

ENERGY PROBE INTERROGATORY #4

INTERROGATORY

Reference: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Schedule 3 Page 19

Preamble: "In particular, Enbridge shared concerns about how delayed evaluation efforts impacted and inconvenienced customers who were being queried on projects that were implemented over a year, and in some cases, over two years previous. This impacted the ability for the EC to connect with customer contacts that had sufficient (or any) knowledge of specific projects and most certainly impacted customers' recall regarding projects details and arguably effected NTG responses."

- a). Is Enbridge of the view that one to two years after a DSM project is completed that the companies – and the employees overseeing the project – will have little to no knowledge over the long-term impact of these projects?
- b). If many companies are unable to accurately verify DSM savings just one to two years after the project was completed, how are the Board and customers able to confidently verify those savings?
- c). What about Secondary Attribution? If many companies are unable to accurately discuss DSM projects one to two years later, how can Enbridge (or Union) accurately verify Secondary Attribution benefits, given that they are based on a long-term horizon?

RESPONSE

a) No, Enbridge has not made comments regarding the customer's knowledge over the long term impact of the projects, but rather the context of the statement quoted above was with respect to the NTG study which aims to assess the utility's program influence on the customer and the decision making process with respect to undertaking an energy efficiency improvement project. Enbridge's concerns regarding challenges with customer recall and recall bias as time elapses align with those of many evaluation experts on this topic including those outlined by Research into Action and Navigant Consulting Inc. and referenced in the 2015 Clearance Application, such as:

- The longer the time that has elapsed between the behavior and the self-report about the behavior, the more likely the respondent is to forget their intentions,

Witnesses: D. Bullock  
D. Johnson

- the motivations, and other influences on their behavior (even if the respondent had been aware of them at the time of action).<sup>1</sup>
- ...it is often important that the survey introduces the ways support was provided through the program. This would include making sure that program training, analysis, and support are described to the participant. These can be particularly difficult for the respondent to recall if the survey takes place 1 year or more after participation.<sup>2</sup>
- b) The above referenced preamble addresses the impact of elapsed time between project implementation and customer representative responses to Net-to-Gross surveys which are looking for customers to recall details regarding the utility's influence on project implementation that may or may not have an impact on the calculation of that project's NTG value. It does not make reference to the customer's involvement in an audit process which focuses on efforts to verify savings.
- c) As outlined in the Research into Action Review and Analysis of Net-to-Gross Assessment Issues (Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 3) there are many factors and biases inherent in a self-report NTG survey approach that in no way presumes accuracy in NTG survey results including:
- a. Failure to recognize or recall all direct or indirect paths of program influence
  - b. Difficulty estimating and reporting attribution and recognizing the complex factors that lead to behaviour/decision making – who gets credit for actions
  - c. Difficulty reporting the hypothetical alternatives – imagining what they might have done and speculating an accurate assessment of this imagined behaviour
  - d. Tendencies for people to rationalize past decisions to and provide socially desirable responses
  - e. Lack of clarity in survey questions
  - f. Potential arbitrariness in free-ridership scoring methods

Enbridge asserts however that equal treatment and consideration to all NTG related values (i.e., all components of attribution including Secondary Attribution) should be undertaken. Enbridge is concerned that there has not been equal treatment of those values that reduce its results, as those that recognize the benefits that programs deliver.

---

<sup>1</sup> EB-2017-0324, Exhibit B Tab 6 Schedule 3 Page 20 of 39

<sup>2</sup> EB-2017-0324, Exhibit B Tab 6 Schedule 2 Page 18 of 19

Witnesses: D. Bullock  
D. Johnson