

Illinois EE Stakeholder Advisory Group Market Transformation Savings Working Group

Thursday, April 21, 2022 Meeting

12:30 – 3:00 pm pm

Teleconference

Attendees and Meeting Notes

Meeting Materials

- [SAG Market Transformation Savings Working Group Webpage](#)
- Posted on the [April 21 meeting page](#):
 - [Thursday, April 21 Market Transformation Savings Working Group Agenda](#)
 - [SAG Facilitator Introduction to SAG MT Savings Working Group](#)
 - Illinois Utility Market Transformation (MT) Updates
 - [Illinois Utility Market Transformation Initiatives 2022 Summary Table](#)
 - [Ameren Illinois MT Initiative Update Presentation](#)
 - [ComEd MT Initiative Update Presentation](#)
 - [Nicor Gas MT Initiative Update Presentation](#)
 - Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas: Verbal Update
 - [SAG MT Savings Protocol Process Draft Recommendation: Nicor Gas Presentation](#)
 - [Stretch Energy Codes & Evaluation of Market Transformation: Slipstream, MEEA and Guidehouse Presentation](#)

Attendees (by webinar)

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

Samarth Medakkar, Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (MEEA) – Meeting Support

Abigail Miner, IL Attorney General's Office

Aivy Mathew, EfficiencyOne

Alison Lindburg, MEEA

Andrey Gribovich, DNV

Billy Davis, Bronzeville Community Development Partnership

Carl Nelson, Center for Energy and Environment

Chris Burgess, MEEA

Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, representing NRDC

Corey Grace, Resource Innovations

Cynthia Segura, Citizens Utility Board

Dena Jefferson, Franklin Energy

Ellen Rubinstein, Resource Innovations

Erin Daughton, ComEd

Fred Wu, Aiqueous

Gabriel Duarte, CLEAResult

Hannah Collins, Leidos

Jane Colby, Apex Analytics

Jean Gibson, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas

Jeannette LeZaks, Slipstream

Jeff Harris, Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA)

Jennifer Morris, ICC Staff

Jim Fay, ComEd
Jim Jerozal, Nicor Gas
John Davis, PSD Consulting
John Lavallee, Leidos
Kegan Daugherty, Resource Innovations
Keith Downes, Ecometric Consulting
Kevin Grabner, Guidehouse
Kirsten Millar, Virtual Peaker
Michelle Thorsell, MEEA
Maddie Johnston, MEEA
Maddie Koolbeck, Slipstream
Mark Szczygiel, Nicor Gas
Mark Milby, ComEd
Martha White, Nicor Gas
Matt Armstrong, Ameren Illinois
Michael Pittman, Ameren Illinois
Molly Graham, MEEA
Molly Lunn, ComEd
Patricia Plympton, Guidehouse
Paul Wasmund, Opinion Dynamics
Ram Dharmarajan, Gas Technology Institute
Randy Opdyke, Nicor Gas
Rick Tonielli, ComEd
Rita Siong, Resource Innovations
Ryan Kelly, EfficiencyOne
Saranya Gunasingh, Slipstream
Scott Allen, Citizens Utility Board
Seth Craigo-Snell, SCS Analytics
Shannon Kahl, ILLUME
Stacey Paradis, MEEA
Stefan Johnson, Guidehouse
Stu Slote, Guidehouse
Ted Weaver, First Tracks Consulting, on behalf of Nicor Gas
Thomas Manjarres, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas
Vincent Gutierrez, ComEd
Wayne Leonard, Guidehouse
Zachary Froio, Applied Energy Group

Opening & Introductions

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

Purpose of meeting:

1. For Illinois utilities to provide a status update on current Illinois market transformation (MT) initiatives in progress in 2022;
2. For Nicor Gas to present a proposed market transformation savings protocol process for discuss MT initiatives; and
3. For Slipstream, MEEA, and Guidehouse to present an update on the Code Advancement Energy Stretch Codes Initiative.

Introduction to MT Savings Working Group

- Purpose: To provide a forum for utilities and stakeholders to discuss Illinois market transformation (MT) initiatives, and the data/approach to use for savings from specific MT initiatives
- Working Group Website: https://www.ilsag.info/mt_savings_working_group/
- Background: Working Group est. in 2019 to reach agreement on a framework for MT savings, which was included in IL-TRM Version 8.0; meetings in recent years focused on discussing open MT policy issues and progress updates on utility MT initiatives
- If there are changes proposed to IL-TRM Attachment C for IL-TRM Version 11.0, edits need to be discussed and approved by this Working Group
- To be included in IL-TRM Version 11.0, the Working Group must send the final IL-TRM Attachment C to the IL-TRM Administrator (VEIC) by Wed. Aug. 3 (for Aug. 5 IL-TRM deliverable)
- If the August deadline cannot be met, the final opportunity to include edits to Attachment C in the IL-TRM is submittal by Wed. Sept. 7 (to meet the final Sept. 9 IL-TRM deliverable)
- 2022 Working Group Goals:
 - 1. Provide a forum for utilities to update interested stakeholders on the progress of market transformation initiatives
 - 2. Discuss and finalize proposed edits to IL-TRM Attachment C
 - 3. Discuss, and if possible, reach agreement on how utilities may claim savings from market transformation initiatives
 - 4. Provide a forum for stakeholders to raise market transformation ideas for consideration by Illinois utilities

Discussion

[Erin Daughton] We're thinking about edits to existing text of Attachment C, but MT specific write ups – thinking those would be an attachment to Attachment C.

[Celia Johnson] Agreed.

[Jim Fay] What is the deadline for edits?

[Jennifer Morris] Aug 3rd is when the final version would be submitted to VEIC.

[Celia Johnson] I suggest early June to provide time to review and discuss in the Working Group.

Status Update on Current Illinois MT Initiatives

Utility Representatives

[Illinois Utility Market Transformation Initiatives 2022 Summary Table](#)

Ameren Illinois Update

- We looked for an initiative that offers significant energy savings with low adoption. Something we could get specific and tailor to our service territory. We landed on LLLC for 2022. Recent studies (NEEA) show significant savings from LLLCs when you do a 1 to 1 replacement, at less cost. Connective lighting comprises less than 1% of luminaires in the US. Bring lasting change to the market.

- We did a brief survey and identified barriers. Identified tactics to target market barriers.
- Update on completed activities and future plans
- Program ally training - targeting two trainings this year
- In 2021, we partnered with Nicor and ComEd to do a market characterization study on advanced windows. In 2022, Ameren will continue to explore partnering with ComEd and Nicor to do a market characterization study.

[Jim Fay] Do you have an evaluation plan completed for LLLC?

[Michael Pittman] It's still in draft format.

[Chris Neme] Is your intention to develop a MT savings claim process and claims savings for advancing LLLC adoption through that process? Is Ameren also rebating products through resource acquisition (RA) strategy? How does this work with MT?

[Michael Pittman] We will be counting RA savings because we are working hand in hand with NLC contractors, but the idea is to do other activities to ensure no double counting.

[Chris Neme] But you will also want to count market effects over and above the savings that would have resulted from RA rebates. You just have to get approved a protocol for what that will look like. Does this kind of approach make sense to ComEd as well? Any value to integrating efforts?

[Jim Fay] We're looking at it. Interested, but we haven't moved forward with anything yet.

[Jim Fay] In the evaluation report, is the market effects included? Will evaluation determine the savings for those market effects?

[Michael Pittman] Yes, we will follow up.

- Future Working Group Discussion- Luminaire Level Lighting Controls: November presentation on Natural Market Baseline and savings protocols.

ComEd Update

- Our first large dip into the MT pool has been the ENERGY STAR Retail Products Program (ESRPP), attempting to drive efficiency for various appliances across the country. ComEd following the lead of other utilities. Joined in 2020. Currently providing assessment for top loading washers, fridges, etc.
- We also working toward a MT initiative around stretch codes and BPS. CEJA specified CDB to develop stretch codes by the end of 2023. To get ahead of this, working with gas utilities, Guidehouse and Slipstream to get process for evaluation in advance. Paving the way for munis to be aware and utilities available to support effort to adopt code and help the customers comply with it. Wide variety of resources to support. Currently working on development of an evaluation pathways document.
- Exploring additional MT opportunities – thin triple windows, glazing systems for commercial buildings, other measures

[Chris Neme] What is the timeline?

[Rick Tonielli] Over the next few months. Final reports for research coming soon. Electric side, glazing seems more favorable. Next step is deciding to move forward.

Nicor Gas Update

- MT can't really be done alone – collaborating with other utilities is important.
- How to work together speaking with manufactures about technologies and leverage funds as a group with a common story to move the market.
- These are critical as best practices to influence the market.
- Initiatives shown here are in early adoption phase.
- Thin Triple Windows: Presented an update last July; performed research with NEEA. Right now, advanced windows are 1-2% of the market in the U.S. Good history of single pane to double pane that demonstrates opportunities. We've already started working to get consensus on savings protocols; engaging with a coalition to support windows. Engaged with manufactures of these advanced windows; great opportunity for gas and electric to work together and move the market.
- Code advancement: Did a lot of research last cycle; working towards consensus on NMB; evaluation; quantify savings; to get to a savings protocol for measuring and implementation.
- Efficient rooftop units: Emerging tech pipeline. Engaged with big box stores – lots of barriers; related to condensation management; collaborating with NEEA. Managing in cold climate. Conducting quantitative research to understand potential for initiative and we can develop what might be good intervention strategies related to logic model and inputs for the NMB.
- Gas heat pumps: Emerging tech pipeline. Pilots done in IL. Next gen tech for space and water heating. Working with 14 utilities – through our voice, opportunity to accelerate codes certs and standards. Leveraging funds to get market research in our territory and us to build awareness and offer customers new incentives to improve efficiency beyond what's available today.
- Secondary glazing systems: Early market research – understand potential and awareness and challenges.
- Advanced windows: Draft logic model; looking at where we are in developing NMB; additional data needs to evaluate needs. Unit savings already in the TRM. We haven't started the theory-based evaluation. How do you measure units.

[Jim Fay] Where will you put an evaluation plan in the sequence of activities?

[Randy Opdyke] Falls under theory-based evaluation. Michael was speaking about this for LLLC; that will fall into here for codes.

[Chris Neme] Have you made a definite determination that all of these are best fit for MT approach as opposed RA approach?

[Randy Opdyke] Early stages for some of these. As for as logic model, we have to think about this from a market perspective, but for windows it might be too early. This doesn't mean that these won't fall back to RA or influencing market may have RA pathway but will be determined in theory-based evaluation.

Peoples Gas and North Shore Gas Update

- Codes: It's important to think of these as multiple initiatives. Accelerating adoption of these. Compliance and Building Performance Standards (BPS) are separate. Thanks to the resources in the previous triennial, data about New Construction (NC) market. Using that to inform analysis on MT initiatives. Although we lag behind in NC, code compliance is something that we'll continue pursuing.
- Same research also applies to the thin triple windows work. Right now, thin triple windows initiative narrowly focused on construction market. We are watching how this initiative progresses. Once the focus shifts to retrofit opportunities, then we'll look into more closely.

MT Savings Protocol Process Recommendation

Randy Opdyke, Nicor Gas

MT Initiative Development Process and Products

- As we're going through the development process of MT initiatives, we believe there's some critical items here – so far, over the past several years, MT initiative starts from idea; collab efforts, R&D, nat'l picture, other utilizes or MT subcommittee and there's multiple phases before implementation. Under the TRM, there's some key frameworks that help us understand how we might do it MT perspective.

Reviewed Attachment C of the IL-TRM

- Attachment C provides a framework for counting, terminology, outlines best practices, defines theoretical framework and provides examples for how to allocate savings.
- TRM defers SAG MT Working Group to finalize initiative-specific MT savings protocol. Attachment C does not provide a process for reaching consensus on savings protocols; not specific for any initiative developed under MT framework.
- We would like to formalize a process to streamline activities as a group to reach consensus on MT savings protocols. We're grounded in MT best practices. Important that we would off lessons learned; where are today and how to get to consensus on protocols. We believe there's a defined process in our proposals. It's not linear and will vary by initiative, but the initiative builds to inform us on how we are measuring and quantifying savings or implementing MT initiatives. There's a waterfall effect with these activities.
- Activities mean that utilities working together and evaluators to get a work product in a good state where we can clearly define component and give good status updates on each initiative. If each utility is doing multiple initiatives, important to know where we are with each and what's up next to come to Working Group.

Key Components in TRM Attachment C

- Logic model, confirming savings per unit and NMB.
- Think about intervention strategies before we can finalize logic model; share with Working Group to get comments as well. In relation to overall savings. Confirming savings per unit. We might need a TRM workpaper first; might have to do demos; then NMB – we need a lot of review potentially with 3rd party; MR data collected to understand potential NMB over time.
- All these are critical data components – first tier of activities under framework of MT to help us for thinking about next level – key components of TRM.
- Next components related to theory-based evaluation and utilities getting credit for their intervention over multiple plan cycles.

- How do we account for savings across utilities? If defined up front; evaluators know how to evaluator, group gets to review; prepares for finalizing methodology and moving on with allocation.

Nicor Gas Recommendation: Suggest including this process framework in the TRM. We're not suggesting all of the steps are required for each MT initiative; it's a starting point to bring visibility and transparency, and to achieve consensus on initiative-specific MT savings protocols.

[Jim Fay] On the process flow table; there are various points where we as utilities have to make a decision to go or not go forward with an MT concept. I'm assuming that at the end of all this is where the financial investment will be started; also a go or no-go decision at end of phase 1. Is this correct?

[Randy Opdyke] Yes. As you start to dig down in the research as we're going to through these are influential points that might not merit to savings over time or MT that's worth moving forward with.

[Chris Neme] I reviewed with Nicor's team before the meeting today. I think there is value in the documentation of where we're at with different initiatives; enough moving parts that we're talking about that having a dashboard is a good idea. Less clear on what needs formal approval in the TRM as opposed to general agreement with how we'll track through a dashboard; not sure why formal TRM approval is needed, instead of agreement here to start using it.

[Randy Opdyke] Documenting something in the TRM related to this provides clarity. The TRM would provide the framework (i.e. we need the NMB before we can start determining how to count savings with evaluation tech; more or less to help with additional clarity). We're trying to track the critical components valuable to making consensus decisions.

[Jim Jerozal] We're trying to nail down a process. Each of these lines / steps are going to have lots of detail and engagement. The process is what we were focused on here. Relates back to history of MT – look at California. There was misalignment in savings protocols. If we can document this process well in Illinois, this is our blueprint and it becomes transparent. Entering this in the TRM would prevent what occurred in California.

[Chris Neme] I see value in fleshing out these steps. I want to be careful that we don't do this in a way that we force ourselves into a precise set of steps that don't align exactly with each initiative.

[Jennifer Morris] There could be some flexibility incorporated in the language. Related to Chris' first question, other attachments in the TRM include a process (ex: Net to Gross Attachment).

[Jim Jerozal] Agree with Chris – writing this in a way that provides flexibility.

[Chris Neme] On the draft methodology – how is this different than the theory-based savings protocol?

[Keegan Daugherty] This is an amendment we made following our conversation – specific evaluation plan would be made after a utility decides to move forward. Might be terminology cleanup in the final dashboard to ensure people are clear on definitions.

[Rick Tonielli] Having been through this with the Retail Products Platform and codes and standards, it's clear that these two programs are very different. We're concerned about having to get nailed down to follow a prescriptive process. We see value in documentation, but the prescriptive element is concerning. Important to leave flexibility.

[Randy Opdyke] I agree; there needs to be flexibility amongst initiatives. Intent is not to be overly prescriptive; intent is to outline a framework.

[Rick Tonielli] It will be helpful to see the language for flexibility.

[Randy Opdyke] Nicor Gas can draft language for review by end of May.

[Stacey Paradis] If this process is pursued and approved, what happens to potential programs already in progress?

[Jim Jerozal] If there's already an initiative underway, we don't necessarily need to start from step 1.

[Jim Fay] I agree with Jim; we wouldn't do anything different right now in the current MT initiatives. One of the things we've learned through the RPP, is following this kind of process would help. All of this activity before the investment is made is meant to reduce risk of the investment. We found what we should have dealt with earlier in this process – following this process would help front-load the issues we're dealing with right now. Wouldn't do anything different with current programs we're managing, it would be helpful for future initiatives.

[Jim Fay] What this is pointing out is that it's very beneficial to address all these issues before we get started. We're dealing with issues now that we should've dealt with before we got started. There is a significant amount of effort needed for MT programs vs RA programs. It's all being done upfront – before the first dollar is investments. It's correct in expecting that all of this work would be done up front for MT programs. But it is much different than RA programs.

[Jim Fay] As utilities, we need to understand the risk of our program investments. We don't know the risks until we finish the items [in blue table on slides]. When we compare investment in an MT program with the other competing investments we have, we don't know if it's the best investment until we complete these steps in blue.

[Jim Jerozal] Agreed.

[Jeff Harris] Can this exist as a process document on the SAG website vs in the TRM?

[Jim Jerozal] TRM is the gold standard. Locking this in with appropriate flexibility. I like the idea of using the tool of the TRM to avoid re-treading these issues.

[Erin Daughton] What happens if consensus can't be reached?

[Jim Jerozal] I think once we've more finalized the language, we can take a look at this scenario.

[Erin Daughton] Requiring consensus at certain points is out of alignment with the SAG role – which is advisory and informative.

[Jim Jerozal] I think we need to define consensus.

[Mark Milby] Agree with Erin, we want to avoid making this too rigid; I'm not sure I see the need to include this process in the TRM yet. We can see how this plays out for the first few initiatives. Advocate we consider Jeff's suggestion.

Code Advancement Update

Slipstream, MEEA, and Guidehouse

- This presentation is a result of prior conversations and several rounds of feedback.
- Stretch energy codes and evaluation of MT initiative
- Most recent feedback received on previous version of evaluation pathways document. Want to discuss key points of feedback received.
- Background on policies can be found in previous slide decks.
- Lay a clear path for evaluators to follow and include in TRM.

Key Points Overview

- Use more market-focused language to avoid confusion
- Evaluation pathways document is separated by two activities – policy advancement (supporting municipalities in adopting the statewide stretch code) and code compliance support (support complying with stretch code). Include definitions within these activities.
- Shared common language for MT – policy advancement. Shared definitions for policy advancement.
- The statewide code without the stretch code is the baseline. We're saying that everyone would be on the baseline code if not for utility and non-utility advancement activities – baseline for "policy advancement".

Policy Advancement Illustration

- Certain municipalities will adopt the stretch code. Identify compliance rate for those munis. Net savings are base code baseline removed.

[Jennifer Morris] The base code baseline defined as the statewide code?

[Keith Downes] The baseline is what's happening if the statewide base code is in place.

[Chris Neme] Reiterate for clarity: the GTP is the difference between the level of energy consumption of every building that builds exactly to statewide code and level of consumption had every building been built to exactly to the statewide stretch code in every municipality. Only a portion of municipalities adopt the stretch codes – this is a portion of GTP. Confused by "Net Savings" – in this case, presented by average construction in a non-stretch code municipality would be better than stretch code.

[Keith Downes] It could be bigger as well due to compliance. It could be greater or smaller than the "Actual Market Savings."

Policy Advancement Illustration – Equation

- We also received feedback about attribution and its definition. In this case, attribution means actual impact that utility had in advancing policy. We've struggled in this area – we won't know what this is until after a policy has passed. We tried to figure out a way to understand that estimation for utilities to understand.

Definitions for Compliance Support; Stretch Code Compliance Support Illustration

- “Stretch code adopted municipalities” = savings left due to lack of compliance
- Savings left due to lack of compliance (dark blue area) get shared among utilities
- We also want to make sure we incorporate stretch code compliance baseline.

Cyclical Nature of Codes and MT Initiative

- Stretch code cycle is every three years; for CEJA, first cycle is shorter than every subsequent cycle.
- We recommend that certain evaluation aspects could be done on a regular basis
- When does utility influence start? Activities can start now
- When utility support ends? Utilities can continue to count savings for policy advancement, count long-lived effects. (How long is up for discussion). Whereas code compliance support ends upon end of utility compliance support.

[Jennifer Morris] If the utilities have good code compliance programs and municipalities are trained, and they stop because municipalities are adequately supported, do utilities claim savings according to policy advancement?

[Keith Downes] That contributes to policy advancement; you're not subtracting off a low compliance rate, instead that pie grows.

[Jeannette LeZaks] This data would be reviewed by a Delphi panel.

Illustration of Utility Influence and Evaluation of Policy Advancement and Code Support

- One of the key points related to stretch code targets – municipality could adopt the first stretch code and may not update and adopt a future code. There will be continued effort from utilities for municipalities to adopt new codes.

[Jennifer Morris] Clarification – municipalities are allowed to adopt stretch code and declare adoption of ALL future codes?

[Alison Lindburg] Yes, they could do this.

[Jennifer Morris] Is there a risk that builders try to pull municipalities adopt future codes, even if they declare they will adopt all future codes in the ordinance?

[Alison Lindburg] Yes. This is why the compliance support is a key piece; builders need to see that it's doable.

What is the evaluator's role?

- Evaluator can't do anything until the code is adopted by a municipality. (Step 1) Estimation that can happen, however. Deemed level of compliance and deemed base code baseline. Deemed value would apply to evaluation after they are agreed upon.

- Ensure the numbers are correct. Slipstream and MEEA are in conversation with utilities about gathering this data and doing an evaluation.

[Rita Siong] Would the evaluator be responsible for organizing the Delphi panel?

[Jeannette LeZaks] Yes. The Delphi panel should be anonymous, convened by evaluator.

[Keith Downes] Credentials given including education levels but not identified, i.e. organizations they work for.

Similar process for code support programs. Addressed frequency of compliance studies.

- Recommend a compliance study every 6 years. Inform compliance rates.
- Referring to process figures; we can lock in some deemed values in the green box at the beginning of the cycle. Then, for evaluated savings, there's a cost to finalizing numbers and missing data. This is based on how quickly you want to evaluate savings. If you want to do it annually, higher cost. Once per code cycle is another option.

[Ted Weaver] Is there something that happens in between? Measure something, lock in a piece of algorithm?

[Keith Downes] Let's take the policy advancement scenario. What we can do up front is what is deemed, what compliance would be. Deem what the compliance rate and base code baseline would be. Delphi panel may say that baseline improves year to year. If we can estimate all the other factors (i.e. based on experience or from other states). What we can't do is determine exactly which munis will adopt the stretch code, when are they going to adopt it, what are the actual actions that people have done to get a higher attribution score. We can figure out how many buildings have been built; what has been done to pass stretch codes, but we can't evaluate till we get to that point.

[Jennifer Morris] It seems like the only thing that would be known is the bill rate.

[Keith Downes] Yes, once you've been able to assess what's gone into the attribution scores.

[Ted Weaver] It seems like you deem a number of things. Measure which munis joined, how many buildings get built.

[Keith Downes] As munis start joining, you have to do a study to determine attribution score for each utility.

[Ted Weaver] That would come after two to three years?

[Keith Downes] You can do it earlier; as soon as a code is adopted. Let's say a muni joined years later. You wouldn't know what their attribution score is until they passed it.

[Ted Weaver] It seems like the attribution is a piece of NTG, with those, we don't look back at everything. We look back to assess the effectiveness and apply to next year. We could determine some of these values.

[Keith Downes] I think with this, we could do this, but also contingent on what the utility does in a particular utility. Evaluator can look at emails, meetings, research, etc. You know at the beginning of the year and only unknown is build rate. For codes support, it's going to determine what efforts the utility actually do. Not appropriate to determine this ahead of time, when they could stop funding in the middle of the year. I think it's going to matter the level of effort during the year. On this, you also need to know the build rate.

[Jeannette LeZaks] Even though we're trying to define total effectiveness so that utilities can support.

[Celia Johnson] Interested in what would be included in the TRM. Also interested in process and next steps on building performance standards.

[Jeannette LeZaks] In lieu of a meeting, we can send out a version of the evaluation pathways document including responses and see if stakeholders would like a follow-up meeting.

[Jeannette LeZaks] Related to BPS – we think it will be relatively straightforward to prepare a similar document.

[Jennifer Morris] Would that be for next year's TRM update process?

[Jeannette LeZaks] Yes, I think so.

Closing and Next Steps

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

- **Code Advancement:** Slipstream, MEEA and Guidehouse will share a marked-up version of the Evaluation Pathways document, including responses to comments received. Parties that shared comments will share feedback on whether a follow-up discussion is needed to finalize this document and determine what information belongs in the IL-TRM.
- **Edits to IL-TRM Attachment C:**
 - Any final updates to IL-TRM Attachment C, or final savings protocol attachments to be included in the IL-TRM, need to be shared by the Working Group with VEIC (IL-TRM Administrator) by August 3, 2022.
 - ComEd will share proposed edits to Attachment C in early June, for Working Group review.
 - Nicor Gas will share draft language summarizing the MT process recommendation by late May/early June, for Working Group review. The Working Group will also discuss whether this should be added to the IL-TRM.
- **Next Meeting – mid-June (date TBD)**
 - Topics include discussing edits to Attachment C, Nicor's draft MT process language, and the proposed/draft ENERGY STAR Retail Products Platform savings protocol components for inclusion in the IL-TRM.