product governance committee. More updates in Aug-Sept.

Overview of Approach to Evaluation & Next Steps for Evaluator Small Group Discussions

- ODC and Guidehouse coordinating and working with small groups as we can to coordinate evaluations for ESRPP across the state
- Attachment C (to IL TRM) some more details on SAG website. High level framework useful for estimating MT savings. Not very prescriptive like we would see in other parts of TRM. Key things that Att C highlights is a number of uncertainties – longer timeframe, uncertain attribution. Important to spell things out and come to consensus at the outset. Other key thing that Att C highlights is need for theory-based evaluation. Want to test causal pathways and are on same page with what these initiatives are trying to do and the outcomes in the logic model.
- Core components of the evaluations: Right now reviewing the program theory and logic model. Central, critical first step. Need to capture everything in the MPIs. Next need to develop natural market baseline and analyze sales data. Then assess MPIs. Then attribution approach, and finally verified net savings.
- Logic model and MPI review: NEEA has provided drafts and we are reviewing. Critical first step that we agree on MPIs. Next step for SAG is convening smaller group meetings throughout July to get that consensus by September.

- Other key components for the ESRPP is the Natural Market Baseline (NMB) and the approach for analyzing the sales data from the RPP Portal. Attachment C indicates that all EE programs will need to quantitatively estimate savings toward the goal and also for cost effectiveness testing. This is the approach sanctioned by Att C to have that quantified savings estimate produced annually. NMB is the counterfactual what would have happened without RPP. Actual sales compared to NMB to determine net savings. NEEA shared an overview of their NMB approach and sales data analysis approach. We also shared ours. We are trading workbooks to understand approaches, and next month will convene a larger small group to discuss an approach that we can all get behind statewide. Anticipate consensus by September on that approach.
- MPI Assessment: NMB and sales data is one of the Market Progress Indicators (MPIs). Others are how much do retailers consider ESRPP in their assortments and marketing positions – which can be assessed by regularly scheduled retailer interviews and quarterly retailer presentations. Another mid-term MPI is market share of the MPP-qualified product tier, assessed by measuring market share. A longer term MPI is how the ESRPP sponsors influence federal standards – track RPP engagement with standard revision processes. 10 year horizon in IL and we have short, mid and long-term MPIs and we need to get to a consensus on how those will be assessed. Will be convening a small group in July to assess the MPIs in NEEA’s logic model. Consensus by September here as well.

[Chris Neme] Estimating Natural Market Baseline (NMB) – basis from which achieved savings estimation from that and sales data. Also other MPIs. How do they factor into calculation of savings, if at all?

[Patricia Plympton] They do but we haven’t totally unpacked that aspect of MPP in Illinois. Perhaps NEEA can answer how it happened elsewhere?

[Jeff Harris] In our practice in northwest, NMB embeds all the counterfactual within the baseline. Apart from the counterfactual, the assessment of the logic model and the MPIs, assuming the assessment of logic model is sound and plausible, if these things happen to overcome those barriers, then these outcomes should occur. If that is valid, then what measures give us confidence that the MT theory in the logic model is still sound and the implementation of the intervention strategies is playing out as we expect and yielding changes in the market. Those are the building blocks of how the MT works, and then at the end is the assumption that if the logic is valid and progress is occurring and NMB is accounted for, then savings above NMB are due to interventions funded by ratepayer actions. At the end, an adjustment for any other ratepayer funded activities such as other utility incentives which are netted out.

[Chris Neme] To summarize: NMB is 1000 units a year, sales data says 1500 were sold, then savings are per unit saving times 500 units. But also MPIs in logic model to establish a level of comfort that the uplift is due to the MPP? What if the answer is “not sure” or “only partly”? Or if the logic model doesn’t seem to be working?

[Jeff Harris] You’re on the right track. Fuzzy part is that the fundamental logic model is one element and the MPIs are not a black and white quantitative assessment of whether market progress is occurring exactly as we would expect. That’s why we use the phrase “preponderance of evidence” – so if we have 5 MPIs and 4 of them show that what is

happening is in accordance with the logic model, we would conclude that the program is having the influence in consistency with the logic model.

[Paul Wasmund] There is a tie-in to the attribution approach. That's one of the consensus items we are working on. Some of the MPIs would give us a scaled or binary assessment of "is this initiative influencing market changes" – would exactly use them to estimate savings like we would with free ridership evaluation, etc. But would use it to show that we are influencing the market. Net effect should be baked into the sales data analysis approach. MPIs show if initiative is influencing the market.

[Chris Neme] If NMB is 1000 and sales are 1500, uplift is 500, is that the savings that are used no matter what, or does the MPI change that 500?

[Paul Wasmund] No derating like we would see. We could determine an approach, being a little vague here because we haven't decided on an approach yet... Could determine whether initiative is having an effect, then second stage would be determining the net savings from the sales data using the NMB.

[Zach Ross] We would not derate savings like we would for free ridership. It's not a net effect per se. There is a possibility that MPIs could tell us something very different than sales minus NMB – maybe that we need to revisit assumptions or we don't have confidence in attributing and might have to adjust. But not the same way we would think about it with net effects.

[Chris Neme] Could show that NMB is wrong or other factors?

[Zach Ross] Yes, that's right. There could be blips here and there in the NMB and have to do some trend work over the 10 year timeframe.

[Jim Fay] The 10 year horizon – how to approach determining how far the NMB projection should go?

[Patricia Plympton] We haven't talked much about the longevity but have discussed what can cause it to change. We expect that there will be some or multiple events that require us to adjust it.

[Jim Fay] Do we have enough info to make a decision that the program is or isn't working so we can reallocate dollars to a more productive investment? If we characterize investment on the front end, really what is the time horizon we are looking at. 10 seems arbitrary, maybe we can think about how long that needs to be.

[Patricia Plympton] Good question and we can talk about that in small group meetings.

- Attribution: this is one way we can reduce the risk associated with the program. Determine to what extent the intervention has influenced the MPIs. Preponderance of evidence approach as was noted. Already talked about sales data analysis to look at net effect in market. Will discuss in detail next month with aim of consensus by September.
- Small group meetings will be scheduled by evaluation teams between July and September. Previously involved parties did work to tee up questions that need to be answered in detail.
- Upcoming activities – comments through utilities back to NEEA on logic models and MPIs this week. Three sets of small group meetings, which ODC and Guidehouse will

schedule. Reach out to Paul and myself via email to let us know if you want to be on the invite list for the Doodle polls. Consensus is important so we can have one evaluation approach statewide. And want to hear from stakeholders.

Natural Market Baseline – NEEA Presentation

- NEEA process to estimate NMB: Develop baseline forecast using market trends and other data to show trends in product we are working on. Consider future events that could influence adoptions – such as ES specifications and federal standards. Once internal baseline forecast is developed, have a 3rd party review our approach and recommend changes; incorporated as needed. Revisit baseline every few years. Events such as test procedures or specification updates, we then have a 3rd party estimate our baseline share from our work on those events. The baseline estimate would be based on whether through our influence we sped up adoption of the change, increased the stringency, or expanded the scope.
- Once baseline is established, can report savings to stakeholders. Report savings annually.
- Key points to savings approach. First, forecasts are tied to program strategies. Depends on where we are on adoption curve. Chart shows that commonly ES Most Efficient specs are early on in the adoption process and ES is farther along when product specs are more developed. Midstream incentives and emerging technologies where we are trying to identify the most efficient technologies out there and increase adoption. Measurement and compliance with test procedure work. Specification advancements and standards. Forecasts have to be tied to program strategies and it's important to monitor market adoption for each ES spec.
- Next key point is value of additional sponsors. Each additional sponsor is part of collaborative effort, so we don't measure effect of new sponsors. Distribute savings to each region based on baseline approach. Program Year 1 – develop baseline forecast in dotted green line. Solid green line is adoption over time from program implementation. Difference between those is the “co-created savings” or net savings. If new participant is added in Year 5 to program, we would use the same slope of the line for the baseline forecast and anchor it based on the Year 4 market share for that participant. Not only does adding sponsor help change retail stocking patterns, but also can be tipping point of whether ES advancement or federal standard update. Key point on this slide is value of additional sponsor is more than just the increment from the market share – prior investment in national program.
- Example of ES Clothes Washers (top loading) baseline forecast using ComEd data. NEEA has been doing CW since 2015 and have the trend downward for the market share, as shown on solid blue line. We forecasted out that baseline from that historic data and show the declining market share over time. When we moved to apply baseline trend for ComEd and started incentivizing in 2020, initial baseline point is 2019 year prior to investment. NEEA took the orange dot baseline forecast for ComEd and then the slope matches the slope NEEA is using in northwest region. Then the savings would be the difference between the green dots and the orange dots.

[Chris Neme] The forecast baseline, is it based only on historic trends or are there other factors?

[Christina Steinhoff] Not just the declining trend. We had a third party review what could be causing that trend and whether it would continue anyway without program based on sales data. Looked at buying cycles, that was a big one – annual or bi-annual buying

cycles; patterns within manufacturers changing their product lines; etc. A bunch of factors we looked at and reviewed. We can provide that review to look at.

[Jeff Harris] I have shown idealized market diffusion curves that always go up to the right. This is an example of where things don't go according to the idealized market adoption curves. We always want to make sure we have the third party, independent review to make sure we are addressing what is going on structurally in the market.

[Christina Steinhoff] This is a good example of the process I explained in the beginning of how we develop an internal baseline and then have a third party review.

[Jeff Erickson] Market for efficient washers includes top and front loading. Is there an interplay between the popularity of those, and is there a way it has been taken into account? Is trend in top loading a trend from changes from top to front loaders?

[Christina Steinhoff] We are trying to map our baselines to our strategies and our strategy is based on the top loaders, since front loaders are very efficient and market share of all washers both front and top are very steady – don't see a lot of switching from one to the other. Strategy is focused on getting the top loading as much as possible. We don't include front loading because they aren't part of the program strategy. Decline does not have to do with any switching.

[Jeff Erickson] Would be interesting to see the data that backs that up.

[Jeff Harris] This is showing just the ENERGY STAR share of top loaders declining over time, doesn't have anything to do with switching from top loaders.

[Q] Third party reviewer – is it someone who knows the market or someone good at analytics?

[Meghan Bean] Typically bid those out and get proposals from a number of evaluation firms. Look for demonstrated ability to do that type of calculation and seems to understand or can get up to speed on the market.

[Christina Steinhoff] Longer period than 1-2 years, things happen over time to change baseline. Right now there is Refrigerators Emerging Tech Award, to identify most efficient refrigerators out there compared to previously available. How does that affect adoption of ES Most Efficient or equivalent. Other coming up include ES update opportunities – could influence the ES spec for clothes washers in 2023. Could be new federal standard opportunities in 2026 to influence. Longer term events where we see larger influence.

- Optional additional slides in the deck to show forecasts for different efficiency tiers, using our approach for ComEd.
- We've broken out refrigerators into side mount, bottom mount freezers, and "other" which is mostly top mount freezers. Market research we have done shows different buying patterns and costs for these configurations and can have different strategies for these configurations.
- First is side mounted freezers. Tracking ES adoption for this and shows declining over time similar to CW example. Similar approach to forecast out that decline over time and track the adoption above that. Have some assumption that NMB will increase over time but expect it will increase after 2021, based on assumption that market share will pick up

with next ES spec advancement. Reviewed by Apex Analytics and will have another review for ES Most Efficient/Emerging Tech in 2022 for refrigerators.

- Top mounted freezers, use less energy and highest ES market share. Baseline forecast and tracked market share for ES Most Efficient.
- Bottom mount freezers, ES spec may be not stringent enough; when we entered the market the market share was already at 75% for these configurations. So we don't track any savings, assume that this market share will continue to increase. Strategy has been adjusted to focus on ES Most Efficient and ones that meet Emerging Tech Award specs. Will have a baseline for the Emerging Tech Award and will track that.

[Patricia Plympton] This is something we would look at in greater detail in small group meetings in July.

[Jeff Harris] Good illustration of why program strategies segregated by product category is important – they are at different places in ES and tech advancement life cycle for market adoption. Important to look at the details and look at the MT logic model and interventions for each product separately.

[Chris Neme] If for this model is already at 75% it doesn't make any sense to do anything with it.

[Christina Steinhoff] That's correct, that's why we are only focusing on ES Most Efficient for these units. They use a lot of energy compared to other configurations and are very popular. There is tech out there that isn't being recognized by ES Most Efficient so that is why we are looking at that Emerging Tech Award to recognize these that aren't shown by the ES test procedure. Don't want to invest where the market is already saturated.

[Jeff Harris] On the S-curve slide, great point to go back to that. This illustrates the three products we have looked at are in different places in the curve. Bottom mounted is at the upper right hand side – time to talk to DOE about a federal standards change since 75% of the market is there. Simultaneously, we know there is better technology that is barely in the market so we want to talk to manufacturers about getting that in place.

[Jim Fay] Based on program and what we have seen to date, can you determine if the program is working or do you need more experience in the market?

[Christina Steinhoff] First was 2019 baseline year. Second two are the 2020 and 2021. When we add a new sponsor, we aren't trying to determine what the difference is just from adding a new sponsor because there are multiple effects.

[Jim Fay] Nothing set in stone about an annual process – might be longer than one year process?

[Christina] Yes

[Sharon Lewis] Black and brown ratepayers are typically the last to purchase. Rebate makes sense but first cost is too high. Especially buy top loading machines, especially older customers who don't want the bending over. As part of ES appliance replacement, there are low end appliances that fail often and perform poorly. Some residents take those appliances and try to upgrade from used stores to get something "heavier and better conditioned".

[Zach Ross] This is definitely something we have started thinking about. Had some discussion about the business plan for the initiative and where the effects are going to be felt. Appreciate the comment. It probably underscores that we may need to do some distributive research to understand where the outcomes that this initiative will hopefully be producing are going to actually be felt. We haven't progressed much further than that yet.

[Patricia Plympton] We are looking at a broader question across ComEd IQ programs and participation and want to loop this dynamic into that as well. Would love to follow up offline.

[Beth Littlehales] Appreciate that perspective. EPA is working on an affordability study and have done an assessment of the price points of different efficient models of common appliances. Governance committee is looking at this right now.

[Jill Reynolds] EPA will have something to look at about affordability in the next few months; they have a presentation we can share or have them walk through with you.

[Carla Walker-Miller] Affordability and cultural competence and equity are especially sensitive topics. When we were moving everything online there were promises that everyone would get same access to service as people with digital access have – but it turns out to be harder to get things done by phone now. Equity in electrifying vehicle fleet as an example – have to build equity in from this stage before market forces take over. Underrepresented and poor are going to be left out otherwise.

- **Next steps:**
 1. Evaluation teams will host small group meetings starting in July, with the goal of reaching consensus on Retail Products Platform evaluation considerations in September. If any SAG Working Group participants are interested in participating, reach out to Patricia Plympton (Guidehouse) and Paul Wasmund (Opinion Dynamics).
 2. The final Retail Products Platform evaluation approach will be presented to the MT Savings Working Group in Q4.
 3. Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA) follow-up documents:
 - EPA ENERGY STAR: Affordability of ENERGY STAR Appliances Research Findings (May 2021)
 - Retail Products Platform Product Operational Strategy – Clothes Washers (September 2020)
 - Memo summarizing evaluator's review of NEEA clothes washer baseline assumptions – *coming soon*

Thin Triple Windows MT Initiative

Randy Opdyke, Nicor Gas

Michael Pittman, Ameren Illinois

- TTW is a new version that has same ~R-5 insulation without added thickness & weight. Uses thinner glass technology similar to the thin glass you would see on a smart phone. Same dimensions as double pane window but 40% more efficient – instead of 50% heavier it is only about 10% heavier. Doesn't require additional framing. Haven't been a lot of advancement for several decades, so this is an opportunity to improve the building envelope.

- Nicor sees it as a great opportunity to expand our portfolio. Gives offering and choice for customers. Can advance technology in new construction and retrofit markets. Today double pane window has R-3 / U factor 0.33. Windows are 30-40% of heat loss/cooling loss. Opportunity for electric and gas utilities to work in partnership.
- We believe the new technology will have a better adoption opportunity to overcome barriers and get to a higher rate than current triple pane.

[David Kilgore] You mentioned the difference is a different glass?

[Randy Opdyke] Yes, and coatings and gas between panes

[Randy Opdyke] Manufacturers are another opportunity – there are manufacturers at the higher end new construction and the replacement/retrofit end of the market. There are already players there working on these technologies.

- We're working with our implementer and with experts in the field (NEEA, LBNL, additional SMEs) to develop national initiative and support IL specifics (like IL TRM workpaper). Also have been involved from the beginning with other utilities and evaluation teams.
- National level, Nicor is involved with PAWS (partnership for advanced windows solutions) with NEEA and DOE to launch collaborative effort to improve window standards. Have programs like new construction builder engagement program, to look for pilot opportunities with builders and window manufacturers; try to advance this technology into our various market segments in our portfolio.
- IL TRM Workpaper – committed to developing our business plans related to MT initiatives following the IL TRM framework. Where we are on the journey is early – TRM savings workpaper and target markets. Are working on logic model but have a lot more work to do to get a full business plan to continue to engage and achieve consensus. Need to work with MT working group to get, we hope, to full implementation of this MT initiative. TRM is our framework that we are committed to.
- Logic model – early on evaluators at Guidehouse and other utilities in meetings with NEEA. Worked on early steps of logic model to get where we want to go. We think it is important to involve evaluator up front. Target markets of new construction and retrofit markets. End goals of windows standards below 0.2 U factor, engage manufacturers to develop U factor 0.15; want adoption of windows with U factor below 0.2 at 50%.
- Intervention strategies – several strategies under logic model. Working with builders and the value proposition and technical support and training tools for them. Need to understand their needs for SF and MF new construction, develop demo pilots. Other areas in retrofit side. Want to influence ES specification on U-factor. Leverage national retail programs to bring TTW to the retrofit market. Integrate into IL TRM. Other opportunities for ES home certifications as well. Co-create marketing plans with manufacturers and participate in collaboratives like PAWS and advocate for code advancement.
- TTW workpaper for IL TRMv10. Feedback in early engagement with Guidehouse and other utilities, always the big question of What are the Savings? Partnered with Berkeley Lab and NEEA and Guidehouse in workpaper development. Under this identified the baseline under current code for new construction and retrofit, and then both on gas and electric side developed the savings opportunities. We thought this was a critical step to get it out there into the TRM.
- Market baseline – national perspective, and how it translates to Illinois. Initial work on a national baseline prepared by Steve S from NEEA, Guidehouse is reviewing. Majority of

national building stock is single family. Today TTW are only 1.6% of national market. Currently the feedback is that there is a lack of market demand, no pressure for this technology to advance. Over the next decade, there doesn't seem like the market will adopt TTW at an increasing rate over 5%. Intervention strategies can really lead these to faster adoption over time above the baseline where they would be independent of utility engagement. This MT has happened before with double paned windows, which are now 87% of the market. It has happened over several decades with Low-E involvement, but TTW are just scratching the surface.

- Next steps – working with other utilities in IL. Timeline through 2022. Next steps are builder survey, market characterization research, IL-specific NMB, business plan development with sound logic model, and then a pilot program for new construction and into the retrofit market in 2022 plan cycle. Interested in working with partners, this group, our evaluators and NEEA – can all get a lot further. Great long-term opportunity for all the utilities. Ameren is already committed on this.
- Ameren Illinois update: We will be co-funding the study with Nicor to continue to look at this through 2022. This will allow Ameren IL to make a better determination once we know the market characterization.
- **Next steps: An update on the initiative will be scheduled in either Q4 2021 or Q1 2022.**

Closing & Next Steps

Retail Products Platform MT Initiative:

1. Evaluation teams will host small group meetings starting in July, with the goal of reaching consensus on Retail Products Platform evaluation considerations in September. If any SAG Working Group participants are interested in participating, reach out to Patricia Plympton (Guidehouse) and Paul Wasmund (Opinion Dynamics).
2. The final Retail Products Platform evaluation approach will be presented to the MT Savings Working Group in Q4.
3. Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA) follow-up documents:
 - EPA ENERGY STAR: Affordability of ENERGY STAR Appliances Research Findings (May 2021)
 - Retail Products Platform Product Operational Strategy – Clothes Washers (September 2020)
 - Memo summarizing evaluator's review of NEEA clothes washer baseline assumptions – *coming soon*

Thin Triple Windows MT Initiative:

- An update on the initiative will be scheduled in either Q4 2021 or Q1 2022.