

PROCESS EVALUATION
New York Energy \$martSM Business Partners Program
Final Report

Prepared for
The New York State
Energy Research and Development Authority
Patricia Gonzales
Project Manager

Prepared by
Research Into Action, Inc.
P.O. Box 12312
Portland, Oregon 97212
503 / 287-9136

Principal Investigator:
Jane S. Peters, Ph.D.

Project Staff:
Robert Scholl, J.D.
Joe Van Clock

Project Number 9835

NYSERDA
June 8, 2010

NOTICE

This report was prepared by Research Into Action, Inc., in the course of performing work contracted for and sponsored by the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (hereinafter the “Sponsor”). The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the Sponsor or the State of New York, and reference to any specific product, service, process, or method does not constitute an implied or expressed recommendation or endorsement of it. Further, the Sponsor, the State of New York, and the contractor make no warranties or representations, expressed or implied, as to the fitness for particular purpose or merchantability of any product, apparatus, or service, or the usefulness, completeness, or accuracy of any processes, methods, or other information contained, described, disclosed, or referred to in this report. The Sponsor, the State of New York, and the contractor make no representation that the use of any product, apparatus, process, method, or other information will not infringe privately owned rights and will assume no liability for any loss, injury, or damage resulting from, or occurring in connection with, the use of information constrained, described, disclosed, or referred to in this report.

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the results of the process evaluation of the Motors Systems and Lighting components of the 2008-2009 NYSERDA Business Partners program, which is part of the **New York Energy \$martSM** programs. The Business Partners program partners with trade allies including building and systems contractors, distributors, vendors, manufacturer representatives, lighting designers, architects, engineers, and energy service providers to work with NYSERDA to promote energy-efficient products and services. In exchange, business partners gain access to special training, tools, guidelines, and performance incentives.

The Business Partners program process evaluation relied on in-depth interviews with seven NYSERDA program and implementation staff, on 41 interviews with active and inactive Motors partners, and on 92 interviews with active and inactive Lighting partners. Research Into Action, Inc. conducted all of the interviews. These interviews were designed to help Business Partners staff understand barriers to participation in the Business Partners components, to gauge progress toward program implementation, and to understand the value to partners of the program services provided to them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to this evaluation effort. The process evaluation team wishes to acknowledge the contributions of Patricia Gonzales, Alison Neligan, and Marilyn Dare of NYSERDA, Ed Evans and Joan Simpson of Applied Proactive Technologies, Inc., and Dan Rogers, Kelly Seeger, and Kenn Latal at ICF International for their assistance in providing advice and data throughout this evaluation. The team also would like to thank the many Motors Systems and Lighting business partners who spoke with us in-depth about their experiences with the Business Partners program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTICE	I
ABSTRACT	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
1.1 Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	I
1.1.1 Motors Findings.....	I
1.1.2 Motors Conclusions and Recommendations.....	III
1.1.3 Lighting Findings.....	IV
1.1.4 Lighting Conclusions and Recommendations	V
SECTION 2: INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.1 Process Evaluation Approach and Methodology	2-2
2.1.1 Research Objectives.....	2-2
2.1.2 Coordination of Activities.....	2-2
2.1.3 This Report	2-2
SECTION 3: MOTOR SYSTEMS PARTNERS	3-1
3.1 Introduction.....	3-1
3.1.1 Program Description	3-1
3.1.2 Active and Inactive Partners	3-1
3.1.3 Populations, Samples and Call List Dispositions.....	3-2
3.2 Business Partner Characteristics and Market Environment.....	3-3
3.2.1 Business Partner Characteristics	3-3
3.2.2 Business Partners' Approach toward Energy Efficiency	3-5
3.3 Vendor Activities	3-6
3.3.1 Number and Frequency of Inventories Completed.....	3-6
3.3.2 Reasons for Inactivity	3-7
3.3.3 Effect of Motor Inventories on Vendors	3-10
3.4 Program Experiences	3-11
3.4.1 Length of Program Involvement and Source of Program Awareness.....	3-11
3.4.2 Reasons for Program Participation	3-12
3.4.3 Program Enrollment Process.....	3-12
3.4.4 Program Outreach and Communication.....	3-13
3.4.5 Training.....	3-14
3.4.6 Record Keeping and Reporting.....	3-14
3.4.7 Information about Other NYSERDA Programs	3-15
3.5 Business Partner Perceptions of Customer Attitudes toward Energy Efficiency.....	3-15
3.5.1 Customer Awareness of Energy Efficiency.....	3-15
3.5.2 Customer Attitudes toward Energy Efficiency	3-16
3.5.3 Customer Participation in Other NYSERDA Programs	3-16
3.6 Vendor Marketing Strategies	3-17
3.6.1 Outreach Strategies	3-17
3.6.2 Incentives as a Sales Tool	3-17
3.6.3 Customer Incentives Not Currently Offered.....	3-18

3.7 Summary3-20

SECTION 4: LIGHTING PARTNERS..... 4-1

4.1 Description of Lighting Partners.....4-1

4.1.1 Definitions of “Active” and “Inactive” Lighting Partners4-1

4.1.2 Populations, Samples, and Call List Dispositions.....4-1

4.1.3 Characteristics of Lighting Partner Samples.....4-2

4.2 Program Experiences4-4

4.2.1 Source of Program Awareness.....4-4

4.2.2 Reasons for Involvement4-4

4.2.3 Participation in SCLP4-6

4.2.4 Program Sign-Up Experiences.....4-7

4.2.5 Experiences with Other Aspects of the Program4-8

4.2.6 Program Activities4-14

4.2.7 Portions of Customers’ Projects That Are Business Partners Projects4-16

4.3 Reasons for Inactivity4-16

4.4 Effects of Program Participation.....4-17

4.4.1 Effects of Program on Business Partners4-17

4.4.2 Effects of Program on End-Use Customers4-18

4.5 Lighting Partner Marketing Activities4-19

4.5.1 Customer Identification and Outreach Strategies4-19

4.5.2 Use of Business Partner Status in Marketing.....4-20

4.5.3 Energy Efficiency Products and Services4-20

4.6 Summary4-21

SECTION 5: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 5-1

5.1 Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations5-1

5.1.1 Motors Findings5-1

5.1.2 Motors Conclusions and Recommendations.....5-2

5.1.3 Lighting Findings.....5-4

5.1.4 Lighting Conclusions and Recommendations5-4

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDES..... A-1

**INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR NYSEDA BUSINESS PARTNERS PROGRAM STAFF
(MOTORS AND LIGHTING)..... A-2**

**INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR BUSINESS PARTNERS IMPLEMENTATION
CONTRACTORS (MOTORS AND LIGHTING)..... A-4**

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR ACTIVE MOTOR SYSTEMS PARTNERS..... A-6

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INACTIVE MOTOR SYSTEMS PARTNERS A-10

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR ACTIVE LIGHTING PARTNERS A-12

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INACTIVE LIGHTING PARTNERS..... A-15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: Final Dispositions for Motor Partner Interviews	3-2
Table 3-2: Motor Vendors by Number of Employees in New York State.....	3-3
Table 3-3: Motor Vendors by Number of Locations in New York State.....	3-3
Table 3-4: Motor Repair Services Offered	3-4
Table 3-5: Types of Customer Served (Multiple Responses Allowed)	3-4
Table 3-6: Portion of All Business Comprised of Energy Efficient Products and Services	3-5
Table 3-7: Number of Motor Inventories Completed by Year, From Program Records	3-6
Table 3-8: Number of Inventories Reported by Motor Vendors.....	3-6
Table 3-9: Motor Inventories by Inactive Partners	3-7
Table 3-10: Motor Inventory Activity by Vendor Size.....	3-7
Table 3-11: Formerly Active Vendors Reasons for Recent Inactivity.....	3-8
Table 3-12: Reasons for Doing Inventories without Program Support.....	3-9
Table 3-13: Active Vendors' Assessment of Motor Inventory Costs and Benefits	3-11
Table 3-14: Length of Involvement in NYSERDA Motors Programs.....	3-11
Table 3-15: Source of Program Awareness	3-12
Table 3-16: Use of Customer Incentives as a Sales Tool.....	3-18
Table 3-17: Motor Vendor Opinions Regarding Incentives for Motors Exceeding NEMA Premium	3-19
Table 3-18: Motor Vendors' Opinions Regarding Increased Incentives for Vertical Shaft Motors	3-20
Table 4-1: Final Dispositions for Active Lighting Partner Interviews.....	4-2
Table 4-2: Lighting Partner Types Interviewed.....	4-2
Table 4-3: Lighting Partner Offices in New York State	4-3
Table 4-4: Lighting Partner Employees in New York State	4-3
Table 4-5: Interviewed Lighting Partner Job Titles	4-3
Table 4-6: Sources of Program Awareness.....	4-4
Table 4-7: Reasons for Program Participation (Multiple Responses Allowed)	4-5
Table 4-8: Participation in SCLP	4-6
Table 4-9: Changes from the SCLP to Business Partners (Multiple Responses Allowed).....	4-7
Table 4-10: Program Education and Training.....	4-11
Table 4-11: Suggested Additions/Changes to Program Education and Training (Multiple Responses Allowed).....	4-12
Table 4-12: Most Valuable Program Services (Multiple Responses Allowed)	4-13
Table 4-13: Program Activity Since 2008	4-15
Table 4-14: Program Activity During the Previous Six Months.....	4-15
Table 4-15: Business Partner Projects as Portion of All Projects	4-16
Table 4-16: Effects of Program on Lighting Partners (Multiple Responses Allowed).....	4-18
Table 4-17: Effects of Program on End-Use Customers (Multiple Responses Allowed).....	4-18
Table 4-18: Portion of Customers' Projects Receiving Other NYSERDA Incentives	4-19
Table 4-19: Lighting Partner Customer Identification and Outreach (Multiple Responses Allowed).....	4-20
Table 4-20: Portion of Business That Is Energy Efficiency Products or Services.....	4-21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) began operating the **New York Energy \$martsm** Programs in July 1998. In 2008, NYSERDA created the Business Partners program as an umbrella “brand” for three pre-existing programs for commercial lighting, motor systems, and building performance, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. The Business Partners program also added an umbrella Core Services support function to these components to provide administrative consistency across the three program elements. However, activities of the Core Services component have been deferred pending the development of overarching, agency-wide, branding and marketing strategies and tactics.

In 2009, NYSERDA contracted with Research Into Action, Inc. to conduct a process evaluation of the Business Partners program. This document is the deliverable for the process evaluation of the Lighting and Motor Systems components of Business Partners. The process evaluations of those two program components were performed from December 2009 through March 2010, and focused on the experiences of both active and inactive business partners with those program components.

Barriers to participation, and especially reasons for business partners’ program inactivity were explored, as well as specific issues related to partners’ marketing activities and program training. Techniques to address these issues included interviews with key staff, telephone interviews with business partners, and reviews of program documents and websites.

Key findings of this process evaluation are highlighted below, along with brief recommendations for program improvement. Additional details can be found in the body of this report and attendant appendices.

1.1 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In January and February of 2010, we conducted interviews with 8 active and 33 inactive Motors business partners. During the same two months, 36 active and 51 inactive Lighting business partners were interviewed about their experiences with the program. As a prologue to those interviews, we interviewed eight NYSERDA program and implementation staff during November and December 2009. Program documents and the program website were also reviewed. The following paragraphs describe key findings from our interviews and research, conclusions drawn from those findings, and recommendations for program responses.

1.1.1 Motors Findings

Vendor Overview

Motor vendor business partners range from very small businesses (fewer than five employees, single location) to large suppliers (more than 60 employees, multiple locations) in New York State, but most vendors participating in the program come from larger companies with multiple branches. Most program participants have been involved with the NYSERDA motors programs for more than five years.

In-person contact with program staff is a common source of program awareness among motor vendors, and a primary way in which program staff provides services to motor vendors. Vendors predominantly view the program as offering a “value added” service for their customers. Vendors cited building customer relationships as both a reason for participating in the program and an outcome of program participation.

Motor Inventories

By supporting vendors' motor inventories, the Business Partners program gathers information on the types of motors in use, and gains the opportunity to present the case for motor management directly to motor users. However, some motor vendors conduct inventories without program support. Some of these vendors use inventories to identify opportunities for energy efficiency in drives and other equipment (HVAC, for example) for which implementation staff do not provide energy savings estimates. Other vendors do not seek program support in conducting motor inventories because the time commitment to work with the program is not justified in their view by resulting sales of motors. Motor vendors spend as much as a week gathering data on the motors in their customers' facilities, and in most cases, only about 10% of the motors inventoried are recommended for immediate replacement. Further, customers are reluctant to follow recommendations for immediate motor replacement. These latter vendors appear to conduct inventories on a more cursory level than that required for program-supported inventories.

Improved customer relationships, rather than immediate motor sales, are the primary benefit motor inventories provide to the vendors who conduct them.

Ten business partners reported conducting eight motor inventories in 2008 and ten inventories in 2009. This compares to 46 inventories in 2006 and 24 in 2007 conducted as part of the predecessor Premium Efficiency Motors program.

Based on vendor reports, the decline in motor inventories cannot be attributed solely to discontinuation of vendor incentives, because that occurred in 2004. Other reasons such as market saturation, inadequate short-term motor sales to offset the vendors' cost of conducting inventories, the ability of some vendors to perform their own energy-savings calculations from the inventories, and the use of inventories by vendors for purposes other than those directly supported by the program all contributed to this decline as well.

For a variety of reasons, small and very small vendors are less likely than larger vendors to complete motor inventories. These reasons include:

- Smaller vendors more often service customers in the residential, small-commercial, and agricultural sectors. Such customers use fewer motors than typical industrial facilities, making them less attractive candidates to vendors for a motor inventory.
- The smaller facilities more likely to be served by smaller vendors often use fractional horsepower motors, which have less potential for energy savings than larger motors and do not qualify for customer incentives.
- Smaller vendors have little or no dedicated outside sales staff. Given the key role outside salespeople play in coordinating and following up on motor inventories, this circumstance limits small vendors' capacity to conduct inventories and limits the usefulness of the inventories to them.

Sales of Higher Efficiency Motors

With vendor incentives no longer available, some vendors are less engaged with the Business Partners program and with their customers' participation in the Existing Facilities program. However, vendors continue to promote energy efficient motors and drives and to use customer incentives as a sales tool. Some vendors focus on energy efficiency more heavily than others. Generally speaking, larger vendors typically try to up-sell NEMA Premium motors, while smaller vendors are more likely to offer NEMA Premium motors only to their customers who inquire about such motors.

Sales of motors that exceed NEMA Premium efficiency levels face several hurdles. Some vendors have not heard of such motors. Other vendors who have heard of them are skeptical of the manufacturers' claims of their efficiency levels. The vendors generally do not promote such motors, and reported they are

not widely available. But most critically, there are no recognized standards for the efficiency of such motors.

Program Training and Information

Motor vendors value the information the program provides to them about customer incentives available through the Existing Facilities program. Inactive vendors in particular expressed a desire for additional training related to available customer incentives and to services the Business Partners program offers.

1.1.2 Motors Conclusions and Recommendations

Incentives for Sales of Efficient Motors

1. **Conclusions:** As a means of increasing motor vendors' engagement with the Business Partners program, program and implementation staff have discussed reinstatement of motor vendor incentives for sales of NEMA Premium motors. Even though NYSERDA discontinued paying incentives for sales of NEMA Premium motors in 2004, motor inventories conducted with NYSERDA support increased in 2005 and again in 2006. In 2008 and 2009, the numbers of inventories conducted with program support declined sharply. Factors contributing to this decline include the economic downturn, market saturation in some motor vendors' service territories, and vendor disappointment with low levels of motor sales in return for the time they invest to conduct the inventories. The discontinuation of incentives for motor sales is not the reason for the decline in motor inventories.
2. Staff are also considering incentives for sales of motors that are one or two bands higher than NEMA Premium. However, no recognized standards for such motors exist at this time. Without recognized standards for the reliable determination of energy savings from motors with higher efficiency levels than NEMA Premium, the task of measuring savings motor by motor to determine appropriate incentive levels would be too onerous for the program to undertake.

Recommendations: The program need not reinstate vendor incentives for sales of NEMA Premium motors as a means to increase the number of motor inventories conducted through the program. Furthermore, the implications for demands on staff time that would result from offering incentives for motors of higher efficiency than NEMA Premium make such incentives impractical at this time. Further consideration of incentives for such motors should be deferred until NEMA promulgates appropriate standards for them.

Motor Inventories

3. **Conclusion:** There is little demand for program support of motor inventories, especially among small vendors. The demand and opportunities that remain are predominantly among customers of large vendors. Although the ability of motor vendors to conduct inventories without program support is considered a program success, some large vendors who conduct motor inventories without program support indicated their inventories are less rigorous than those conducted through the program. Further, when inventories are conducted without program involvement, the program loses an opportunity to collect information about motors in use and customer practices.

Recommendation: To encourage vendors' efforts to gather information on motors in their customers' facilities, the program should consider offering vendors incentives for conducting motor inventories (at least for vendors' initial inventories). Such incentives would offset the short-term costs vendors face in conducting inventories, and may increase vendors' engagement with the program and with motor inventories. In addition, offering incentives for motor inventories may encourage vendors who would otherwise conduct their own, less rigorous inventories to seek program support. To complement vendors' activities, the program should also

consider offering energy savings estimates for drives. Finally, because most motor inventory opportunities are found among the customers of larger vendors, consider refocusing program staff support on fewer and larger vendors.

Program Training and Information

4. **Conclusion:** Vendors' use of customer incentives as a sales tool would be enhanced by vendors' increased knowledge of the incentives available through other programs, and by a clearer understanding of the process involved in receiving those incentives. In addition, some vendors do not take full advantage of program services because they are not aware of the full range of services available and of the potential benefits of those services.

Recommendation: The program should offer additional training related both to available program services and to customer incentives from other programs for efficient motors and drives. Inactive vendors in particular should be targeted for such training.

1.1.3 Lighting Findings

Lighting Partner Overview

Lighting partners typically have a single office in New York State. Even so, firms of active partners are generally larger (have more employees in New York State) than firms of inactive partners. Active Lighting partners participate in the program to gain a competitive advantage and to obtain program incentives for their firm. Inactive partners participate for the partner incentives and the program's fit with their firm's business model. Active Lighting partners are more likely than inactive partners to have participated in the Small Commercial Lighting Program (SCLP).

Program Processes

Lighting partners are satisfied with program processes. A large majority of Lighting partners described the program's sign-up process as "simple" or "easy." Lighting partners are very satisfied with communications with implementation staff, and generally see no need for more direct communication with NYSERDA staff. Lighting partners are also very satisfied with the program support they receive from implementation staff. One area of program communications can be improved, however. There could be greater interaction between the Motors and Lighting components of the program.

Training and Information

While most active partners are satisfied with the program training they receive, reporting it is adequate for their needs, about one fifth of active partners had received no program training or perceived the training they had received as inadequate. And roughly three quarters of the inactive partners had received no training from the program. Active partners most often suggested a need for additional training in new technologies, while inactive partners most often suggested a need for training in program requirements for projects. In addition, most partners had received no information about other NYSERDA programs, including information about other Business Partners components.

Partner Marketing and Outreach

Most active partners believe program participation provides a competitive advantage to their firms. Nonetheless, they generally do not use the Business Partners "brand" as part of their marketing strategy or tactics. Although the data do not shed light on reasons the brand is not generally used, Lighting partners may not use it in their marketing efforts because Business Partners projects are such a small portion of

their work, representing less than 10% of the projects of most active Lighting partners. On the other hand, the small sizes of the portions of active partners' projects that are Business partners projects may result from the partners not embracing and promoting the Business Partners brand.

Inactive Partners

The most commonly mentioned reason for program inactivity was the economic downturn. Nonetheless, "inactive" partners are substantially more active than their program categorization indicates. Twelve had completed Business Partners projects during the previous six months; 15 other inactive partners had projects pending or ready to submit to the program; and 15 additional inactive partners expect to complete a project through the program within the next year.

1.1.4 Lighting Conclusions and Recommendations

Program Processes

1. **Conclusion:** Administratively, especially regarding communications and staff support for Lighting partners, the program is functioning well. However, there may be lost opportunities resulting from the absence of formal procedures for referrals between program components. Efforts have been made to achieve such cross pollination, but more can be done.

Recommendation: Identify and establish a process for enhanced communications about customer opportunities between program components.

Training and Information

2. **Conclusion:** There are opportunities to provide additional training and information to Lighting partners.

Recommendation: The program should conduct additional training sessions with Lighting Partners, and also consider other means of communicating basic program information to them. Training and information topics, especially for smaller and inactive partners, should repetitively include Business Partner program descriptions, benefits, and procedures. Other critical topics for both active and inactive partners are program information about end-use customer incentive programs, especially Existing Facilities and New Construction, and about the other Business Partner components.

Partner Marketing and Outreach

3. **Conclusion:** "Business Partners" has not achieved its potential for recognition as a valued brand among business partners. We recognize the efforts to solidify the Business Partners brand have been deferred to overarching agency branding efforts. Therefore rather than offer a recommendation to address this conclusion, we offer the observation that there is unfulfilled potential in the impact of the Business Partners brand, and therefore, in the impact of the program.

Inactive Partners

4. **Conclusion:** Projects often take more than six months to complete. The six-month criterion in which to complete a program project for purposes of designating Lighting partners as active participants is well intended but too short to reflect their activities accurately.

Recommendation: Consider modifying the criterion for remaining an active Lighting partner from completion of a qualifying project within the previous six-months to completion of a project within the previous 12 months.

SECTION 2:

INTRODUCTION

The **New York Energy \$martSM** programs are funded by an electric distribution System Benefits Charge (SBC) paid by customers of Central Hudson Gas and Electric Corporation; Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.; New York State Electric and Gas Corporation; National Grid; Orange and Rockland Utilities; and Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation. Programs are available to all electric distribution customers that pay into the SBC. The New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA), a public benefit corporation established in 1975, administers the SBC funds.

In 2003, NYSERDA expanded its evaluation of the **New York Energy \$mart** program, launching a large-scale assessment using specialized contractor teams to provide evaluation services. Research Into Action, Inc. has conducted process evaluations of the **New York Energy \$mart** programs since May 2003.

During 2008, several changes arising from the Public Service Commission's (PSC) Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) proceeding have affected NYSERDA's **New York Energy \$mart** program portfolio and evaluation efforts. The PSC's June 23rd EEPS Order called for an increase in SBC collections and a ramp up of program efforts by NYSERDA and the State's six investor-owned electricity transmission and distribution utilities to meet the State's "15-by-15" electricity reduction goal. NYSERDA complied with the PSC's Order by submitting a Supplemental Revision to the SBC Operating Plan incorporating approximately \$80 million per year in additional funds for five new or expanded programs as well as general awareness, administration and evaluation associated with those programs.

The **New York Energy \$mart Business Partners** program consolidates three prior programs for commercial lighting, for motor systems, and for building performance, including heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. The Business Partners program also added an umbrella Core Services support function to these components to provide administrative consistency across the three program elements. However, activities of the Core Services component have been deferred pending the development of overarching, agency-wide, branding and marketing strategies and tactics.

Business partners include building and systems contractors, distributors, vendors, manufacturer representatives, lighting designers, architects, engineers, and energy service providers. Business partners are allies who agree to work with NYSERDA to promote energy-efficient products and services. In exchange, business partners gain access to special training, tools, guidelines, and performance incentives.

NYSERDA works with its business partners to help them differentiate their businesses in a highly competitive marketplace, while assuring appropriate quality. This involves creating a brand identity that conveys the theme that mid-market businesses are vital to the growth of the energy efficiency industry and important to the state's economy. By partnering with these business allies, market infrastructure is strengthened, leading to increased product and service availability and increased demand. Each of the program components improves the awareness of, and familiarity with targeted technologies and services.

This report presents the results of process evaluations of the motor systems and commercial lighting components of the Business Partners program. The report was prepared jointly by staff of NYSERDA and a team of evaluation contractors, consistent with the terms and conditions of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) ¹ between NYSERDA, the New York State Department of Public Service (DPS),

¹ Memorandum of Understanding between the New York State Public Service Commission, New York State Department of Public Service, and New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, March 11, 1998, revised December 6, 2001.

and the New York State Public Service Commission (PSC). The evaluation contractors worked closely with NYSERDA staff, NYSERDA's program implementation contractors, and Motor Systems and Lighting business partners to understand the experiences of those Business partners with their respective program components. The process evaluation focused on program activity in 2008 and 2009. Data collection for the Motors and Lighting components were conducted from December 2009 through March 2010. Data collection for the HVAC component will occur in the summer and fall of 2010.

2.1 PROCESS EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The three Business Partners program components have outreach, training, and, except for the Motors component, incentives for business partners that are implemented uniquely in each of their three market channels. The process evaluation examines each market channel approach, using similar methods in order to provide comparable results for the three efforts. The activities have included in-depth interviews with NYSERDA and program implementation contractor staff in late 2009, and with Motor Systems and Lighting partners in the first quarter of 2010. Subsequent activities will include in-depth interviews with HVAC implementation contractors and business partners in the summer and fall of 2010. Staff interviews for each component are followed by interviews with active (one or more completed projects) and inactive (no recently completed projects) partners in the particular component.

2.1.1 Research Objectives

The objectives for the process evaluation include:

- Assess barriers to participation in the Business Partners components, including understanding reasons for program inactivity.
- Assess progress toward increased program implementation.
- Assess the value of services provided to partners.
- Provide actionable recommendations for the current or future program design, if modifications are necessary.

2.1.2 Coordination of Activities

This process evaluation is part of a larger effort that includes an impact evaluation and a market characterization and assessment of the Business Partners program. To maximize the effectiveness of the overall efforts, the process evaluation team discussed activity schedules and overlapping interview topics with the impact evaluation team and with the market characterization and assessment (MCA) team, and worked closely with those teams to develop coordinated interview efforts for the program components. For example, to provide the impact team with insight for their work on attribution, the process team included questions about how motor vendors market motor inventories to their customers. To support the efforts of both other teams, the process team will provide the MCA and Impact Teams access to information obtained from program staff and from active and inactive partners, and mentioned to Motors and Lighting partners that they may be called again by another evaluation team. These efforts will minimize the burden on all respondents and will improve the integration and cost-efficiency of evaluation efforts.

2.1.3 This Report

Following this introduction, chapter 2 describes the program experiences and feedback from the perspective of Motors Systems program and implementation staff, and Motors business partners, both active and inactive. Chapter 3 provides similar information from the perspectives of Lighting program

and implementation staff, and active and inactive Lighting business partners. Chapter 4 presents the conclusions and recommendations derived from the evaluation.

SECTION 3:

MOTOR SYSTEMS PARTNERS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 Program Description

The motor systems component of the New York Energy SmartSM Business Partners program works with suppliers, motor vendors, and motor repair services to promote National Electric Manufacturers Association (NEMA) Premium[®] motors, quality motor repairs, and motor management services, which include motor assessments, planning for future repair and replacement, and consideration of drives. In 2007, NYSERDA contracted with an implementation contractor, Applied Proactive Technologies (APT), through RFP 1055 to provide further program development and to continue the program's promotion of motor management activities under the newly created Business Partners program.

Until December 31, 2004, the program offered financial incentives to motor vendors. According to program staff, the discontinuation of incentives led some vendors who had participated in the previous motors program to decline to enroll in the Business Partners program. According to one program staff member the program had approximately 200 participants before the incentives were discontinued. Program recruiting efforts have returned the current number of participants to nearly 100.

Since vendor incentives were discontinued, education and training related to motor management services have been a primary focus of the program. The program works with vendors to present the case for a motor management program to their customers, to conduct motor assessments (referred to as motor inventories), and to facilitate implementation of motor management plans and policies whenever possible.

The program views motor inventories as a first step toward a more comprehensive approach to motor management. Thus, support in motor inventories is a central service the program offers to motor vendors. In a motor inventory, the motor vendor collects nameplate data and operating hours for each of the motors in the customer's facility. Implementation staff are available to assist in collecting these data. Implementation staff also enter the data the motor vendor collects into MotorMaster+ software in order to generate calculations of the energy and cost savings that would result from replacing each motor with a NEMA Premium alternative. From these calculations, implementation staff and motor vendors generate recommendations regarding whether each motor should be replaced with an efficient alternative immediately or at failure. Finally, implementation staff work with motor vendors to present the results of this analysis to motor users and to inform them about incentives available for any of the motors identified for replacement.

Implementation staff describe these efforts as "a value added service," providing participants with tools and information that will ultimately help them increase sales. The program's website further describes the benefits the program seeks to provide to participants, stating, "The economic climate is such that for a motor vendor to be successful, he must...move away from a seller-purchaser relationship to that of a trusted advisor and partner."

In addition to their efforts to promote motor management activities, implementation staff provide motor vendors and their customers with information about other NYSERDA programs for which motor users might be eligible, including incentives available to motor users through the Existing Facilities program.

3.1.2 Active and Inactive Partners

In January 2010, the process evaluation team obtained from the program website a list of motor vendors who had signed up to participate in the Business Partners program. Program staff also provided a list of

all the motor inventories that participating vendors had conducted with program assistance between April 6, 2005 and October 20, 2009. By combining these lists we were able to determine how many inventories each vendor had completed and when the inventories were carried out. Motor inventories conducted prior to 2008 were completed under the Premium Efficiency Motors program, not under Business Partners, and are therefore outside the scope of this evaluation. Only motor vendors who completed inventories with program assistance 2008 or 2009 were considered “active” participants for the purposes of this evaluation. As of January 2010, there were 10 active participants and 71 inactive participants listed on the program website.

3.1.3 Populations, Samples, and Call List Dispositions

We attempted to contact all of the motor vendors listed on the program website. However, one large vendor’s centralized answering service impeded us in reaching qualified respondents in its branches where a specific contact name was not available. As a result, in consultation with program staff, 14 of this vendor’s branches were dropped from the contact list. A contact name was available for four of this vendor’s branches, and these four branches remained on the contact list. All of the branches dropped from the list were inactive, leaving us with a list of 57 inactive contacts.

We completed interviews with six respondents originally identified as active, as well as two respondents who were determined to be active based on their responses to screening questions, for a total of eight active motor vendors. We completed interviews with 32 inactive motor vendors, and completed a partial interview with one additional inactive motor vendor, for a total of 41 complete or partial interviews.

Most of the remaining contacts were not interviewed because they did not return calls before interview quotas were reached or because no one was reached after at least six attempts. A few remaining contacts were not interviewed for other reasons (Table 3-1).²

Table 3-1: Final Dispositions for Motor Partner Interviews

Outcome		Active		Inactive	
		Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Eligible					
Complete	Complete	8	67%	32	56%
	Partial	0	0%	1	2%
Contacted	Left Message	1	8%	10	18%
	Refused	1	8%	8	14%
Not Eligible					
Duplicate Contact		1	8%	2	4%
Business or Contact No Longer Available		1	8%	0	0%
Bad or Wrong Number		0	0%	1	2%
Failed Screening		0	0%	3	5%
Total		12	99%	57	101%

²Due to rounding errors, total percentages presented in tables throughout this report sometimes vary from 100%.

3.2 BUSINESS PARTNER CHARACTERISTICS AND MARKET ENVIRONMENT

3.2.1 Business Partner Characteristics

The motor vendors interviewed varied greatly with regard to business size, with the smallest reporting a single employee while the largest, a national distributor, employs more than 250 people in 18 branches across New York State. A plurality of motor vendors (46%) reported their companies have more than 60 employees in New York State (Table 3-2).

Table 3-2: Motor Vendors by Number of Employees in New York State

Size	Active		Inactive		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Very Small (0-5 employees)	0	0%	7	21%	7	17%
Small (6 to 20 employees)	0	0%	4	12%	4	10%
Medium (21 to 60 employees)	1	13%	10	30%	11	27%
Large (More than 60 employees)	7	88%	12	36%	19	46%
Total	8	100%	33	100%	41	100%

All of the “very small” (0-5 employees) and “small” (6 to 20 employees) vendors reported their companies have only one location in New York State. By contrast, only one “large” vendor (more than 60 employees) reported having a single location. Nearly half (49%) of the vendors reported their companies have six or more locations in New York State (Table 3-3). A similar proportion (49%) of program participants is a branch of one of the three largest companies. Active vendors are among the largest companies, both in terms of number of employees and number of branches.

Table 3-3: Motor Vendors by Number of Locations in New York State

Locations	Active		Inactive		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
1	1	13%	14	42%	15	37%
2 to 5	0	0%	6	18%	6	15%
6 to 10	4	50%	5	15%	9	22%
More than 10	3	38%	8	24%	11	27%
Total	8	101%	33	99%	41	101%

All interviewed motor vendors reported they sell motors, although two vendors, both inactive, stated motor sales were not their primary business. The majority of the vendors also offer motor repairs as a service to their customers, although these vendors were divided between those who repair motors directly and those who outsource motor repairs through another branch of their company or a third party (Table 3-4).

Table 3-4: Motor Repair Services Offered

Service	Active		Inactive		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Repair Motors	4	50%	11	33%	15	37%
Offer Outsourced Motor Repairs	1	13%	7	21%	8	20%
Do Not Offer Motor Repairs	3	38%	15	45%	18	44%
Total	8	101%	33	99%	41	101%

Small and very small companies more frequently reported they repair motors. Nearly three fourths (8 of 11) of the contacted vendors with 20 employees or fewer reported repairing motors while less than one fourth of (4 of 19) large vendors reported in-house motor repairs.

Regarding sales of related equipment, only one vendor (inactive) reported his company does not sell variable frequency drives (VFDs), although four additional inactive contacts specified VFDs make up only a small part of their business. As with motor repairs, the vendors were divided as to whether they repair VFDs, with a plurality (41%) reporting they do not repair VFDs and the rest evenly divided between those who repair drives (29%), and those who offer the service through a third party or another branch of their company (29%).

Interview findings suggest the majority of motor vendors are not specialized with regard to the market segments they serve, although the vendor’s location may influence their customer base. As Table 3-5 demonstrates, vendors most commonly reported working with a variety of industrial customers, selling them motors for a range of facilities and uses. In a typical response, when asked what market segments his company serves, one vendor stated “if [a facility] has got any of our products in it, we are going after it. It’s really unending; any kind of manufacturing, anything where there is something turning.”³

Table 3-5: Types of Customers Served (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Type of Customer Served	Active		Inactive		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Industrial	8	100%	25	76%	33	80%
Commercial	2	25%	14	42%	16	39%
Institutional	4	50%	12	36%	16	39%
Agricultural	0	0%	5	15%	5	12%
Residential	0	0%	4	12%	4	10%
Original Equipment Manufacturers	3	38%	2	6%	5	12%
Contractor	0	0%	5	15%	5	12%

The active motor vendor contacts are more likely to serve industrial and institutional customers than are the inactive vendors. In turn, inactive vendors more frequently reported serving commercial, agricultural and residential customers. In addition, while relatively few contacts reported selling motors to original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) and contractors, these sales are notable in that, unlike other business sectors with which the vendors work, OEMs and contractors are not the end users of the motors they

³ In order to maintain confidentiality of responses, the male pronoun is used for all motor vendor respondents. The male pronoun was chosen because the majority of motor vendor respondents are male.

purchase. OEMs incorporate motors in equipment they fabricate to sell to their own customers, while contractors purchase motors to install in their customers’ facilities.

3.2.2 Business Partners’ Approach toward Energy Efficiency

Business Impact of Energy Efficiency

Most of the interviewed motor vendors (33 of 41 respondents, 81%), including all but one active motor vendor, reported offering energy efficient products and services helps them to increase their business. Although the motor vendors generally recognize the value of offering energy efficiency products and services, most of them reported only a small portion of their business is comprised of such products and services (Table 3-6). Contacts’ companies offer a wide range of products, including many items for which an energy efficient alternative does not exist. Only one contact, a small company specializing in energy efficiency performance contracting, estimated more than 50% of his business involved energy efficiency.

Table 3-6: Portion of All Business Comprised of Energy Efficient Products and Services

Portion	Active		Inactive		Total	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
0% to 5%	0	0%	7	21%	7	17%
6% to 15%	4	50%	6	18%	10	24%
16% to 30%	0	0%	11	33%	11	27%
30% to 50%	2	25%	1	3%	3	7%
More than 50%	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
DK/NA	2	25%	7	21%	9	22%
Total	8	100%	33	99%	41	99%

DK/NA=Did not know or was not asked.

Efforts to Promote Energy Efficiency

Vendors described promoting energy efficient motors in a variety of ways. Some contacts reported actively promoting efficient motors and drives, in some cases elaborating that they had made energy efficiency a focus of their business. In illustrative comments, vendors stated:

- “We focus on [energy efficiency]”
- “That’s what it’s all about now, green”
- “[Energy efficiency] is our prime target right now.”

In order to promote energy efficiency, contacts reported sponsoring training sessions and seminars, both in-person and online, to educate customers about the benefits of efficient motors and drives. In addition, one company’s telephone hold recording includes a segment promoting NEMA Premium motors.

In contrast, other contacts stated that, while they may try to up-sell customers to an energy efficient motor, they do not actively promote efficiency to all their customers. One contact described energy efficiency as “a pushing tool, it’s not something that draws people in,” explaining customers were unlikely to come to his shop specifically seeking energy efficient motors.

3.3 VENDOR ACTIVITIES

3.3.1 Number and Frequency of Inventories Completed

As noted previously, this evaluation considers motor vendors inactive if they did not receive assistance from the Business Partners program in completing a motor inventory, that is, if they had not worked with NYSERDA's motors program during 2008 or 2009. According to program records, between April 2005 and October 2009, NYSERDA motors programs assisted 33 vendors in completing a total of 114 motor inventories. Vendors completed most (97) of those inventories between 2005 and the time of the program's transition to Business Partners in 2008. Since then, 10 vendors have completed 17 inventories as Business Partners (Table 3-7).⁴

Table 3-7: Number of Motor Inventories Completed by Year, From Program Records

Year	Number of Vendors Completing Inventories	Number of Inventories Completed
2005*	10	26
2006	21	46
2007	12	24
2008	6	8
2009**	6	10

*4/6/2005-12/31/2005

**1/1/2009-10/20/2009

Program records indicate a large majority (71%) of the vendors had completed only one motor inventory. Reports by motor vendors are largely consistent with these records, with a plurality of the vendors interviewed reporting that they had completed between one and five motor inventories (Table 3-8).⁵

Table 3-8: Number of Inventories Reported by Motor Vendors

Number of Inventories	Active (n=8)		Inactive (n=33)		Total (n=41)	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
0	0	0%	11	33%	11	27%
1 to 5	4	50%	11	33%	15	37%
6 to 10	3	38%	2	6%	5	12%
More than 10	1	13%	3	9%	4	10%
Unknown	0	0%	6	18%	6	15%

Although 33 of the motor vendors interviewed fit the definition of inactive participants, only 11 of those 33 vendors reported they had never completed a motor inventory. Twelve other inactive motor vendors reported completing motor inventories without program assistance. The remaining ten inactive vendors

⁴ The program's transition to Business Partners occurred in the middle of 2008. One vendor carried out a motor inventory very early in 2008, before the program's transition. Thus, Table 3-7 shows 18 inventories carried out in 2008 and 2009.

⁵ In interviews, many vendors were unable to provide a precise estimate of the number of inventories their company or branch had completed.

reported receiving program assistance in completing motor inventories prior to 2008, but had not completed inventories more recently.

Table 3-9: Motor Inventories by Inactive Motor Partners

Inventories	Count (N=33)	Percent
Inventories Conducted Under Previous Motors Program	10	30%
Inventories Conducted Without Program Assistance	12	36%
No Inventories Conducted	11	33%

3.3.2 Reasons for Inactivity

Vendor size (number of employees) is an indicator of motor inventory activity. Motor vendors with no inventories were frequently the smallest companies. None of the very small (five employees or fewer) motor vendors reported they had completed inventories (Table 3-10). In contrast, all but one of the active vendors are large (more than 60 employees), and all of the large vendors reported completing motor inventories.

Table 3-10: Motor Inventory Activity by Vendor Size

Activity	Very Small (0-5 Employees, n=7)	Small (6-20 Employees, n=4)	Medium (21-60 Employees, n=11)	Large (>60 Employees, n=19)	Total (n=41)
Active					
Inventories Conducted in 2008 & 2009	0	0	1*	7	8
Inactive					
Inventories Conducted Before 2008	0	2	2	6	10
Inventories Conducted Without Program Support	0	0	6	6	12
No Inventories Conducted	7	2	2	0	11

*The one active vendor who is not classified as large is nonetheless a branch of a national company.

Interview results confirmed program staff reports that the economic downturn is one factor contributing to the decline in the number of inventories. Three (of 10, Table 3-11) vendors who had completed inventories with program assistance in the past, said they had not done so more recently because the opportunity had not arisen. We interpreted these responses as reflecting the weaker economy.⁶

⁶ Two other inactive vendors, one of whom had completed inventories without program assistance and one of whom had not completed inventories, also cited the depressed economy as preventing them from completing inventories recently.

Table 3-11: Formerly Active Vendors Reasons for Recent Inactivity

Reason	Count (N=10)
Poor Economy	3
Disinterested in Program	3
Territory Saturated	1
Previous Inventories Did Not Result in Anticipated Sales	1
Not Specified	2

Other factors leading to the decline in the number of inventories include disinterest in the program. Three vendors mentioned program disinterest, with two of these contacts reporting they lost interest with the discontinuation of vendor incentives. However, since the program ended vendor incentives at the end of 2004, this change is unlikely to have directly impacted the number of motor inventories conducted in 2008 and 2009. Nonetheless, these responses indicate the program may benefit from increased outreach, ensuring vendors are aware of the program's benefits for their customer relationships.

Another reason formerly active vendors reported they had not completed inventories more recently is that customers may purchase motors recommended for replacement from another vendor offering a lower price or from another vendor with whom the customer has a pre-existing relationship. Three inactive vendors expressed such concerns about motor inventories. One inactive vendor suggested the program could offer incentives to vendors based on the number of motors surveyed to overcome this uncertainty.

One vendor reported he had not completed motor inventories recently, because in 2005 and 2006, his branch completed motor inventories for all of its customers within the branch's sales-and-service area who have enough motors for an inventory to be worthwhile and who are willing to have an inventory done in their facility. That is, in his view, his territory is saturated.

Vendors Who Have Never Conducted Inventories

Motor vendors who had never completed inventories gave a variety of reasons for not doing so, including:

- A lack of demand for the service among their customers (three mentions). Vendors attributed this lack of demand to economic conditions that had reduced the amount of manufacturing occurring in their area as well as low demand for energy efficient motors in general.
- Commonly selling motors that do not qualify for customer incentives (two mentions). Vendors reported they had not conducted motor inventories because a large portion of their work is agricultural and they sell many single phase motors, which do not qualify for incentives.
- A focus on retail sales (two mentions). Consistent with the finding that the smallest motor vendors had not completed motor inventories, two vendors reported that, with very few employees, their businesses focus more strongly on retail sales than on building the outside sales relationships conducive to motor inventories.
- Motor sales as a secondary business focus (two mentions). One vendor reported that, while he carries motors, his primary focus has been on lighting products, and a second contact primarily installs burners and boilers and only sells motors as needed for those applications.
- Sales staff not placing a high priority on inventories (one mention).
- A general lack of engagement with the program since it stopped offering vendor incentives (two mentions)

Inventories Conducted without Program Support

Both active and inactive participants said they do not always seek implementation staff support in conducting motor inventories. For example, one inactive motor vendor stated that he had completed as many as 75 inventories without program support. These contacts most commonly cited one of two reasons for conducting inventories without program support. First, vendors reported their firms have the capability to complete motor inventories without support from implementation staff. Two of these contacts elaborated that their own employees are qualified to conduct and analyze the results of motor inventories, and a third reported his firm has software similar to MotorMaster+.

Second, vendors reported they had not sought assistance because their goals for their inventories would not be served by the program’s focus on identifying motors to be replaced by NEMA Premium alternatives. The one active vendor whose response falls into this category said, at times, his company conducts inventories simply to gain an understanding of the types of motors in a customer’s facility and to identify uncommon motors that may be more difficult to obtain (Table 3-12).

In contrast, the inactive vendors with different inventory goals seek to use inventories to identify opportunities to replace drives as well as motors. According to one of these contacts, “we actually do our own analysis...We want it in our format rather than theirs because we do more things with our format than they do with theirs. We are typically not just collecting information on motors; we may also be collecting information on the mechanical drive coming off the motor and if there is a more efficient way of delivering that power.” Another contact said he typically looks at compressors and other types of equipment his company supplies as well as motors.

“Other” reasons motor vendors cited for not involving implementation staff in motor inventories included a lack of program awareness at the time they completed inventories and a lack of familiarity with program requirements by motor vendors and their customers, suggesting an opportunity for implementation staff to increase vendor awareness of the services the program offers

Table 3-12: Reasons for Doing Inventories without Program Support

Reason	Number of Active Vendors	Number of Inactive Vendors	Total
No Inventories	0	11	11
Capability exists within Firm	1	4	5
Different Goals	1	3	4
Other	1	3	4
Not Specified/Don’t Know	0	2	2
Total	3	23	26

One vendor reported he has learned to identify opportunities for energy savings through long experience with NYSERDA motors programs and therefore no longer seeks program support in conducting motor inventories. However, interview results suggest other vendors who conduct inventories without program support do not draw on knowledge gained through the program in this way. Given the time commitment required of vendors conducting program-supported inventories, it is unlikely that the large numbers of inventories some vendors reported are conducted at the same level of detail as are program-supported inventories. In fact, four vendors reported in some cases, they do not inventory all of the motors in a customer’s facility. These vendors reported they may focus only on the motors that run most frequently, on a single piece of equipment, or on a section of a plant.

Inactive Vendors Prospective Activity

Fourteen (of 33) inactive motor vendors reported they would complete motor inventories in the future if the opportunity arises. Five of them explicitly stated they would seek program support in conducting

inventories. However, only two of those vendors said they had identified specific facilities as candidates for motor inventories.

3.3.3 Effect of Motor Inventories on Vendors

Using the data collected in motor inventories, implementation staff provide motor vendors with estimates of the cost and energy savings that would result from replacing each inventoried motor with a NEMA Premium alternative. Based on this information, vendors and implementation staff make recommendations to the customer regarding which motors to replace and whether to replace those motors immediately or at failure.

Motor vendors reported discussing these recommendations with their customers and offering to support customers in a variety of motor management activities based on the results of the motor inventory. Contacts said they may suggest ways to eliminate duplication and to reduce the customer's overall motor inventory or suggest a stocking program for replacement motors. Vendors also reported discussing customer incentives available for any motors recommended for replacement. Five of the eight active motor vendors reported their outside sales staff play a continuing role in coordination and follow up of motor inventories.

According to implementation staff, analysis of the data collected during motor inventories typically results in recommendations to replace approximately 10% of the inventoried motors immediately, and to replace 50% of the inventoried motors at failure.⁷ However, both implementation staff and motor vendors reported motor users are often reluctant to accept motor inventory recommendations. One vendor estimated that customers generally act on only about 30% of the recommendations made, and other vendors reported that customers are especially reluctant to replace working motors. Vendors cited a lack of funding for capital improvements and company policies requiring certain payback periods for energy efficiency investments as barriers that prevent customers from acting on motor inventory recommendations.

These findings appear to influence the vendors' choices of facilities to inventory. Program records and vendor reports indicate motor inventories have occurred primarily in large facilities. Four of the eight active vendors stated that they specifically seek large facilities for motor inventories. Inventories of large facilities result in the greatest number of motors recommended for immediate replacement and therefore, have the greatest potential to result in motor sales. However, conducting inventories in these facilities can take as much as a week of the vendors' time. Since vendors typically do not charge customers for time spent on motor inventories, vendors noted this time commitment is the primary cost they face in program participation.

Another factor influencing vendors' decisions regarding whether to pursue a motor inventory in a facility is the customer's attitude toward motor replacement and management. According to one contact, "it really depends on what their philosophy is. If they are just buying stuff, we wouldn't be doing [an inventory], but if they want to get more proactive about it, it could be done at any time."

Active motor vendors were divided regarding whether the benefits of motor inventories justify the time and effort required. Five of the eight active vendors (Table 3-13), indicated the benefits of motor inventories justify their costs. These vendors cited two primary benefits of motor inventories. First, contacts described using the data collected through motor inventories as a sales tool in conjunction with available customer incentives. Second, vendors noted the benefits of motor inventories in helping to build relationships with their customers.

⁷ These estimates are consistent with data provided in the 2007 Motor Systems RFP (1055), which stated, as of December, 2006, 62% of the motors inventoried through the program had been recommended for replacement, with 20% of those recommended for immediate replacement and 80% recommended for replacement at failure.

Table 3-13: Active Vendors' Assessment of Motor Inventory Costs and Benefits

Assessment	Count (n=8)
Benefits Justify Costs	
Inventories Used as a Sales Tool in Conjunction with Rebates	3
Inventories Used to Build Customer Relationships	2
Total	5
Costs Outweigh Benefits	
Inventories Do Not Generate Sufficient Sales	2
Vendor Conducting Inventory May Not Benefit from Sales	1
Total	3

The three remaining active vendors who reported the time and effort required to complete motor inventories do not justify their benefits reported the inventories they conducted had little effect on their customers and generated few motor sales. One of these vendors noted his customers generally buy premium efficient motors even without receiving motor inventories.

3.4 PROGRAM EXPERIENCES

3.4.1 Length of Program Involvement and Source of Program Awareness

Most of the motor vendors interviewed have been involved with NYSERDA motors programs for several years, with the majority (23 of 41, or 56%) reporting their program involvement spans five years or more. Some contacts reported they have been involved with NYSERDA motors programs since the 1990s. Only two contacts (5%), both of whom are inactive, reported their companies or branches have been involved with the program less than one year (Table 3-14).

Table 3-14: Length of Involvement in NYSERDA Motors Programs

Length of Involvement	Active (n=8)		Inactive (n=33)		Total (n=41)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1 year	0	0%	2	6%	2	5%
1-3 years	2	25%	4	12%	6	15%
3-5 years	2	25%	5	15%	7	17%
More than 5 years	4	50%	19	58%	23	56%
Don't know	0	0%	3	9%	3	7%

Motor vendors most commonly reported becoming aware of the Business Partners program as a result of a visit to their location or other direct contact by program implementation staff (Table 3-15). This finding is consistent with program implementation staff reports that in-person visits are central to their efforts to recruit new business partners and to maintain relationships with existing business partners. Other sources of program awareness noted once each include customer interest in efficient motors, internet searches, and contacts at the vendor's local utility. Most (75%) of the contacts who could not identify the source of their program awareness had been involved in NYSERDA's motors programs for more than five years.

Table 3-15: Source of Program Awareness

Source of Awareness	Active (n=8)		Inactive (n=33)		Total (n=41)	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Visit or other direct contact with implementation staff	3	38%	9	27%	12	29%
Sources within the vendor’s company	2	25%	5	15%	7	17%
Other contact with NYSERDA	0	0%	3	9%	3	7%
Contact with other companies (i.e. vendors, suppliers)	0	0%	3	9%	3	7%
Customer Interest	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
Other	0	0%	3	9%	3	7%
Don't Know	3	38%	9	27%	12	29%

3.4.2 Reasons for Program Participation

The majority of active motor vendors (5 of 8) were drawn to the program as an opportunity to build relationships with their customers. According to these vendors, offering energy efficient options and providing estimates of available energy and cost savings augment their value to their customers by providing services beyond mere equipment sales. As one contact stated, “when you show [the customer] that there is a six-month payback and you can save them several hundred or thousands of dollars a year, it shows up that you are a value added supplier; you are not just parts in a box.”

Directly increasing sales is another motivation for program involvement among active vendors. Although only one active vendor reported participating in the program with the hope of increasing sales directly, all but one of the active vendors who reported seeking strengthened customer relationships noted that those relationships would result in increased sales. Two other active motor vendors reported participating in the program so that they could better support customers in receiving incentives through the Existing Facilities program.

Motor vendors from some large companies reported that their regional management had provided their branches with information about the program, and encouraged participation. One regional manager reported that, while his company had participated in previous motors programs as a corporation, the company had decided each branch would enroll in the Business Partners program individually in order to increase the level of program support available at the branch level. Interview results suggest branches of other large companies largely act independently in deciding to participate in the program, with contacts reporting different lengths of program involvement between branches of the same company.

As noted above, active motor vendors’ assessments were mixed regarding whether the motor inventories they conduct justify the time and effort required. However, only one active vendor reported that program participation had not given his firm a competitive advantage over vendors that are not involved in the program.

Although not asked their reasons for participation directly, nine (of 33) inactive vendors reported their program participation primarily benefits their customers. And, like some active vendors, four of those inactive vendors elaborated that providing this added benefit to customers in turn increases their business.

3.4.3 Program Enrollment Process

Neither implementation staff nor motor vendors reported experiencing any technical difficulties with the program enrollment process. Program staff described a two-page application that vendors must complete,

and implementation staff stated that they fill in as much information as possible in advance of meeting a potential participant. The active motor vendors recognized the support that implementation staff provide in the enrollment process and stated they had encountered only minor problems, which implementation staff had easily resolved.⁸ In typical comments, vendors described the application process as “pretty standard” and stated that “when we’ve been involved, there hasn’t been an issue with the process.”

As well as receiving support from implementation staff in the enrollment process, half (4 of 8) of the active motor vendors reported receiving support from within their companies. One contact, a regional manager for a large company, described supporting individual branches through the application process and answering questions from those branches when possible before contacting implementation staff.

Despite the relative ease of the enrollment process, an implementation staff contact reported that vendors may be reluctant to enroll in the program for two primary reasons. First, some vendors are very busy and do not have time to complete even a simple application. Second, some vendors are simply not interested in program offerings. This contact said only about half of the motor vendors she contacts complete the form.⁹

3.4.4 Program Outreach and Communication

Implementation Staff Outreach to Motor Vendors

As with efforts to recruit new Business Partners, implementation staff reported in-person contact is central to program communication with participants. One implementation staff contact asserted this “aggressive” face-to-face marketing is the program’s greatest strength.

While vendors cited in-person contact as one of the primary ways they communicate with implementation staff, interview results suggest implementation staff visit some vendors more frequently than others. While five vendors (two active, three inactive) reported receiving regular visits from implementation staff, four vendors (two active, two inactive) reported implementation staff visits were infrequent. Two of the vendors who reported infrequent visits (one active, one inactive) stated their communication with program staff was, nonetheless, meeting their needs. However, one inactive vendor said it had been more than a year since implementation staff visited his facility.

Some motor vendors reported that previous implementation staff representatives visited their locations more frequently than their current representative. These observations may reflect a shift in the program implementer’s approach to motor vendor outreach. According to contacts, the implementer now seeks to reach a large group of vendors rather than concentrate outreach efforts on a few vendors as had occurred in the past.

Implementation staff reported that a second recent change in program implementation has improved their ability to communicate with motor users as well as vendors. NYSERDA now allows implementation staff to meet with motor users who have had a motor inventory through the program without the motor vendor present. According to implementation staff, this ability to meet directly with motor users has increased program efficiency and allowed the program to be directly involved in a relationship with the end user. One implementation staff member also reported having a NYSERDA representative present the results of a motor inventory to customers greatly increases the credibility of the motor vendor who coordinated the survey.

⁸ Inactive vendors were not asked about the enrollment process.

⁹ As with motor vendors, to maintain confidentiality of responses, a single gender pronoun is used to refer to all program and implementation staff members. In this case, the female pronoun was chosen because the majority of program and implementation staff contacts are female.

Program Support to Motor Vendors

Contacts reported implementation staff quickly respond to requests for support and provide assistance that meets the Business Partners' needs. While none of the motor vendors contacted reported any problems with staff responsiveness, responses by one inactive vendor suggest he is unaware of whom to contact for program support.

Active motor vendors reported receiving a wide range of information and support from implementation staff. Most commonly vendors noted staff support in conducting motor inventories and providing information about customer rebates for efficient motors and drives. Contacts also reported receiving program assistance in trade shows and promotions to encourage the use of efficient motors and drives. In an illustrative comment, one contact noted the value of program support, saying, "When we need their assistance, no matter what it is, they do their best to accommodate us, whether it is going on a survey, assisting a customer with rebate paperwork, or just explaining NYSERDA to the customer."

Consistent with motor vendors' general satisfaction with communication with implementation staff, respondents were generally indifferent as to whether they would like more contact directly with NYSERDA as compared to implementation staff. Two contacts stated that such contact might be valuable were they to encounter an issue implementation staff was unable to resolve. Two additional contacts said they, and their customers, do not differentiate between NYSERDA staff and implementation staff. According to one of these contacts, as far as his branch is concerned, "we are dealing with NYSERDA and so is the end user. Even though it is a contractor for NYSERDA, most people don't realize there is a difference."

3.4.5 Training

The training motor vendors most commonly reported receiving was on Business Partners services and on the Existing Facilities Program's incentives for efficient motors and drives. Vendors stated the program had supplied this training both to their sales staff and directly to their customers.

Seventeen (1 active, 16 inactive) motor vendors expressed a desire for additional training, including five inactive vendors who indicated they were unaware of the full range of services the Business Partners program offers.¹⁰ The motor vendors who expressed a desire for additional training most often sought training similar to the training other partners reported receiving. The majority (11 of 17) of these vendors who expressed a desire for additional training would like training related to program services available to motor vendors, the incentives available to their customers, or the process involved in receiving customer incentives. In addition, these vendors stated that training provided directly to their salespeople would be valuable, especially for new employees. The motor vendors suggested several formats for training and informational materials, including printed materials they could pass on to their customers, online training that could be completed outside normal business hours, in-person training, and case studies.¹¹

In addition, mentioned once each were a desire for training in motor repair, VFD applications, navigating NYSERDA's website, and other NYSERDA programs.

3.4.6 Record Keeping and Reporting

The program's data tracking activities are centered on motor inventories. Vendors supply implementation staff with information collected as part of the motor inventories they conduct, and, in addition to providing the vendors with calculations of the potential energy and cost savings from replacing inefficient

¹⁰ Five additional inactive vendors indicated they were unaware of the full range of program services, but asserted that any offerings of which they were not aware were likely not relevant to their business.

¹¹ One vendor suggested case studies should not name specific customers or motor vendors, saying that named vendors can use program case studies as promotional materials for their firms.

motors, implementation staff store this information in a database. Since incentives to motor vendors are no longer a Business Partners service, implementation staff stated participation requires relatively little commitment of vendors in terms of data reporting. The active motor vendors interviewed said they provide little information to implementation staff beyond that related to motor inventories.

In addition to the information they provide to the Business Partners program, motor vendors described providing information to the Existing Facilities program in support of their customers' incentive applications. Two active vendors stated the reports generated as a result of motor inventories facilitate the incentive application process for any motors customers choose to replace.

Despite motor vendors' reports of providing information to support their customers' applications to the Existing Facilities program, one implementation staff member said the Existing Facilities program does not capture vendor information. As a result, implementation staff cannot correlate inventories or other activities conducted through the Business Partners program to sales of NEMA Premium motors. According to this contact, this inability to connect motor inventories to sales of efficient motors limits the Business Partners program's ability to identify what actions motor users have taken as a result of a motor inventory and what opportunities remain for energy efficiency.

3.4.7 Information about Other NYSERDA Programs

Implementation staff reported they make an effort to inform motor vendors of other programs. In addition, implementation staff said they inform other programs about participant prospects they encounter through the Business Partners program. Specifically, staff contacts reported providing motor vendors with information about the lighting component of the Business Partners program as well as the FlexTech, Focus on Energy, Waste Water, and Industrial and Process Efficiency programs. Despite their efforts to inform motor vendors about other programs, implementation staff said they do not receive similar referrals of interested participants from other programs or Business Partners components.

Confirming staff reports, all but one active motor vendor reported receiving information about other NYSERDA programs from Business Partners implementation staff. However, in contrast to the interest vendors expressed in information on customer incentives available through the Existing Facilities program (discussed below) the vendors expressed little interest in programs that do not directly deal with motors and drives. In a typical comment, one vendor stated, "We have gotten other information, but motors and drives are the ones we are concerned with. The customer knows there are other programs, and we talk about that; if NYSERDA is in the meetings, that will come up. But generally speaking, we will not make money off of it."

Consistent with the disinterest these active motor vendors expressed toward other NYSERDA programs, one implementation staff member reported it was easier for implementation staff to inform motor users of other NYSERDA programs when motor vendors are not present. With motor vendors present, staff feel constrained to talk only about motors.

3.5 BUSINESS PARTNER PERCEPTIONS OF CUSTOMER ATTITUDES TOWARD ENERGY EFFICIENCY

3.5.1 Customer Awareness of Energy Efficiency

Interviews with active motor vendors suggest the majority of motor purchasers are aware that energy efficient options exist as they consider motors and drives.¹² The active motor vendors reported their

¹² In order to limit the burden of interviews for inactive vendors, only active contacts were asked about their customers' awareness of and attitudes toward energy efficiency.

customers are familiar with the NEMA Premium classification and with VFDs, although comments by some vendors suggest opportunities remain to educate customers about VFDs further. For example, one vendor estimated that, even following a marketing push to inform customers about the use of VFDs in HVAC applications, only half of his customers were aware of the drives.

In contrast to vendors' reports of relatively high customer awareness of the NEMA Premium label and VFDs, the active motor vendors reported their customers were largely unaware of motors that exceed NEMA Premium efficiency levels. Interview results suggest the motor vendors themselves have relatively little awareness of motors that exceed NEMA Premium and see little demand for those motors. In typical comments, vendors stated, "I've kind of heard about them, but I don't know anybody that's selling them;" and "Do you know of a motor? I would love to know of one if there is." Nonetheless, two contacts reported the more specialized individuals in their customers' engineering, maintenance, or electrical departments would be aware of motors that exceed NEMA Premium.

Half of the active vendors contacted credited their companies' efforts to promote efficient motors for raising customer awareness. However, one contact stated, while his company puts a great deal of effort into educating customers about efficient motors, his customers seem to retain that knowledge for a relatively short time.

3.5.2 Customer Attitudes toward Energy Efficiency

Active Business Partners estimated that between 20% and 25% of their customers are engaged in motor management activities, and reported their largest customers were those most likely to be involved in motor management.

Even though customers are generally aware of energy efficient motors and VFDs, vendors stated customers may still purchase standard products. Motor vendors identified two primary barriers that prevent their customers from purchasing efficient motors and drives: the added cost of NEMA Premium motors and the need to gain approval from multiple levels within the customer's organization.

In order to reach individuals at multiple levels of the customers' organization more effectively, contacts suggested that efficiency programs seek to make contacts at an organization's corporate level to encourage top-down support for energy efficiency. In addition, one motor vendor suggested program-supplied literature detailing the energy and cost savings that would result from an energy efficient motor to help maintenance people justify the costs of efficient motors to others in their organization.

3.5.3 Customer Participation in Other NYSERDA Programs

The motor vendors reported their customers were receptive to incentives available for energy efficient motors and drives. One contact compared the attitudes toward energy efficiency of his customers in New York to that of his customers in other states where incentives for efficient motors and drives are not available. According to this contact, "I've had applications where I showed somebody you could save them \$80,000 a year and they couldn't care less. But if you show them the same system in New York State and tell them that NYSERDA will kick in this much, they jump on the bandwagon." Vendors stated that customers are especially receptive when the available incentives contribute to a more attractive payback period for the customer's investment in energy efficient equipment.

While motor vendors reported their customers were receptive to incentives for energy efficient motors and drives, contacts said some customers do not apply for incentives because they find the Existing Facilities program's application and verification process too difficult. One contact stated that successful programs incentivizing efficient motors and drives during the 1990s had used an easier application and verification process and suggested that NYSERDA should work with motor vendors to determine what information is truly necessary, what end users are interested in, and how to simplify program paperwork. Nonetheless, other vendors stated that, despite some customers' reluctance to complete program paperwork, the paperwork requirements for customers to receive an incentive were reasonable.

3.6 VENDOR MARKETING STRATEGIES

3.6.1 Outreach Strategies

Consistent with their reports of serving a wide range of customers, motor vendors' marketing activities target a broad audience. Contacts reported identifying potential customers by contacting chambers of commerce, through internet and phone book searches, and through word-of-mouth referrals. The vendors contacted primarily reach out to potential customers through personal contact by outside salespeople. In addition, contacts reported using fliers, cards, and e-mail to reach out to customers. Finally, one contact stated his company may target specific customer types at different times during the year based on characteristics of the target industry or recommendations by sales and marketing staff.

Because of their inactive status, small and very small vendors were not asked about their marketing activities. However, interview data suggest smaller motor vendors do not rely as strongly on outside salespeople to reach out to their customers as larger vendors do. Given the central role, noted above, that outside salespeople play in conducting and following up on motor inventories, comments by one very small vendor suggest the availability of fewer outside salespeople may contribute to some vendors' inactivity. According to this vendor, "I just don't have time to go into big companies."

3.6.2 Incentives as a Sales Tool

Interview findings suggest participants in the Business Partners program are interested in the customer incentives for efficient motors offered through the Existing Facilities program, with six vendors reporting the information and support they receive regarding customer incentives is the most valuable service the program provides. As noted above, vendors reported their customers are concerned with the time required to receive a return on their investment in an energy efficient motor, and customer incentives reduce their payback period.

Slightly more than half of the motor vendors (21 of 41) reported using customer incentives for efficient motors and drives as a sales tool (Table 3-16). These vendors are divided between those who reported rebates play a central role in influencing customers' interest in and decisions to purchase efficient motors and drives, and vendors who reported that they use rebates as a sales tool only when the customer is already interested in efficient motors. These latter vendors generally reported they see relatively little demand for energy efficient motors and drives, suggesting they do not often use other program incentives as a sales tool.

Vendors who reported they do not use customer incentives as a sales tool gave a variety of reasons including lack of customer interest in the other programs and the small portion of qualifying motors they sell.

Table 3-16: Use of Customer Incentives as a Sales Tool

Assessment	Active (n=8)		Inactive (n=33)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Use as a Sales Tool				
Actively promote customer rebates	5	63%	8	24%
Promote rebates only to interested/eligible customers	1	13%	7	21%
Do Not Use as a Sales Tool				
Do not use incentives as a sales tool	2	25%	3	9%
Not aware of available incentives	0	0%	5	15%
Unknown				
Did not mention*	0	0%	10	30%

*Vendors were not asked directly about their approach to customer incentives. As a result, some vendors did not provide sufficient detail to determine whether they use incentives as a sales tool.

Two motor vendors reported the customer incentives available for efficient drives were more generous than those available for motors, making drive incentives an especially effective sales tool. One vendor stated the rebates available for drives were “well more than what I am selling a drive for.” This comment is consistent with an implementation staff report that, depending on the brand of drives a vendor carries and that vendor’s pricing structure, available incentives may cover the full cost of a drive. According to that report, some vendors promote incentivized drives as free to their customers.

3.6.3 Customer Incentives Not Currently Offered

When asked whether there were motors or drives for which NYSERDA does not offer incentives that should be incentivized, contacts offered a variety of suggestions, including:

- **Fractional horsepower motors:** Vendors most commonly (9 of 41, 1 active, 8 inactive) suggested NYSERDA should offer incentives on fractional horsepower motors like those used in agriculture, fans, refrigeration units, and residential applications. While NYSERDA does not offer incentives for fractional horsepower motors, some vendors suggested NYSERDA promote shaded pole and ECM motors. One vendor said an efficient fan motor on a refrigeration unit could be 40% more efficient than an inefficient alternative and another said ECM motors are 67% more efficient than the alternative.
- **Variable frequency drives (VFDs) in applications beyond pumps and fans:** Implementation staff noted that vendors would like to see incentives for VFDs in applications beyond pumps and fans. Five motor vendors (1 active, 4 inactive) confirmed this assertion, stating that offering incentives for VFDs in a wider range of applications might encourage adoption of the drives on a wider scale.
- **Motors over 200 horsepower:** One implementation staff member reported NYSERDA no longer offers incentives for motors larger than 200 horsepower. Three motor vendors (1 active, 2 inactive) suggested incentives for this type of motor would be beneficial.
- **Other types of drives:** Three vendors said they would like to see incentives for types of drives that are not currently incentivized. One vendor suggested NYSERDA should offer higher incentives to offset the increased costs of “panel drives” for VFDs. A second said there was a high potential for energy savings in larger drives than those that currently qualify for incentives, and the third vendor asserted that the potential for energy savings from replacing a V-belt drive with a synchronous-belt drive may exceed the savings from replacing a motor.

- **Air compressors:** One contact expressed a desire for more prescriptive incentives for variable speed air compressors like the incentives offered by the Long Island Power Authority, which offer set incentive payments based on the compressor’s horsepower.

The motor vendors were also asked whether they felt NYSERDA would benefit by offering higher incentives for motors that achieve efficiency levels one or two bands higher than NEMA premium and for vertical shaft motors.

Motors more efficient than NEMA Premium: According to NEMA, there are no recognized standards for the efficiency of motors with levels of efficiency higher than NEMA Premium motors. Program and implementation staff members stated incentives for motors that exceed NEMA Premium are not practical because NEMA Premium motors already achieve a high level of efficiency and because the added cost of motors that exceed NEMA Premium outweighs the increased efficiency they provide. Motor vendors were divided regarding whether increased incentives for motors that exceed NEMA Premium efficiency levels would be beneficial (Table 3-17).

Table 3-17: Motor Vendor Opinions Regarding Incentives for Motors Exceeding NEMA Premium

Assessment	Active (n=8)	Inactive (n=33)
Beneficial	4	13
Not Beneficial	4	10
Don’t Know/No Response	0	10

Seventeen motor vendors reported higher incentives for motors exceeding NEMA Premium would be beneficial, while fourteen vendors reported such incentives would not be beneficial. The majority (10 of 14) of these latter vendors said they were not aware of motors that exceed NEMA Premium efficiency levels or they were skeptical of motors claiming to be more efficient than NEMA Premium. According to one of these vendors, “when you start getting above NEMA Premium, when you see those nameplates, you know they are lying to you.”¹³ The remaining four motor vendors echoed program staff, saying the higher price of motors exceeding NEMA premium would reduce the cost effectiveness of these motors and limit customer demand.

Vertical Shaft Motors: Motor vendors largely favor the idea of increased incentives for vertical shaft motors, which are more costly than horizontal motors (Table 3-18). Vendors who support increased incentives noted they frequently encounter vertical shaft motors. Due to the motors’ cost, vendors said customers are often reluctant to replace vertical shaft motors, although significant energy savings are available. In a typical comment, one vendor said, “They are larger horsepower motors and that’s a good potential for savings, the bigger the motor the more energy they use, and there are a lot of them out there in the municipalities, power plants, that kind of things. And getting them to change those bigger motors would take a higher incentive.”

¹³ Motor vendors noted that in the 1990’s, motor manufacturers had engaged in competition over energy efficiency. At that time, the difficulty of determining the true efficiency levels of motors marketed as energy efficient led to the creation of the NEMA Premium label for motors that meet set standards for energy efficiency.

Table 3-18: Motor Vendors' Opinions Regarding Increased Incentives for Vertical Shaft Motors

Assessment	Active (n=8)	Inactive (n=33)
Beneficial	6	17
Not Beneficial	1	6
Don't Know/No Response	1	10

3.7 SUMMARY

In January and February of 2010, we conducted interviews with 6 of 10 active and 35 of 71 inactive participants. Responses by two participants originally labeled inactive indicated these participants are in fact active. Key findings from those interviews are as follows:

Motor vendors signed up to participate in the Business Partners program range from very small businesses employing fewer than five employees in a single location to very large suppliers with more than 60 employees spread throughout 10 or more locations in New York State. The majority of the vendors participating in the program come from larger companies with multiple branches in New York State. The majority of program participants had been involved with the NYSERDA motors programs for more than five years.

Consistent with the variety observed in the size of motor vendors participating in the program, vendors reported a variety of business strategies and a range of approaches toward promotion of energy efficient motors and drives. While larger vendors commonly rely on outside sales staff to reach out to customers, some of these vendors actively promote energy efficient equipment while others bring up energy efficient equipment only to some customers. Some smaller vendors reported a stronger focus on retail sales and said they serve the residential, commercial, and agricultural markets more heavily.

In-person contact with implementation staff emerged both as a common source of program awareness among motor vendors and as a primary way in which implementation staff communicates with and provides services to motor vendors participating in the program.

Motor vendors largely appear to have accepted implementation staff's view that the program offers a "value added" service that the vendors can provide to their customers. Vendors cited building customer relationships as both a reason for participating in the program and an outcome of their program participation.

Reflecting the program's relatively few reporting requirements, motor vendors reported few problems related to program processes or data requirements.

The number of motor inventories conducted in 2008 and 2009 through Business Partners has declined sharply from the number of inventories conducted through the predecessor program in 2006 and 2007. Factors contributing to this decline included the economic downturn, a saturated market for some vendors, and vendor disappointment with motor sales in return for their time investment in conducting inventories.

The majority of motor vendors considered inactive for the purposes of this evaluation had, in fact, completed motor inventories. These vendors were relatively evenly divided between vendors who had completed inventories with assistance from the Premium Efficiency Motors program before its transition to Business Partners, and vendors who had completed inventories without program support.

The smallest motor vendors are those least likely to have completed motor inventories, with or without program support.

Active vendors reported motor inventories require a great deal of time and effort. While five active vendors reported motor inventories help them to build relationships with their customers, the other three

stated inventories do not always generate sufficient sales, at least in the short-term, to make them worthwhile.

Interview results suggest motor vendors value the information the Business Partners program provides to them about customer incentives for the purchase of efficient motors and drives available through the Existing Facilities program. Vendors reported using available customer incentives as a sales tool and inactive vendors in particular expressed a desire for additional training related to available customer incentives as well as services the Business Partners program offers.

SECTION 4:

LIGHTING PARTNERS

The commercial lighting component of the **New York Energy Smart** Business Partners program, formerly known as the Small Commercial Lighting Program (SCLP), promotes effective, energy-efficient lighting in commercial and industrial spaces under the brand **The Right LightSM**. The SCLP originally served small commercial spaces less than 10,000 square feet. In 2003, the program increased the size of qualifying spaces up to 25,000 square feet. Currently, spaces up to 100,000 square feet may qualify for program participation. Lighting practitioners, including contractors, distributors, manufacturer representatives, lighting designers, architects, engineers, energy service companies (ESCOs), and other lighting professionals and decision makers, may become Lighting partners. The program provides training, field support, project incentives, and demonstration awards to participating lighting practitioner allies. The program also offers design and installation competitions, training and qualification incentives to contractors, and other special incentives. In 2008, NYSERDA contracted with an implementation contractor, ICF International, through RFP 1054 to provide further program development, and to continue these commercial lighting activities under the Business Partners program.¹⁴

For this evaluation, we interviewed the NYSERDA program manager for the Business Partners Lighting component, three staff of ICF International, and many Lighting partners as further described below. We also reviewed program and other related documents, including relevant PONs, RFPs, and the 2006 process evaluation of the SCLP, as well as NYSERDA's website.

4.1 DESCRIPTION OF LIGHTING PARTNERS

This section provides definitions of “active” and “inactive” as used in this chapter to describe the Lighting partners. We also describe the Lighting partner populations and samples used for this report, and characteristics of the sampled Lighting partners.

4.1.1 Definitions of “Active” and “Inactive” Lighting Partners

In October 2009, we obtained, and in January 2010, we updated lists of “active” and “inactive” Lighting partners from NYSERDA's website. When the SCLP changed to the Business Partners program in 2008, participating trade allies were for the first time required to complete a qualifying lighting project within the preceding six months to be considered active program allies (Lighting partners). Thus, active Lighting partners are those who have completed a lighting project through the Business Partners program during the preceding six months. Inactive partners are lighting trade allies who have qualified and signed a participation agreement with the program, but who have not completed any projects through the program during the preceding six months. As of January 2010, there were 71 active and 118 inactive Lighting partners listed on NYSERDA's website, comprising the Lighting partner populations.

4.1.2 Populations, Samples, and Call List Dispositions

Attempts were made to contact all of the Lighting partners. We completed interviews with 36 active partners and with 51 inactive partners. Partial interviews occurred with two additional active and three additional inactive Lighting partners. After multiple attempts to reach the remaining population, most of

¹⁴ ICF International had previously implemented the Small Commercial Lighting Program.

those contacts were unreachable before interview quotas were met.¹⁵ The few remaining contacts were not interviewed for a variety of other reasons (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1: Final Dispositions for Active Lighting Partner Interviews

Outcome		Active	Percent	Inactive	Percent
Eligible					
Complete	Complete	36	51%	51	43%
	Partial	2	3%	3	3%
Contacted	Left Message	26	37%	50	42%
	Refused	0	0%	3	3%
Not Eligible					
Duplicate Contact		5	7%	3	3%
Missing Contact Information		0	0%	2	2%
Business or Contact No Longer Available		1	1%	0	0%
Bad or Wrong Number		1	1%	5	4%
Failed Screening		0	0%	1	1%
Total		71	100%	118	101%

4.1.3 Characteristics of Lighting Partner Samples

Lighting distributors and contractors, who comprise the majority of Lighting partners, were most frequently interviewed. Contacts with ESCOs, along with lighting designers, architects, engineers, and manufacturer reps were also among the interviewed contacts (Table 4-2).

Table 4-2: Lighting Partner Types Interviewed

Lighting Partner Type	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=54)	Percent
Distributor	14	37%	13	24%
Contractor	11	29%	17	31%
ESCO	4	11%	8	15%
Designer	5	13%	9	17%
Architect/Engineer	2	5%	6	11%
Manufacturer Reps	2	5%	1	2%

More than one half of the interviewed Lighting partners reported their firms have a single office in New York State (active: 53%, inactive: 63%). About one quarter of the contacts (active: 26%, inactive: 28%) reported their firms have two through five offices in the state. Four contacts (three active, one inactive) reported their firms have no offices in New York (Table 4-3). Those four contacts are based in New Jersey.

¹⁵ We called unresponsive contacts at least six times each before interviews were completed.

Table 4-3: Lighting Partner Offices in New York State

Number of Offices	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=54)	Percent
None	3	8%	1	2%
One	20	53%	34	63%
Two through Five	10	26%	15	28%
Six or More	3	8%	1	2%
Not Asked (Partial Interviews)	2	5%	3	6%

Generally speaking, active partners’ firms have a larger employee presence in New York than do the firms of inactive partners. For example, roughly two fifths (14 of 38, 37%) of the active firms have more than 20 employees in New York, while about one quarter (14 of 54, 26%) of the inactive firms are that large. Conversely, about one quarter (9 of 38, 24%) of the active firms have one through five New York employees, while more than two fifths (23 of 54, 43%) of the inactive firms have staff sizes in that smaller range in the state (Table 4-4). The four contacts who reported having no offices in New York also reported their firms have no employees in the state.

Table 4-4: Lighting Partner Employees in New York State

Number of Employees	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=54)	Percent
None	3	8%	1	2%
One through Five	9	24%	23	43%
Six through Ten	5	13%	8	15%
11 through 20	6	16%	5	9%
21 through 50	9	24%	9	17%
More than 50	5	13%	5	9%
Not Asked (Partial Interviews)	1	3%	3	6%

Contacts with positions such as owner, partner, president, or principal were most frequently interviewed (active: 45%, inactive: 48%). Managers were the next most frequently interviewed contacts (active: 18%, inactive: 28%, Table 4-5). Job titles of other interviewed contacts included sales rep or account executive, vice president, senior or principal lighting designer, chief electrical engineer, chief estimator, lighting specialist, installer, and consultant.

Table 4-5: Interviewed Lighting Partner Job Titles

Job Title	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=54)	Percent
Owner/Partner/President/Principal	17	45%	26	48%
Manager	7	18%	15	28%
Sales Rep/Account Exec	6	16%	4	7%
Vice President	5	13%	2	4%
Other	2	5%	6	11%
Unknown	1	3%	1	2%

4.2 PROGRAM EXPERIENCES

The Lighting partners described an array of program experiences beginning with the sources of their initial awareness of the program, and continuing through their reasons for participation, their experiences with program enrollment and other administrative aspects of the program, and their program activities.

Overall, interviewed active Lighting partners believe the program is valuable and should be continued. Thirty six of the 38 active partners explicitly reported one or both of these views. The two active contacts who did not report the program was valuable were not asked about the value of the program; one of those two contacts reported having no projects with the program, and the interview with the remaining contact was incomplete.

4.2.1 Source of Program Awareness

Roughly one third (active: 31%, inactive: 37%) of the Lighting partners reported learning about the Business Partners program from the program itself, either directly from program staff, or through an email or newsletter, with about one half (16 of 30, 53%) of those contacts specifying ICF staff as the source of their awareness (Table 4-6).

Table 4-6: Sources of Program Awareness

Source	Active (n=36)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
ICF/NYSERDA	11	31%	19	37%
Vendor/Supplier	5	14%	5	10%
Research/Internet/Website	4	11%	11	22%
Employer/Co-Worker/Colleague	2	6%	3	6%
Trade Association	2	6%	3	6%
Utility	0	0%	2	4%
A Job	1	3%	0	0%
Don't Know	11	31%	8	16%

4.2.2 Reasons for Involvement

Contacts mentioned various reasons for becoming a business partner. Their reasons included: to receive a competitive advantage from participation, to obtain incentives for their firms, expectations of increased business, consistency of the program with their firms' business practices, to provide assistance to their customers in obtaining incentives, to conserve energy for their customers, and to increase their knowledge, among other reasons.

For the most part, the various reasons given for program involvement were mentioned by roughly equal portions of the active and inactive Lighting partners. For example, 31% (11 of 36) of active partners and 30% (15 of 50) of inactive partners reported they were motivated to become business partners to obtain incentives for their firms. Similarly, 19% (7 of 36) of active partners and 20% (10 of 50) of inactive partners reported they were motivated to become partners by the expectation of increased business for their firms.

However, the responses of the active and inactive partners differed in one key respect. Active partners mentioned participation reasons we interpreted as "to provide a competitive advantage" for the partners' firms by a percentage that was more than twice as large as the percentage of inactive partners who gave such reasons. Specifically, one half (18 of 36, 50%) of the active partners reported a reason for being a

partner was to gain a competitive advantage, while less than one quarter (11 of 50, 22%) of the inactive partners mentioned such reasons (Table 4-7).¹⁶ The data do not reveal whether the higher response rate for active partners reflects a pre-existing characteristic in that group or is an effect of active program participation perceived as a reason for participation.

Table 4-7: Reasons for Program Participation (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Reason	Active (n=36)	Percent	Inactive (n=50)	Percent
Competitive Advantage	18	50%	11	22%
Participant Incentives	11	31%	15	30%
Fit Business Model	7	19%	14	28%
To Increase Business	7	19%	10	20%
Customer Incentives	6	17%	9	18%
Energy Conservation/To Be Green	5	14%	13	26%
Training/Education	5	14%	0	0%
To Offer an Additional Service	3	8%	2	4%
Other	3	8%	2	4%
Don't Know	0	0%	1	2%

It should be noted the responses categorized as “Fit Business Model” in the preceding table were unprompted responses. Later during the interviews, contacts were asked specifically “Is participating in the program consistent with your business model, that is, does it compliment the products and services you offer?” In response to this question, 28 active partners (78%) and 15 inactive partners (30%) reported the program fits their business model.

Three active Lighting partners gave reasons for becoming a partner that we were unable to categorize. Those “Other” reasons included 1) the challenge of making their designs “work,” that is, the challenge of designing lighting projects that meet the program’s energy-efficiency requirements, 2) one of the contact’s manufacturer reps suggested it would be good for the contact’s firm, and 3) the program was applicable to a project the firm was doing at the time it became aware of the program. Two inactive partners also gave unique reasons for their participation in the program. Those reasons were 1) to receive “professional help” and 2) to strengthen relationships with the firm’s designer and customers.

Comparing the contacts’ responses to the responses of SCLP participants reported in its 2006 evaluation,¹⁷ suggests an evolution in the reasons for program participation. During the earlier evaluation, when asked what initially interested them in participating in the SCLP, the largest proportion of the

¹⁶ Some examples of responses interpreted as “competitive advantage” include:

- References to enhanced credibility,
- “It’s a good sales tool,”
- The ability to offer an incentive to a customer helps “to sell fixtures,”
- “To showcase ourselves,”
- “It pays to do it,”
- “Being on the NYSERDA list is helpful,”
- “To keep up with the times,” and
- “It made sense for our business to do this program.”

¹⁷ Research Into Action, Process Evaluation, Phase 2 – Business/Institutional Sector Market Development Programs Final Report, May 2006, p. 5-4

respondents (37 of 52, 71%) said they were interested in the project incentives; this compares with 30% (26 of 86) of the contacts in the current evaluation who reported this as the reason their firms became business partners.

4.2.3 Participation in SCLP

Program staff reported all trade ally participants in the Small Commercial Lighting Program (SCLP) “were removed from the slate,” when the program transitioned to the Business Partners program in 2008. To become a business partner, lighting trade allies had to apply to the program regardless of their prior history with the SCLP. In addition, to be shown as an “active” Lighting partner, lighting practitioners must have completed a qualifying project through the program within the preceding six months. According to program staff, this “has resulted in fewer but better business partners.”

The percentages of active and inactive Lighting partners that had participated in the SCLP were almost reversed from each other. About two thirds (25 of 38, 66%) of the active Lighting partners had participated in the SCLP, compared to roughly one third (19 of 53, 36%) of inactive Lighting partners with previous program participation (Table 4-8). Contacts who did not know whether their firms had participated in the previous program were often relatively recent hires. Although not clear from interview data, the staff turnover underlying those responses may have contributed to the “inactivity” of some firms.

Table 4-8: Participation in SCLP

Participated	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=53)	Percent
Yes	25	66%	19	36%
No	12	32%	29	55%
Don't Know	1	3%	5	9%

Two fifths (40%) of the active Lighting partners who had participated in the SCLP perceived no changes in program incentives or services, or in the way in which they interact with program staff when the program became known as Business Partners. This compares to roughly two thirds (68%) of the inactive partners who had SCLP experience and reported no changes between the programs (Table 4-9). The higher portion of inactive partners reporting no changes in the transition from SCLP to Business Partners may reflect their lower level of involvement with program activities compared to active partners. The relatively high percentages of both active and inactive partners who perceived no changes may also reflect the smoothness of the transition from one program to the other.¹⁸ For example, in describing the program transition, contacts made such comments as, “If there were changes..., it was transparent to me,” and “pretty seamless transition.”

¹⁸ Although we did not ask the motor vendors an identical question, motor vendors did not distinguish between Business Partners and its motors predecessor, suggesting a smooth transition for that program as well.

Table 4-9: Changes from the SCLP to Business Partners (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Change	Active (n=25)	Percent	Inactive (n=19)	Percent
No Changes	10	40%	13	68%
Incentives	5	20%	1	5%
More Staff Interaction/Support	3	12%	0	0%
Square Feet Increased	2	8%	0	0%
Less Staff Interaction/Support	0	0%	1	5%
“Opened Possibilities”	1	4%	0	0%
Don’t Know	1	4%	3	16%

The contacts who reported changes from the SCLP mentioned incentive changes (five active, one inactive), greater staff involvement or support (three active), an increase in the size of qualifying spaces (two active), and less staff interaction or support (one inactive). The preceding difference between the responses of the active and inactive partners regarding perceptions of staff support may reflect their respective greater and lesser involvement with the program. One active partner reported the transition “opened possibilities,” which may be another reference to the building-size increase. Curiously, one inactive partner reported he did not know about the Business Partners program, but was familiar with the SCLP.

4.2.4 Program Sign-Up Experiences

As described earlier, the lighting trade allies who participated in the SCLP did not automatically become Lighting business partners. However, those who had participated in the SCLP were required only to complete a Participation Agreement to become a business partner. For other lighting practitioners to qualify as a business partner, at least one person in the company must “be trained and become a specialist in the program.” Program staff described two ways in which lighting practitioners can do this.

The first method is to attend one of the program training sessions, which are available at public locations and as individual lighting-practitioner-office presentations throughout the state. Anyone who attends a training session can apply to be a business partner at that time. Staff reported the most effective recruitment of Lighting partners has resulted from these “lunch and learn” sessions at the individual offices of architects, distributors, and other lighting practitioners. These sessions are organized and presented by implementation staff.

The second method to become a Lighting business partner is through a “self-qualification” process. The latter approach requires receipt of a “self-education packet,” either through the mail from NYSERDA or delivery by program implementation staff. The packet includes a tri-fold brochure for the lighting program, a glossary of lighting terms, literature on T8 lighting by the Design Lights Consortium, case studies, an Existing Facilities application for lighting, and a test for the lighting practitioner to take. The test is returned to the implementation contractor, and those who pass it may apply to be a business partner. Staff suggested an improvement to this second approach would be the development of an electronic self-qualification packet.

To complete the process, business partner prospects must complete a registration form for their firm, an IRS Form W9, and a Participation Agreement. To gain and maintain “active” status with the program, Lighting partners must complete at least one project every six months. Staff reported Lighting partners who have not submitted a project during the preceding four months are contacted and reminded they may be removed from list of active business partners. Such reminders have triggered project submissions.

A large majority (80 of 84, 95%) of the Lighting partners who expressed an opinion about the program's sign-up process described the process as "simple" or "easy." And the comments of two of the four contacts who did not express complete satisfaction with the process were ambiguous or based on second-hand information. One of the two contacts who clearly expressed dissatisfaction with the process had been upset by learning of the program only when he found his company's name had been removed from the website list of lighting trade allies. The other contact, in spite of his misgivings about the sign-up process, reported, "The guys at the program and the packet were very helpful." All four of these contacts are inactive Lighting partners.

4.2.5 Experiences with Other Aspects of the Program

This section describes the contacts' experiences with program processes other than the sign-up process. Specifically, we address the contacts' views of program paperwork, program communication, staff support, training and education, and other program services. This section also describes the contacts' most and least valued program services, and additional services they would like to see the program offer.

Paperwork and Processes

Lighting program staff reported the process by which partners' qualify their projects begins with an on-line tool. Once a project qualifies through the on-line tool, project documentation including cut sheets, a photometric report, and a utility bill must be submitted for review by NYSERDA staff. Experienced partners complete the entire process themselves without the assistance or knowledge of implementation staff (ICF), allowing implementation staff to spend time coaching newer partners who still need assistance.

Staff reported two process concerns regarding the on-line project-qualification tool. Some Lighting partners are still "on dial-up" and need assistance to overcome difficulties resulting from their relatively slow internet access. Another process concern is the use by some Lighting partners of "their own software" to track their projects. This has resulted in double work for those lighting practitioners, because they are unable to upload the data directly from their software, and must manually re-enter it into the program's on-line tool. To address this, program staff has allowed the submission of "alternative documentation" to help the affected Lighting partners avoid that extra work. None of the interviewed contacts mentioned experiencing either of those difficulties.

Project applications also ask whether the end user is considering applying for incentives from any other NYSERDA program for that project. Staff reported that when another program is involved, most commonly it is Existing Facilities.

The previous evaluation of the SCLP found paperwork and bureaucracy were the most frequently mentioned barriers to program participation, with 43% (23 of 53) of the respondents mentioning those factors. Business Partners program staff reported this program's paperwork is also a problem for some Lighting partners. One staff person commented, "Everybody is so busy selling or doing other aspects of their jobs that to take time to do any paperwork is too much. Staffs are lean, and have less time."

Another staff contact reported, "Some business partners don't like the program's paperwork; they think it's too much."

Even though the findings of this evaluation are not strictly comparable with those of the 2006 SCLP evaluation because the questions asked were not the same, the responses to the current evaluation suggest paperwork and process concerns may be less for the Business Partners program than they were for the SCLP. While roughly two fifths (43%) of the respondents to the SCLP evaluation reported the barrier of "paperwork and bureaucracy" as an issue, about one fifth of the interviewed Lighting partners (active: 8 of 38, 21%, inactive: 11 of 54, 20%) mentioned issues with paperwork or program processes.

Two indicative comments by inactive partners included:

- “What we find is that the process is complicated and it’s a little confusing....The paperwork and what qualifies, there are a lot of steps in order to get a job completed,” and
- “The paperwork was horrendous....Paperwork for enrollment was smooth. Paperwork for projects was not smooth.”

Several active partners, who are generally more familiar with the program, added mitigating remarks to their paperwork and process concerns. For example, an active partner who reported, “The paperwork for getting a project through is onerous,” also commented, “Our local representative met with us the other day and he helped. He was wonderful and I realized that he could do a lot of this work for us.” Other expressions of concern with mitigating comments included:

- “There is a lot of paperwork there, but it’s been very good business for us,”
- “There were some issues but not anything major. The issues were resolved easily,” and
- “The rest of the paperwork, it was just getting used to it.”

Two additional active partners echoed the latter comment when they mentioned a learning curve associated with project paperwork.

Both active and inactive partners also expressed concerns about the project review process. An active partner reported, “It takes a while to get the project reviewed. Programs are hard in the marketplace because customers do not want to wait for review processes and paperwork filing.” However, this contact, although shown as an active partner on the NYSERDA website, reported no program activity since participating in the SCLP, and in fact, reported he was unaware the program was a component of Business Partners.

An inactive partner who reported program involvement only during the “last three months” said, “It takes a while for ICF to go through everything. There is a lot of paperwork, and they will call back and say, ‘This doesn’t work; you have to enter it again.’ I think the online application should have a place where you can upload certain data instead of having to e-mail every file.”

Another inactive partner suggested adoption of, “a much easier format so designers can look at that and see the list and know that if I put fixture A into space B, I will get my money.”

Inactive Lighting partners are by definition less likely than active partners to be well acquainted with the program’s paperwork and procedures. This may explain, at least in part, their harsher criticism of these program aspects than was expressed by their active counterparts.

Communication

Program and implementation staff expressed satisfaction with the communications internal to the program, describing both formal weekly meetings and frequent *ad hoc* communications. Additionally, NYSERDA staff described the lighting implementation contractor’s communication with business partners as “exceptional.” That judgment is confirmed by the responses of the business partners themselves. All 38 interviewed active Lighting partners reported their communications with implementation staff in positive terms such as “great” and “very responsive.” These contacts also described receiving monthly newsletters from ICF International and timely email notifications of program changes in addition to *ad hoc* emails, phone calls, and site visits. One contact summarized communications between Lighting partners and implementation staff by saying, “If I call them, they answer the phone. If I email them, I get a response. There have been visits here too, and sometimes we meet on the job.”

Four (7%) of the interviewed inactive Lighting partners reported dissatisfaction with program communications. One of these four reported no program communication had occurred with his firm. Another asked for more frequent communication and more local support as in the “previous small lighting

commercial program.” The third inactive contact reported difficulty in “getting a return phone call.” The fourth of these contacts displayed a tenuous understanding of the program by suggesting communication would be enhanced if the program served as an “intermediary” to connect that firm with clients. Two other inactive partners expressed unfamiliarity with the name ICF International.

As another indication of the overall satisfaction of the Lighting partners with their communications with program implementation staff, when specifically asked whether they would “like more contact directly with NYSERDA staff about the program,” only seven contacts (three active, four inactive) reported they would like such additional contact. Typical responses to that question included replies such as:

- “I don’t see a need for additional contact with NYSERDA,”
- “Not necessary. ICF provides, has always provided us with what we need,” and
- “I don’t see any reason really.”

And even among the contacts who indicated more direct contact with NYSERDA staff is desirable, their desire typically did not arise from shortcomings in communications with ICF staff. Two of the three active partners who desire more contact with NYSERDA based their reasons on hypothetical circumstances or conjecture. Their reasons were:

- “I think I’m going to have more complex projects soon, and I may need more assistance then,” and
- “The NYSERDA portion sometimes requires a NYSERDA person because ICF may not be privy to everything. Programs constantly change.”

The third active contact simply wanted more information about other programs such as “the Existing Facilities and New Construction programs that aren’t administered by ICF.”

Responses of inactive partners followed a similar pattern in that, with one possible exception, they indicated no difficulties in their communications with the implementation contractor. Two of the four inactive contacts who indicated a desire for more direct communication with NYSERDA staff commented:

- “Is that available? Yeah, instead of going through another party, I would prefer to go direct to the source myself,” and
- “If it helps the system work smoother, I’m all for it. You can’t get too much contact....”

A third inactive partner initially responded, “Sure, yes,” when asked about the desirability of more direct contact with NYSERDA staff; but when asked why, he added, “Not really. I guess it doesn’t really matter.... Well, I’d rather deal directly with the entity that you are doing business with than a third party. That would be my overall feeling.”

The remaining inactive contact offered the only reason for a desire for additional contact with NYSERDA staff that suggested a communication difficulty. That contact reported “I was working on one large project and I got 10 different answers for this complex. I wound up walking away from the project, which would have been lucrative for me and good for NYSERDA.” While this claim is likely an exaggeration regarding the number of different answers, we are unable to provide further insight into that situation. And again, the fact that this is the only suggestion by any of the contacts of a program communication difficulty reinforces, rather than discredits, the overall impression of effective program communications with the Lighting partners.

Staff Support

As might be expected from the positive responses about program communications, interviewed partners overall, also expressed satisfaction with the staff support they receive through the program. Both active

and inactive contacts described implementation staff as “responsive,” “knowledgeable,” “timely,” “exceptional,” and even as “unbelievable,” among many other positive expressions regarding the program’s staff support.

The comments of only one of the active partners even suggested a possible improvement in staff support. While saying ICF International had been “very responsive” to him, that contact commented it would be helpful if ICF staff would “hold your hand and come out with you” on one project.

Four inactive Lighting partners expressed concerns about program staff support. However, two of those four concerns were not related to the Lighting program. Instead, both were about insufficient information and support for programs offering incentives to end-use customers. One of the remaining two inactive contacts described difficulty in getting together with implementation staff “on a couple things that I was looking for him to help me out with.” The fourth contact reported staff support through the SCLP was better than through Business Partners adding, “I liked more frequent contact.”

As with program communication, the almost complete absence of concerns about program staff support is a testament to its reach and quality. In fact, program staff support is so extensive contacts sometimes perceive it as part of program training and education.

Training and Education

For this discussion of program training and education, we distinguish “training and education” from both the partner-enrollment sessions and from the often detailed responses by ICF staff to partners’ questions and concerns, even when the latter involve site visits by implementation staff.

Although few contacts (three active, one inactive) reported the program’s education and training are not meeting their needs, overall, the contacts’ responses suggest additional training opportunities may be desirable, particularly for inactive Lighting partners.

Specifically, about one fifth (8 of 38, 21%) of the active partners interviewed reported either they had received no training from the program, or the program’s training and education are not meeting their needs. Roughly three quarters (37 of 51, 73%) of the inactive Lighting partners gave such responses, with all but one of those 37 contacts reporting they had not received any training from the program (Table 4-10).

Of the four contacts who reported the program is not meeting their education and training needs, one active partner and the single inactive partner did not elaborate. One of the two remaining contacts, both active, who reported unmet training needs, specifically mentioned a desire for training for the firm’s sales staff in the program’s offerings and benefits. The other contact, a lighting designer, added the training “is for non-lighting designers.”

Table 4-10: Program Education and Training

Education and Training Responses	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
No Training Received	5	13%	36	71%
Training Not Meeting Needs	3	8%	1	2%
Additions/Changes Suggested	12	32%	9	17%

Twelve active and nine inactive contacts suggested additional training opportunities they would like the program to offer, or suggested changes to make the training more available to them. The most frequent suggestion was for training in new technologies (five active, two inactive, Table 4-11). The next most commonly suggested training subjects were program information (for example, project qualifications, glare requirements, rebates) and “Lighting 101” seminars, that is, training in lighting types, fixtures, and lighting applications in different spaces. Two inactive partners requested more locally available training, indicating they are in relatively remote locations, and perhaps partially explaining their inactive status.

Table 4-11: Suggested Additions/Changes to Program Education and Training (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Addition/Change	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
New Technologies	5	13%	2	4%
Program Info (Project Qualifications, Rebates)	2	5%	3	6%
Lighting Types, Fixtures & Applications	2	5%	2	4%
Local Training	0	0%	2	4%
Program Forms and Processes	1	3%	1	2%
Lighting Audit Methodology	1	3%	0	0%
Program Info for Other Utilities	1	3%	0	0%
Renewable Technologies	1	3%	0	0%
Webcast or Video Sessions	1	3%	0	0%
Website Tutorials	1	3%	0	0%

In addition to the kinds of information mentioned in Table 4-11, the contacts indicated a need for information or training about other NYSERDA programs and the other Business Partner components. Most (21 of 38, 55%) of the active partners reported they had received no information or training about other NYSERDA programs, including information about the other Business Partners components; and all but one of the 12 active partners who reported they did receive information about other programs from the Business Partners program described receiving that information informally through the program's newsletter or only on request from program staff.

Other Program Services

Other program services mentioned by staff and Lighting partners included monthly newsletters that among other things include "technical data,...suggested layouts, [and] suggested ways of dealing with applications," email notices of program changes, a website payback analysis tool, and "learning tools about lighting nomenclature" also on the website. All of these services were viewed favorably by the Lighting partners who mentioned them. It is noteworthy that the contacts' descriptions of the benefits and information provided by these other program features appear to address many of the perceived gaps in the program's education and training described by contacts in the preceding section.

Most Valued Services

Perhaps not surprisingly, the program "service" most frequently mentioned by the Lighting partners as most valuable was the program's incentives. After the incentives, the assistance and support given to the contacts by implementation staff was most frequently mentioned (active: 12 of 38, 32%, inactive: 13 of 51, 25%), followed closely by the program's training and information (active: 10 of 38, 26%, inactive: 11 of 51, 22%, Table 4-12).

Table 4-12: Most Valuable Program Services (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Program Service	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
Incentives	19	50%	14	27%
Staff Support	12	32%	13	25%
Training/Information	10	26%	11	22%
Website Information and Tools	4	11%	6	12%
Other	3	8%	4	8%
All Services Equally Valuable	0	0%	3	6%

We attempted to distinguish contacts’ reports of training and information from their reports of website information and tools as the program’s most valuable service. For example, one contact reported the most valuable program service is: “understanding how to read a photometric report and properly light and position lighting so that the illumination levels are adequate.” That response was categorized with the training-and-information responses. Regarding the website-information-and-tools category of Table 4-12, above, in addition to straightforward reports of the website as the program’s most valuable service, other responses we interpreted as belonging in this category included:

- Table of products,
- Payback analysis tool,
- Learning tools about lighting nomenclature,
- Lifecycle tool,
- Design checklist, and
- Program documents that offer design strategies and guidelines.

“Other” services the contacts reported to be the program’s most valuable services included:

- The newsletter (three inactive partners),
- Credibility for the contact’s firm (one active and one inactive partner),
- “More business” (one active partner), and
- Review of the firm’s lighting designs by program staff (one active partner).

Three inactive partners reported all of the services are equally valuable. These three responses are not included in the counts for the other categories of services.

Least Valued Services

The interviewed partners had greater difficulty identifying the program’s “least valuable” service than they did describing its most valuable services. Eight contacts (two active, six inactive) reported a program feature they believe is least valuable. However, these reports, both because of their small number and because of their content and sources, should be of limited concern to the program.

For example, reports by two active partners reflect their particular job activities at least as much as they suggest a program shortcoming. Specifically, one of the two active partners, a principal in a lighting-design firm, mentioned the training as the program’s least valuable service; conversely, a contact from a lighting distributor reported the program’s design component as its least valuable service.

The significance of the “least valuable” services named by the six inactive partners is similarly limited. They either named items that are not fully within the scope of this program, or identified participation difficulties rather than services that are of little value to them. Specifically, one of these contacts

described as least valuable the information about awareness of energy efficient products and incentives that is offered to end-users, a feature that is predominantly outside the scope of this program. The reports by the five remaining inactive contacts included:

- Difficulty navigating the website to find “the spreadsheet that has codes information,”
- “...where you have to pick fixtures from a list. That is not helpful. You could never keep up with the styles,”
- “Last minute” program changes,
- The specifications on specific lighting fixtures, and
- “The paperwork, the mountains of convoluted paperwork.”

Additional Services Desired

Additional tools or training these contacts reported that they, or their firms, want or need to be more effective in the marketplace, once again, differ markedly between active and inactive partners. The desired types of tools and training mentioned by the contacts also reinforce the earlier observation about the need for additional training, especially for inactive partners. For example, five inactive partners mentioned a need for training about program criteria (ranging from “refresher” courses to lighting applications to qualifying fixtures) or procedures in addition to and reinforcing the comments reported under the *Training and Education* section above. By comparison, one active partner suggested additional training about the program’s lighting calculation software, but only for the firm’s “junior staff.”

Seven inactive partners reported a need for additional marketing support from the program or from NYSERDA. Suggested additional marketing support ranged from training in “marketing techniques” to broad-based program promotion and marketing. In contrast, no active partners suggested a need for such additional services. This difference between active and inactive partners suggests inactive partners are more reliant on the program than are active partners to market their services to new customers.

Two inactive contacts reported they would like additional staff support (more frequent visits, and to assist with paperwork). Two other inactive contacts reported they would like the program to provide them additional information: updated lists of incentives when the incentives change, and direct mailings about program offerings.

Taken together, the foregoing suggestions for additional program services again indicate inactive partners are less well acquainted with the program than are active partners. However, it is not clear whether inactive partners are less acquainted with the program because they are newer to it, or feel they have insufficient time to pursue program activity, or simply, are less interested in it.

4.2.6 Program Activities

The responses of 17 “inactive” Lighting partners to our initial screening questions indicated they had engaged in some level of program activity. To capture as much information as possible, our interviewers used the more in-depth, active-partners, interview guide for these 17 contacts. Thus, inactive partners are included at certain additional points in the discussion of program activities.

Two of the interviewed active partners’ reported their firms’ had not completed any projects through the program since becoming a business partner, that is, since 2008 when the program transitioned from the SCLP. One of these two was the contact who reported he was unaware the program had become part of Business Partners. The other active contact reported submission of 12 projects, none of which received incentives.

One half (19 of 38, 50%) of the active contacts reported completing six or more projects through the Business Partners program, and all but two of this latter group of contacts had completed more than ten

projects (Table 4-13). Thirteen inactive partners reported completing projects as a business partner, with one of these 13 contacts reporting completion of 25 projects through the program.

Table 4-13: Program Activity Since 2008

Number of Projects	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=54)	Percent
0	2	5%	41	76%
1-2	8	21%	5	9%
3-5	7	18%	5	9%
6-10	2	5%	1	2%
11-20	10	26%	1	2%
More than 20	7	18%	1	2%
Don't Know	2	5%	0	0%

More than one half (21 of 38, 55%) of the active partners had completed five or fewer projects during the previous six months, and three active partners reported completing more than 20 projects through the program during the six months preceding their interviews (Table 4-14). Among the 13 inactive contacts who had completed a project as a business partner, 11 reported completing projects within the previous six months, with one contact reporting completion of 15 projects during that time. Thirteen additional inactive partners have projects underway or completed for which they plan to submit paperwork to the program.

Table 4-14: Program Activity During the Previous Six Months

Number of Projects	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=54)	Percent
0	2	5%	31	57%
Projects Underway or Pending Paperwork	0	0	13	24%
1-2	13	34%	10	19%
3-5	6	16%	0	0%
6-10	9	24%	0	0%
11-20	4	11%	1	2%
More than 20	3	8%	0	0%
Don't Know	1	3%	0	0%

Program involvement is even greater among “inactive” Lighting partners than their inactive designation and the preceding paragraph suggest. In addition to the 12 inactive partners who reported completion of Business Partner projects within the past six months, 15 other inactive partners reported they have projects pending with the program or ready to submit to it. The number of such projects these 15 partners reported having underway were:

- One (eight mentions),
- Two (four mentions),
- Six (two mentions), and
- Ten (one mention).

Coincidentally, 15 other inactive partners reported they expect to complete a project through the program within the next year, with six of those 15 contacts expecting to complete a project within the next six months, and three of them expecting to complete a project within the next three months.

One reason “inactive” partners appear to be more active with the program than their inactive status would suggest is the recent nature of that program activity. For example, one inactive contact reported, “I just received an email from ICF confirming the project.” That is, the program activity reported by some inactive partners had been too recent to be reflected in the program records on which our call list was based. Another reason for reports of program activity by “inactive” partners was suggested by some contacts who worked on their Business Partner projects with other trade allies. The inactive partners’ comments suggest those other trade allies may have submitted the paperwork to the program under their own names.

4.2.7 Portions of Customers’ Projects That Are Business Partners Projects

Most active Lighting partners reported their Business Partners projects comprise a small part of their overall business. Specifically, more than one half (20 of 36, 55%) reported Business Partners projects comprise less than 10% of their business, with most of these contacts (16 of 20) reporting Business Partners projects are less than 5% of their business. Only four partners reported more than half of their lighting projects are Business Partners projects (Table 4-15).

Table 4-15: Business Partner Projects as Portion of All Projects

Portion of Projects	Active (N=36)	Percent
Less than 5%	16	44%
5% to 10%	4	11%
10% to 20%	2	6%
20% to 30%	6	17%
30% to 40%	1	3%
40% to 50%	2	6%
Greater than 50%	4	11%
Don’t Know	1	3%

4.3 REASONS FOR INACTIVITY

One of the “active” Lighting partners who reported no program activity during the preceding six months explained the inactivity by saying the firm is “doing more multifamily work now. We used to do more commercial work and it made sense to participate then.” As described above, the projects of the other active partner who had no completed projects had failed to qualify for incentives.

One inactive partner also cited his firm’s “mostly multifamily work” as the reason for its inactivity, adding, “There are no incentives for multifamily.” Other inactive partners offered an array of reasons their firms have not recently completed projects through the program. The most commonly mentioned reason, reported by 11 contacts, was the economic downturn. Four additional inactive partners simply reported they have not had, or could not find, any projects or clients who fit the program, which at least in part, may also reflect economic conditions. Curiously, one of these four contacts added, “This program is designed for new construction, not really the retrofit market.”

Other reasons inactive partners gave to explain their inactivity included:

- Short length of program participation (three mentions, with two reporting projects underway),
- Program requirements unclear to the contact (two mentions),
- Firm not doing any work in New York State (two mentions),

- Firm doing mostly residential work (two mentions),
- Insufficient contact or support from program (two mentions),
- Firm's projects have been too small (two mentions),

And mentioned once each:

- Firm's projects take longer than six months to complete,
- Firm is not yet fully licensed in New York,
- Firm works only with newer technologies (LEDs),
- Compliance with program requirements would not provide adequate illumination for a space,
- Incentive would go to the firm's umbrella company, and
- Too much paperwork.

Although not mentioned as a reason for their absence of Business Partners projects, two inactive partners reported they had received notification the program has been discontinued. One of these two added he had been advised to continue to submit project applications. Nonetheless, under this circumstance, it would be understandable if these two business partners remain inactive.

4.4 EFFECTS OF PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

This section describes reported effects of program participation on the business partners' firms, and on their customers.

4.4.1 Effects of Program on Business Partners

At least for the active Lighting partners, their expectations for program participation were fulfilled. That is, the two program effects most frequently reported by active partners corresponded with reasons for program participation.

Specifically, all but one of the 18 active partners who reported becoming a partner to gain a competitive advantage also reported they did indeed gain such an advantage through program participation. The one active contact who hoped for, but did not receive, a competitive advantage from the program reported not noticing a "difference between programs," meaning the advantage to his firm of being a business partner is the same as the advantage it had already gained through participation in the SCLP. Twelve additional active partners also reported gaining a competitive advantage from being a business partner. Altogether, roughly three quarters (29 of 38, 76%) of the active partners reported program participation conveyed a competitive advantage to their firms (Table 4-16). A similar comparison of the responses of inactive partners is not possible because they were not directly asked about the effects of program participation on their firms.

As another indication of fulfilled expectations, all seven active partners who reported becoming a business partner to increase their firm's business reported program participation had had that effect. An additional 10 active partners also reported increased business as a result of program participation, bringing the total who reported this to roughly one half (17 of 38, 45%) of the interviewed active partners.

Active partners also mentioned increased revenue or profits, increased lighting knowledge, better projects, and increased exposure for their firms as effects of program participation. "Other" responses included increased requests for energy efficient products (one active contact), and the provision of lighting audit expertise and support (one inactive contact). The effects of the program on inactive partners shown in Table 4-16 were gleaned from their comments and observations about the program. Again, these

results are not strictly comparable to the reports by the active partners, and are only very rough indicators, because a direct question about the program's effect was not addressed to inactive partners.

Table 4-16: Effects of Program on Lighting Partners (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Effect on Partner	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
Provided Competitive Advantage	29	76%	11	22%
Generated Business	17	45%	6	12%
Increased Revenue/Profit	6	16%	6	12%
Increased Lighting Knowledge	4	11%	0	0%
Created Better Projects	2	5%	2	4%
Increased Exposure	2	5%	0	0%
Negligible/None	3	8%	6	12%
Other	1	3%	1	2%

4.4.2 Effects of Program on End-Use Customers

Lighting partners most frequently reported their program participation results in energy or utility-bill savings for their customers. According to the contacts, their customers also receive better lighting systems, save money on their lighting projects, learn about energy efficiency, have greater satisfaction or confidence in their lighting purchases, increase their business, and receive assistance with their applications for other program incentives as a result of the contacts' participation in the program (Table 4-17).

Table 4-17: Effects of Program on End-Use Customers (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Effect on Customer	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
Energy/Utility-Bill Savings	10	26%	1	2%
Better Lighting Systems	5	13%	1	2%
Project Savings	3	8%	3	6%
Energy-Efficiency Education	2	5%	1	2%
Satisfaction/Confidence in Purchase	2	5%	0	0%
Increased Business	2	5%	0	0%
Assistance with Incentive Application	1	3%	0	0%
None	4*	11%	2	4%

*Two of these four contacts reported the program is transparent to their customers.

Program staff reported another program effect on the business partners' customers. Two staff members separately provided estimates that roughly 80% of Business Partners projects also receive incentives from other NYSERDA programs, predominantly Existing Facilities and New Construction. A third staff person estimated 50% of Business Partner Lighting projects receive other program incentives. These estimates suggest the program is largely successful in its coordination with programs that provide incentives to end-use customers.

Few of the interviewed partners could provide estimates of the portions of their customers that participate in other NYSERDA programs, and the estimate these contacts offered tended to be relatively small or relatively large. Of the 11 active partners who provided an estimate, 8 reported less than 20% of their customers participate in other NYSERDA programs, and the remaining three active contacts reported

more than 90% of their customers participated in other programs (Table 4-18). Similarly, four of the six inactive contacts who provided estimates reported less than 20% of their customers, while one inactive contact reported more than 90%. The sixth inactive contact reported “maybe a quarter” of the firm’s customers participate in other NYSERDA programs.

Table 4-18: Portion of Customers’ Projects Receiving Other NYSERDA Incentives

Portion Receiving Other Incentives	Active (n=37)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
0% to 20%	8	22%	4	8%
~25%	0	0%	1	2%
90% to 100%	3	8%	1	2%

Regarding other energy efficiency programs, program and implementation staff reported NYSERDA’s lighting program is, “beginning to see competition from utility programs,” specifically mentioning programs sponsored by National Grid and Central Hudson Gas and Electric. Four active partners spontaneously reported concerns about competing programs offered by one or both of those utilities. Three of those four contacts reported losing business (two contacts) or the fear of losing business to those programs, with one of these three contacts wondering, “How will NYSERDA respond to programs like that?” The other contact simply wanted information about the competing programs offered by other utilities “to know how [those programs] affect us,” and because “people are asking.”

4.5 LIGHTING PARTNER MARKETING ACTIVITIES

This section describes the approaches interviewed Lighting partners use to identify their customers, the outreach strategies the partners employ to gain their customers’ attention, and the extent to which they promote their status as a business partner in their marketing and outreach. We also describe the partners’ reports of the extent to which they incorporate energy efficient products and services in their businesses, and the effect of promoting and selling such products and services.

4.5.1 Customer Identification and Outreach Strategies

Contacts’ responses to separate questions about methods they use to identify customers and strategies they use to reach out for new customers often overlapped or were repeated. Both questions are components of the larger issue of marketing. Therefore, rather than distinguish between responses such as “cold calls” to identify customers and “cold calls” used as an outreach strategy, we have combined for analysis all responses to both questions. As a further note, these two questions were not included in the interview guide for inactive partners. However, as described earlier, our interviewers used the active partner’s interview guide for 17 inactive partners whose responses to initial screening questions indicated some level of program activity.

Active contacts most frequently reported reliance on word of mouth as a marketing tactic, with about two thirds (66%) of the active contacts mentioning this approach. Cold calls were the next most frequently reported approach to marketing reported by active partners, and were the most commonly reported approach by the inactive partners. Active and inactive contacts also rely upon their pools of existing customers, paid advertising, and other approaches to generate business (Table 4-19). Some contacts (four active and four inactive) reported identifying customers from their equipment orders (an order for T-12s, for example), or by visually assessing the type of lighting equipment a prospect has in place. “Other” reported methods of customer identification included “they come to us” (two active, one inactive), telemarketing (one active), and research online, in newspapers, and in magazines (one active).

Table 4-19: Lighting Partner Customer Identification and Outreach (Multiple Responses Allowed)

Strategy	Active (n=38)	Percent	Inactive (n=17)	Percent
Word of Mouth	25	66%	6	35%
Cold Calls	20	53%	8	47%
Existing Customers	12	32%	3	18%
Paid Advertising	7	18%	2	12%
Partner Firm's Website	5	13%	3	18%
Leads/Lists	5	13%	1	6%
Review Prospects' Existing Equipment	4	11%	4	24%
RFPs	3	8%	1	6%
Mail	2	5%	4	24%
Other	4	11%	1	6%
None	4	11%	3	18%
Refused/Unresponsive	1	3%	3	18%

4.5.2 Use of Business Partner Status in Marketing

Even though large portions of the active partners reported their business partner status gives their firms a competitive advantage (76%) or generates business (45%), they generally do not use their partner status to promote their firms, and may not perceive the label as a distinct “brand.” Twenty two active partners described the way in which they communicate their business partner status to their customers. Many of these descriptions suggest a less than aggressive promotion of their partner status, including comments such as:

- “When I go and look at a job, then I talk to them about the NYSERDA program,”
- “We bring up the program once we have been brought in to do the install work,” and
- “I do it at the beginning if I know they are available for a rebate, when I first call on the customer.”

The latter comment was echoed in the responses of six other active partners who reported talking about “the program” only when their customers are eligible for rebates. Roughly one quarter (9 of 38, 24%) of the active partners reported they do not mention their business partner status to their customers.

4.5.3 Energy Efficiency Products and Services

Energy efficiency products and services represent a substantial portion of the business of the interviewed Lighting partners. More than two fifths (15 of 36, 42%) of the active and about one half (26 of 51, 51%) of the inactive contacts reported more than half of their business consists of energy efficiency products or services; and roughly one fifth (7 of 36, 19%) of active partners and almost one third (16 of 51, 31%) of inactive partners reported all of their business comprises such products or services (Table 4-20). Because all of the work of energy service companies (ESCOs) involves energy efficiency, the portions of active and inactive contacts who reported more than half of their business comprises energy efficiency products or services would have been more nearly equal if ESCOs were represented equally among the sampled groups. The portions of the samples that were ESCOs were 11% (4 of 38) of the active contacts and 15% (8 of 51) of the inactive contacts.

Offering energy efficiency products and services is valuable to these contacts as shown by the large portions of both active (81%) and inactive (80%) Lighting contacts who reported energy efficiency products and services increase their firm's business.

Table 4-20: Portion of Business That Is Energy Efficiency Products or Services

Portion of Business	Active (n=36)	Percent	Inactive (n=51)	Percent
Less than 25%	11	31%	17	33%
25% through 49%	6	17%	6	12%
50% through 74%	3	8%	2	4%
75% through 99%	5	14%	8	16%
100%	7	19%	16	31%
Don't Know	4	11%	2	4%

4.6 SUMMARY

During January and February 2010, 36 of 71 active, and 51 of 118 inactive Lighting business partners were interviewed about their experiences with the Business Partners program. Reflecting the characteristics of the overall population, most of the interviewed firms have only a single office in New York State. Nonetheless, firms of active partners are generally larger (have more employees in New York State) than firms of inactive partners.

The most commonly reported source of Lighting partners awareness of the Business Partners program was NYSERDA program or ICF implementation staff (active: 31%, inactive: 37%). The reasons for program participation most frequently mentioned by active Lighting partners were to gain a competitive advantage (50%) and to obtain program incentives for their firm (31%). Inactive partners most frequently mentioned the incentives (30%) and the program's fit with their firm's business model (28%) as reasons for program participation.

Active Lighting partners were more likely than inactive partners to have participated in the SCLP. About two thirds (66%) of the active Lighting partners had participated in the SCLP, compared to roughly one third (36%) of inactive partners with experience in the predecessor program.

A large majority (95%) of the Lighting partners who expressed an opinion about the program's sign-up process described the process as "simple" or "easy." In the 2006 SCLP evaluation, paperwork and bureaucracy were the most frequently mentioned barriers to program participation (43% of respondents). Even though the findings of this evaluation are not strictly comparable, the responses suggest paperwork and process concerns may be less for the Business Partners program than for the SCLP. About one fifth of the interviewed Lighting partners (active: 21%, inactive: 20%) mentioned issues with paperwork or program processes.

Program and implementation staff expressed satisfaction with communications with each other and with the Lighting partners. Lighting partners are very satisfied with communications with implementation staff, and generally see no need for more direct communication with NYSERDA staff. Lighting partners are also very satisfied with the support they receive from implementation staff.

About one fifth (21%) of active partners had received no program training or the training they had received was inadequate to meet their needs. Roughly three quarters (71%) of the inactive partners had received no training from the program. Active partners most often suggested additional training in new

technologies, while inactive partners most often suggested training in program requirements for projects. In addition, most partners had received no information about other NYSERDA programs, including other Business Partners components.

“Inactive” partners are substantially more active than their program categorization indicates. Ten had completed Business Partners projects during the previous six months; 15 other inactive partners had projects pending or ready to submit to the program; and 15 additional inactive partners expect to complete a project through the program within the next year. The most commonly mentioned reason for program inactivity (22% of inactive partners) was the economic downturn.

Most active partners (76%) believe program participation conveyed a competitive advantage to their firms. Nonetheless, they generally do not use the Business Partners “brand” as part of their marketing strategy or tactics. The marketing approach of most active partners relies primarily on word-of-mouth referrals (66%), and on cold calls (53%) to generate new business. Business Partners projects represent less than 10% of the projects of most (55%) active partners.

SECTION 5:

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Key findings of this process evaluation are highlighted below, along with brief recommendations for program improvement. Additional details can be found in the body of this report and attendant appendices.

5.1 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In January and February of 2010, we conducted interviews with 8 active and 33 inactive Motors business partners. During the same two months, 36 active and 51 inactive Lighting business partners were interviewed about their experiences with the program. As a prologue to those interviews, we interviewed eight NYSERDA program and implementation staff during November and December 2009. Program documents and the program website were also reviewed. The following paragraphs describe key findings from our interviews and research, conclusions drawn from those findings, and recommendations for program responses.

5.1.1 Motors Findings

Vendor Overview

Motor vendor business partners range from very small businesses (fewer than five employees, single location) to large suppliers (more than 60 employees, multiple locations) in New York State, but most vendors participating in the program come from larger companies with multiple branches. Most program participants have been involved with the NYSERDA motors programs for more than five years.

In-person contact with program staff is a common source of program awareness among motor vendors, and a primary way in which program staff provides services to motor vendors. Vendors predominantly view the program as offering a “value added” service for their customers. Vendors cited building customer relationships as both a reason for participating in the program and an outcome of program participation.

Motor Inventories

By supporting vendors’ motor inventories, the Business Partners program gathers information on the types of motors in use, and gains the opportunity to present the case for motor management directly to motor users. However, some motor vendors conduct inventories without program support. Some of these vendors use inventories to identify opportunities for energy efficiency in drives and other equipment (HVAC, for example) for which implementation staff do not provide energy savings estimates. Other vendors do not seek program support in conducting motor inventories because the time commitment to work with the program is not justified in their view by resulting sales of motors. Motor vendors spend as much as a week gathering data on the motors in their customers’ facilities, and in most cases, only about 10% of the motors inventoried are recommended for immediate replacement. Further, customers are reluctant to follow recommendations for immediate motor replacement. These latter vendors appear to conduct inventories on a more cursory level than that required for program-supported inventories.

Improved customer relationships, rather than immediate motor sales, are the primary benefit motor inventories provide to the vendors who conduct them.

Ten business partners reported conducting eight motor inventories in 2008 and ten inventories in 2009. This compares to 46 inventories in 2006 and 24 in 2007 conducted as part of the predecessor Premium Efficiency Motors program.

Based on vendor reports, the decline in motor inventories cannot be attributed solely to discontinuation of vendor incentives, because that occurred in 2004. Other reasons such as market saturation, inadequate short-term motor sales to offset the vendors' cost of conducting inventories, the ability of some vendors to perform their own energy-savings calculations from the inventories, and the use of inventories by vendors for purposes other than those directly supported by the program all contributed to this decline as well.

For a variety of reasons, small and very small vendors are less likely than larger vendors to complete motor inventories. These reasons include:

- Smaller vendors more often service customers in the residential, small-commercial, and agricultural sectors. Such customers use fewer motors than typical industrial facilities, making them less attractive candidates to vendors for a motor inventory.
- The smaller facilities more likely to be served by smaller vendors often use fractional horsepower motors, which have less potential for energy savings than larger motors and do not qualify for customer incentives.
- Smaller vendors have little or no dedicated outside sales staff. Given the key role outside salespeople play in coordinating and following up on motor inventories, this circumstance limits small vendors' capacity to conduct inventories and limits the usefulness of the inventories to them.

Sales of Higher Efficiency Motors

With vendor incentives no longer available, some vendors are less engaged with the Business Partners program and with their customers' participation in the Existing Facilities program. However, vendors continue to promote energy efficient motors and drives and to use customer incentives as a sales tool. Some vendors focus on energy efficiency more heavily than others. Generally speaking, larger vendors typically try to up-sell NEMA Premium motors, while smaller vendors are more likely to offer NEMA Premium motors only to their customers who inquire about such motors.

Sales of motors that exceed NEMA Premium efficiency levels face several hurdles. Some vendors have not heard of such motors. Other vendors who have heard of them are skeptical of the manufacturers' claims of their efficiency levels. The vendors generally do not promote such motors, and reported they are not widely available. But most critically, there are no recognized standards for the efficiency of such motors.

Program Training and Information

Motor vendors value the information the program provides to them about customer incentives available through the Existing Facilities program. Inactive vendors in particular expressed a desire for additional training related to available customer incentives and to services the Business Partners program offers.

5.1.2 Motors Conclusions and Recommendations

Incentives for Sales of Efficient Motors

1. **Conclusions:** As a means of increasing motor vendors' engagement with the Business Partners program, program and implementation staff have discussed reinstatement of motor vendor incentives for sales of NEMA Premium motors. Even though NYSERDA discontinued paying incentives for sales of NEMA Premium motors in 2004, motor inventories conducted with NYSERDA support increased in 2005 and again in 2006. In 2008 and 2009, the numbers of inventories conducted with program support declined sharply. Factors contributing to this decline include the economic downturn, market saturation in some motor vendors' service territories, and vendor disappointment with low levels of motor sales in return for the time they invest to conduct

the inventories. The discontinuation of incentives for motor sales is not the reason for the decline in motor inventories.

2. Staff are also considering incentives for sales of motors that are one or two bands higher than NEMA Premium. However, no recognized standards for such motors exist at this time. Without recognized standards for the reliable determination of energy savings from motors with higher efficiency levels than NEMA Premium, the task of measuring savings motor by motor to determine appropriate incentive levels would be too onerous for the program to undertake.

Recommendations: The program need not reinstate vendor incentives for sales of NEMA Premium motors as a means to increase the number of motor inventories conducted through the program. Furthermore, the implications for demands on staff time that would result from offering incentives for motors of higher efficiency than NEMA Premium make such incentives impractical at this time. Further consideration of incentives for such motors should be deferred until NEMA promulgates appropriate standards for them.

Motor Inventories

3. **Conclusion:** There is little demand for program support of motor inventories, especially among small vendors. The demand and opportunities that remain are predominantly among customers of large vendors. Although the ability of motor vendors to conduct inventories without program support is considered a program success, some large vendors who conduct motor inventories without program support indicated their inventories are less rigorous than those conducted through the program. Further, these vendors may not analyze the data or present it to the customer as occurs with program-supported inventories.

Recommendation: To encourage vendors' efforts to gather information on motors in their customers' facilities, the program should consider offering vendors incentives for conducting motor inventories (at least for vendors' initial inventories). Such incentives would offset the short-term costs vendors face in conducting inventories, and may increase vendors' engagement with the program and with motor inventories. In addition, offering incentives for motor inventories may encourage vendors who would otherwise conduct their own, less rigorous inventories to seek program support. To complement vendors' activities, the program should also consider offering energy savings estimates for drives. Finally, because most motor inventory opportunities are found among the customers of larger vendors, consider refocusing program staff support on fewer and larger vendors.

Program Training and Information

4. **Conclusion:** Vendors' use of customer incentives as a sales tool would be enhanced by vendors' increased knowledge of the incentives available through other programs, and by a clearer understanding of the process involved in receiving those incentives. In addition, some vendors do not take full advantage of program services because they are not aware of the full range of services available and of the potential benefits of those services.

Recommendation: The program should offer additional training related both to available program services and to customer incentives from other programs for efficient motors and drives. Inactive vendors in particular should be targeted for such training.

5.1.3 Lighting Findings

Lighting Partner Overview

Lighting partners typically have a single office in New York State. Even so, firms of active partners are generally larger (have more employees in New York State) than firms of inactive partners. Active Lighting partners participate in the program to gain a competitive advantage and to obtain program incentives for their firm. Inactive partners participate for the partner incentives and the program's fit with their firm's business model. Active Lighting partners are more likely than inactive partners to have participated in the Small Commercial Lighting Program (SCLP).

Program Processes

Lighting partners are satisfied with program processes. A large majority of Lighting partners described the program's sign-up process as "simple" or "easy." Lighting partners are very satisfied with communications with implementation staff, and generally see no need for more direct communication with NYSERDA staff. Lighting partners are also very satisfied with the program support they receive from implementation staff. One area of program communications can be improved, however. There could be greater interaction between the Motors and Lighting components of the program.

Training and Information

While most active partners are satisfied with the program training they receive, reporting it is adequate for their needs, about one fifth of active partners had received no program training or perceived the training they had received as inadequate. And roughly three quarters of the inactive partners had received no training from the program. Active partners most often suggested a need for additional training in new technologies, while inactive partners most often suggested a need for training in program requirements for projects. In addition, most partners had received no information about other NYSERDA programs, including information about other Business Partners components.

Partner Marketing and Outreach

Most active partners believe program participation conveys a competitive advantage to their firms. Nonetheless, they generally do not use the Business Partners "brand" as part of their marketing strategy or tactics. Lighting partners may not use the Business Partners "brand" in their marketing efforts because Business Partners projects represent less than 10% of the projects of most active Lighting partners. On the other hand, the small portion of active partners' projects that participate in the program may in part be a result of the partners not embracing the Business Partners brand as part of their marketing.

Inactive Partners

The most commonly mentioned reason for program inactivity was the economic downturn. Nonetheless, "inactive" partners are substantially more active than their program categorization indicates. Twelve had completed Business Partners projects during the previous six months; 15 other inactive partners had projects pending or ready to submit to the program; and 15 additional inactive partners expect to complete a project through the program within the next year.

5.1.4 Lighting Conclusions and Recommendations

Program Processes

1. **Conclusions:** Administratively, especially regarding communications and staff support for

Lighting partners, the program is functioning well. However, there may be lost opportunities resulting from the absence of formal procedures for referrals between program components. Efforts have been made to achieve such cross pollination, but more can be done.

Recommendation: Identify and establish a process for enhanced communications about customer opportunities between program components.

Training and Information

2. **Conclusion:** There are opportunities to provide additional training and information to Lighting partners.

Recommendation: The program should conduct additional training sessions with Lighting Partners, and also consider other means of communicating basic program information to them. Training and information topics, especially for smaller and inactive partners, should repetitively include Business Partner program descriptions, benefits, and procedures. Other critical topics for both active and inactive partners are program information about end-use customer incentive programs, especially Existing Facilities and New Construction, and about the other Business Partner components.

Partner Marketing and Outreach

3. **Conclusion:** “Business Partners” has not achieved its potential for recognition as a valued brand among business partners. We recognize the efforts to solidify the Business Partners brand have been deferred to overarching agency branding efforts. Therefore rather than offer a recommendation to address this conclusion, we offer the observation that there is unfulfilled potential in the impact of the Business Partners brand, and therefore, in the impact of the program.

Inactive Partners

4. **Conclusion:** Projects often take more than six months to complete. The six-month criterion in which to complete a program project for purposes of designating Lighting partners as active participants is well intended but too short to reflect their activities accurately.

Recommendation: Consider modifying the criterion for remaining an active Lighting partner from completion of a qualifying project within the previous six-months to completion of a project within the previous 12 months.

APPENDIX A:

INTERVIEW GUIDES

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR NYSERDA BUSINESS PARTNERS PROGRAM STAFF (MOTORS AND LIGHTING)

Name: _____ Title: _____

Date: _____ Interviewer: _____

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____. I'm with Research Into Action. As you know, we have been asked by NYSERDA to conduct a process evaluation of the Business Partners program. We would like to have 45 minutes to an hour of your time to talk with you about your involvement and experiences with the [Motors/Lighting] component of the program. Is this a convenient time for you to talk, or would you prefer to schedule another time? [Proceed or schedule appointment as appropriate.]

Role

1. To begin, what are your role and responsibilities with the Business Partners program?
2. Has this changed over time? If so, how?
3. With whom at NYSERDA do you work most frequently on Business Partners matters? What are their roles?

Communications

4. How do you communicate with [Motors/Lighting] implementation staff? [Probe for frequency, regular v. ad hoc, media employed, topics addressed.]
5. [If not addressed] How and how often does implementation staff communicate with you?
6. [If not addressed] Are there ways in which these communications could be improved? [Probe for effectiveness, contact's satisfaction].
7. Have you received any feedback from implementation staff about program communications with or on behalf of Business Partners? If so, what feedback?
8. Have you received any feedback from Business Partners about program communications with or on behalf of them? If so, what was that?
9. [If not addressed] What is the status of Business Partners branding efforts?

Administration

10. How are the [Motors/Lighting] component's information and data recorded and tracked by NYSERDA?
11. Please describe your experience with the [Motors/Lighting] partner enrollment process. [Probe for ease/difficulty].
12. And would you please describe your experience with the project application and incentive and award payment processes? [Probe for ease/difficulty, timeliness of response and payment].
13. [If not addressed] Have improvements or adjustments been made to any of those processes? If so, what changes were made? If not, are any changes being contemplated?
14. [If not addressed] Are you aware of any other ways in which any of those processes could be improved?
15. Have you received any feedback from implementation staff or Business Partners about the program's data tracking, partner enrollment and renewal, project application, or incentive and award payment processes? If so, what have you heard?

Program Activities

16. To what extent and in what ways have you seen the Business Partners program coordinate with other energy efficiency programs? If any, which programs?
17. Do you think the program could coordinate better with other efficiency programs? If so, how?
18. What kinds of things seem to limit or discourage active participation in the program? If any, what do you think can be done about them?
19. What changes, if any, have you seen in program activities [numbers of partners, project activity level, sizes of projects]?
20. Can you think of ways in which the [Motors/Lighting] component has become more effective over the past year or so?
21. Are there ways in which that program component has become less effective?
22. Are you aware of education or training that [Motors/Lighting] partners or prospective partners may be lacking? If so, what kind of training?

Overview

23. What has been the effect of combining the Lighting, Motors and HVAC/Building Performance components under the Business Partners umbrella?
24. [If not addressed] What effect has the addition of Core Services had on the [Motors/Lighting] program component?
25. What is your assessment of the [Motors/Lighting] component's overall effectiveness? [If not previously addressed, probe for retention and increase in number of Business Partners, increase in number of projects].
26. Have there been any surprises to date in implementing the [Motors/Lighting] component?
27. [If not addressed] Have there been any significant problems to date or unforeseen challenges?

Summary

28. What would you say are the greatest strengths of the [Motors/Lighting] component?
29. [Other than previously discussed matters] What are the most important improvements that still need to be made?
30. Are there any other program changes or issues that we have not discussed that you would like to mention?
31. What would you most like to learn from implementation staff about the program?
32. What would you most like to learn from Business Partners about the program?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR BUSINESS PARTNERS IMPLEMENTATION CONTRACTORS (MOTORS AND LIGHTING)

Name: _____ Title: _____

Date: _____ Interviewer: _____

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____. I'm with Research Into Action. As you know, we have been asked by NYSERDA to conduct a process evaluation of the Business Partners program. We would like to have 45 minutes to an hour of your time to talk with you about your involvement and experiences with the [Motors/Lighting] component of the program. Is this a convenient time for you to talk, or would you prefer to schedule another time? [Proceed or schedule appointment as appropriate.]

Role

1. To begin, what are your role and responsibilities with the Business Partners program?
2. Has this changed over time? If so, how?
3. Other than Business Partners themselves, with whom do you work most frequently on Business Partners matters? What are their roles?

Communication and Outreach

4. How do you communicate with [Motors/Lighting] program staff? [Probe for frequency, regular v. ad hoc, topics discussed, media employed.]
5. [If not addressed] How and how often does program staff communicate with you?
6. Are there ways in which these communications could be improved? [Probe for effectiveness, contact's satisfaction].
7. [If not addressed] Have you received any feedback from program staff about program communications? If so, what?
8. How do you communicate with Business Partners [Probe for: frequency, regular v. ad hoc, topics discussed, media employed].
9. [If not addressed] Are there ways in which these communications could be improved? [Probe regarding communications both with program staff and Business Partners, for effectiveness, contact's satisfaction].
10. Have you received any feedback from Business Partners about program communications with or on behalf of them? If so, what?
11. [If not addressed] Have you received any feedback from Business Partners about program outreach activities (program marketing)? If so, what?
12. What would you say are the [Motors/Lighting] component's most effective outreach strategies?
13. Have improvements or adjustments been made to broaden the reach of the program? If so, what adjustments and what have been the results? If not, are any adjustments being contemplated?

Administration and Management

14. How do you record and track data and information for the [Motors/Lighting] component?
15. Please describe your experiences with the Partner enrollment and renewal processes. [Probe for ease/difficulty. Distinguish between first enrollment and renewal].

16. And would you please describe your experience with the project application, and incentive and award payment processes? [Probe for ease/difficulty, timeliness of response and payment].
17. What feedback, if any, have you received about the program's data tracking, Partner enrollment and renewal, project application, or incentive and award payment processes?
18. [If not addressed] What is your assessment of the type and amount of support and direction you receive from program staff? [If not clear] Why do you say that?

Program Activities

19. To what extent and in what ways have you seen the Business Partners program coordinate with other energy efficiency programs? If any, which programs? [Probe for both NYSERDA and utility programs.]
20. Do you think the program could coordinate better with NYSERDA efficiency programs? If so, how? What about with utility efficiency programs? If so, how?
21. What kinds of things, if any, seem to limit or discourage active participation in the program? If any, what do you think can be done about them?
22. What changes have you seen in program activities during the past 24 months [activity level, programmatic changes, change in number of active partners, etc.]? [If any, probe for reasons.]
23. [If not addressed] Can you describe any ways the [Motors/Lighting] component has become more effective over the past year or so?
24. [If not addressed] Can you describe any ways in which the program has become less effective during that time? If any, why?
25. Are you aware of any education or training that [Motors/Lighting] partners or prospective [Motors/Lighting] partners may be lacking? If so, what?
26. What other feedback have you received about program activities?

Overview

27. What has been the effect on the [Motors/Lighting] component of bringing it under the Business Partners umbrella?
28. What is your assessment of the [Motors/Lighting] component's overall effectiveness? [If not previously addressed, probe for retention and increase in number of Business Partners, increase in number of projects].
29. Have there been any surprises to date in implementing the [Motors/Lighting] component?
30. [If not addressed] Have there been any significant problems to date or unforeseen challenges?

Summary

31. What would you say are the greatest strengths of [Motors/Lighting] component?
32. [Other than previously discussed matters] What are the most important improvements that still need to be made?
33. Are there any other program changes or issues that we have not discussed that you would like to mention?
34. What would you most like to learn from Business Partners about their experiences with the program?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR ACTIVE MOTOR SYSTEMS PARTNERS

Name:

Title:

Date:

Interviewer:

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____. I'm with Research Into Action in Portland, Oregon. We have been asked by NYSERDA to conduct an evaluation of the Motor Systems component of the Business Partners program to help NYSERDA improve the program. Our questions will focus on your experiences with program procedures, communications, and activities. We would like to have 20 minutes to half an hour of your time. Is it convenient for you to talk now, or would you prefer to schedule another time? [Proceed or schedule appointment as appropriate.]

Call Back Number 866-395-4641

Role

1. What are your job title and role?

Administrative Processes

2. How long have you been involved with NYSERDA's Business Partners program?
 - a. [If not addressed] Were you involved with the previous Motors program?
3. How many motor inventories have you done through the Business Partners program?
4. How did you become aware of NYSERDA's Business Partners program? [Distinguish from previous Motors program]
5. How did the program enrollment [re-enrollment if applicable] process work for you?
 - a. [If not addressed] How smooth or difficult was the process?
 - b. How about the paperwork requirements, how smooth or difficult were they?
 - c. Did you feel that sufficient support was available from program staff? [*Probe for paperwork requirements, sufficiency of staff support, smoothness or difficulty of process*]
6. What activities with your customers do you report to implementation staff (Applied Proactive Technologies, APT)?
7. How do you track those activities?
 - a. Have you had any difficulty keeping track of the customer information that implementation staff has asked for? [*Probe for ease or difficulty of tracking and reporting*]
8. Please describe your other communications with implementation staff. [*Probe for frequency, media, satisfaction*]
9. [If not addressed] How responsive has APT been?
10. Would you like more contact directly with NYSERDA staff about the program? [If so] Why?

Market Response

11. Why did your firm become a Business Partner? [*Probe for participation in Motors program prior to Business Partners Motor Systems program*]
12. What difference has participation in the Business Partners program made to your firm?

- a. Has your participation in the program had any impact on your business in terms of sales or the products and services that you offer?
 - b. [If appropriate] Has that changed since the program transitioned from the old Motors program to the Business Partners program? [Distinguish from participation in previous Motors program]
13. [If not addressed] What Business Partners program services are the most valuable to your firm? Why?
14. What services are least valuable? Why?
15. Would you like to see incentives for motors or drives that are not currently incentivized by NYSERDA? [If so] What motors or drives?
- a. What about incentives for motors that are one or two bands higher than NEMA Premium and vertical shaft motors? Do you think those would be valuable? [Probe for motors that are one or two bands higher than NEMA Premium, and vertical shaft motors]
16. What additional tools or training do you or your firm, want or need in order to be more effective in promoting NEMA Premium motors and efficient drives in the market place?

Marketing and Outreach (Attribution)

17. How do you identify prospective customers?
18. [If not addressed] How do you reach out to (market to, contact) prospective customers?
19. [If not addressed] How do you communicate to your customers your participation in the Business Partners program?
20. Can you estimate the portion of your customers that is aware of energy efficient motors and drives?
- a. Are those customers that are aware of efficient motors and drives aware of NEMA Premium?
 - b. How about higher than NEMA Premium?
 - c. Are they aware of VSDs? [Probe for awareness of NEMA Premium, awareness of higher than NEMA Premium, and awareness of VSDs]
21. How many customers have you worked with on motor inventory or motor management activities? [Motor management includes work with entire systems (fans, pumps, industrial processes) as well as with discrete motors]
- a. How many of those had you done before you started participating in the Business Partners program? [Distinguish pre- and post-Business Partners]
22. Can you estimate the portion of your customers that has done motor inventories?
- a. What kind of businesses have those customers been?
 - b. In what proportion of cases? [*Probe for customer market-segment type*]
23. [If not addressed] What about the portion involved in motor management? [Probe for customer market-segment type. Motor management includes work with entire systems (fans, pumps, industrial processes) as well as with discrete motors]
- a. And how about those customers, what kinds of businesses do they come from?
24. What type of follow-up do you do with your customers?

25. [Probe for both pre- and post motor inventory]
26. [If not addressed] What advice do you give your customers about motor inventories?
 - a. How many of those recommendations do customers typically implement?
 - b. Are there any pieces of advice that customers are more likely to take than others? Which ones?
 - c. [Probe for the number and types of recommendations customers implement]
27. Have you been provided information about other NYSERDA programs through the Business Partners program?
 - a. [If so] How have you used that information?
28. [If not addressed] What influence does your program participation have on your customers?
 - a. About what proportion of your customers' projects participate in other NYSERDA programs?
 - b. [Probe for portion of customers whose projects participate in other NYSERDA programs]
29. [If not addressed] Has being a Business Partner given your firm a competitive advantage? [If so] In what way?
 - a. Does offering energy efficiency products and services help you to increase your business?
 - b. [If so] By how much and in what specific areas?
30. What proportion of your business do energy efficiency products and services make up?

Firmographics

We have a few questions about your firm to assist in the analysis of the data we collect.

31. How many locations does your firm have in New York State?
32. What is the total number of employees who work out of those locations?
33. Does your firm sell motors?
 - a. Do you repair motors?
34. Does your firm sell variable speed drives?
 - a. Do you repair them?
35. Earlier I asked specifically about the types of customers that do motor inventories and motor management. In general, what are the market segments [customer business types] you serve?
36. And what portions of your firm's business do they represent?

Summary

37. What is your overall assessment of the value of the Business Partners program to your business?
38. To you customers?
39. [If not addressed] What would you say are the greatest strengths of the program?
40. What are the most important improvements that could be made to it?
41. [If not addressed] Do you have any suggestions for how the program could work more effectively with you?

42. Do you have any other thoughts or comments about the Business Partners program that we have not discussed?

Parting Caveat

As part of a larger evaluation effort, NYSERDA is also currently conducting an evaluation of the energy-savings impact of the Business Partners program. A separate firm is conducting that evaluation work. You may also be called by someone from that firm, who will be asking you different questions. We hope you will be as helpful to them as you have been to us.

Thank you for your time.

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INACTIVE MOTOR SYSTEMS PARTNERS

Name:

Title:

Date:

Interviewer:

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____. I'm with Research Into Action in Portland, Oregon. We have been asked by NYSERDA to conduct an evaluation of the Motor Systems component of the Business Partners program to help NYSERDA to improve the program. Our questions will focus on your experiences with program procedures, communications, and activities. We would like to have 15 to 20 minutes of your time. Is it convenient for you to talk now, or would you prefer to schedule another time? [Proceed or schedule appointment as appropriate.]

Call Back Number 866-395-4641

Role

1. What are your job title and role?
2. Has your firm completed any motor inventories for your customers?
 - a. If not, why not?
 - b. If so:
 - i. How many?
 - ii. [If Renewed] Did you receive any assistance from the Business Partners program in conducting those inventories? If so, what was it?
 - iii. [If Renewed] Did you report those inventories to the Business Partners program? If not, why not?
 - iv. [If Renewed] Has your firm received any other training, assistance or other services from the Business Partners program?

Administrative Processes

3. How long has your firm been involved with the Business Partners program? [If appropriate] How long were you involved with the previous motors program?
4. How did you first become aware of NYSERDA's Business Partners Motor Systems program? [Distinguish from previous Motors program]

Market Response

[UNRENEWED]

5. Why did your firm decide not to become a Business Partner in NYSERDA's new motors program?
 - a. How active were you in the previous Motors program?
6. What benefits that are not offered in the current program (besides dealer incentives) did you receive from the old program?
7. Would you be interested in participating in the program if incentives were available to your customers for motors or drives that are not currently incentivized under NYSERDA? [If so] What motors?

- a. Would you be interested in participating if NYSERDA offered incentives to customers for motors that are one to two bands higher than NEMA Premium or if incentives were offered for vertical shaft motors? [Specifically distinguish which]
8. What additional tools or training do you, or your firm, want to see provided that would make you consider participating in the Business Partners Program?
9. [If not addressed] What changes would the program have to make for you to want to participate in it?

[RENEWED]

10. [If not addressed] What is your perception of the costs and benefits associated with the program?
11. [If not addressed] Do you anticipate your firm will complete motor inventories or motor management activities through the program? [If so] When might that occur?
12. What program services are most valuable to your firm?
13. [If not addressed] What services are least valuable? Why?
14. Would you be interested in incentives for your customers for motors or drives that are not currently incentivized under NYSERDA? [If so] What motors?
 - a. How about incentives for motors that are one or two bands higher than NEMA Premium and vertical shaft motors? [Specifically distinguish which]
15. What additional tools or training from the Business Partners program would be helpful to you or your firm?
 - a. How would that be helpful to you?

Marketing and Outreach

16. Does offering energy efficiency products and services help you to increase your business?
17. What proportion of your business do energy efficiency products and services make up?

Firmographics

We have a few questions about your firm to assist in the analysis of the data we collect.

18. How many locations does your firm have in New York State?
19. What is the total number of employees who work out of those locations?
20. Does your firm sell motors?
 - a. Do you repair motors?
21. Does your firm sell variable speed drives?
 - a. Do you repair VSDs?
22. What are the market segments [customer business types] you serve?
23. And what portions of your firm's business do they represent?

Summary

24. Do you have any other thoughts or comments about the Business Partners program?

Thank you for your time.

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR ACTIVE LIGHTING PARTNERS

Name:

Title:

Date:

Interviewer:

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____. I'm with Research Into Action in Portland, Oregon. We have been asked by NYSERDA to conduct an evaluation of the Lighting component of the Business Partners program to help NYSERDA to improve the program. Our questions will focus on your experiences with program procedures, communications, and activities. We would like to have 20 minutes to half an hour of your time. Is it convenient for you to talk now, or would you prefer to schedule another time? [Proceed or schedule appointment as appropriate.]

Call Back No. 866-395-4641

Role

1. What is your job title [If necessary, probe for role]?
2. According to my records you are a [Business Partner Type], is that correct?
3. How many projects has your firm completed through the program in the last six months?
 - a. How many projects has your firm completed through the program since it transitioned to Business Partners from the Small Commercial Lighting program at the end of 2008? *[If no projects completed since 2008, switch to Inactive interview guide.]*

Administrative Processes

4. How long have you been involved with NYSERDA's Business Partners program?
 - a. [If not addressed] Were you involved in the Small Commercial Lighting program before it transitioned to the Business Partners program?
 - b. [If involved in SCL] Did the program's transition from the Small Commercial Lighting program to Business Partners bring about any changes in the incentives or services that you receive or the ways that you interact with program staff?
5. How did you become aware of NYSERDA's Business Partners program? [Distinguish from previous Small Commercial Lighting program]
6. How did the program enrollment process work for you?
 - a. How smooth or difficult was the process, in general?
 - b. Did you have any difficulties with the paperwork requirements?
 - c. How about support from program staff, did you feel like that was sufficient? *[Probe for paperwork requirements, sufficiency of staff support, smoothness or difficulty of process]*
7. How do you track your customers' Business Partners projects?
8. Please describe your communications with implementation staff (ICF International). [Probe for frequency, media, satisfaction]
9. [If not addressed] How responsive has ICF International been?
10. Would you like more contact directly with NYSERDA staff about the program? If so, Why?

Market Response

11. Why did your firm become a Business Partner?

12. What difference has your participation in the Business Partners program made to your business?
 - a. [If not addressed] Do you feel that the opportunity to participate in the program has been valuable?
 - b. Is participating in the program consistent with your business model, that is, does it compliment the products and services you offer?
 - c. Is the program meeting your education and training needs?
13. [If not addressed] What Business Partners program services are the most valuable to your firm? Why?
14. What services are least valuable? Why?
15. What additional tools or training do you, or your firm, want or need in order to be more effective in the market place?

Marketing and Outreach (Attribution)

16. How do you identify prospective customers/clients?
17. How do you reach out to (market to, contact) prospective customers/clients?
18. [If not addressed] How do you communicate to your customers/clients your participation in the Business Partners program?
19. Have you been provided information about other NYSERDA programs through the Business Partners program? [If so] How have you used that information?
20. [If not addressed] What influence does your program participation have on your customers/clients?
 - a. Can you estimate the portion of your customers that participate in other NYSERDA programs?
21. [If not addressed] Has being a Business Partner given your firm a competitive advantage? If so, in what way? [Distinguish pre- and post-Business Partners.]
22. What portion of your work do Business Partners projects represent?
23. What types of organizations have these customers/clients represented?
24. Can you estimate the portions of your Business Partners work these various organization types represent?
25. Does offering energy efficiency products and services help you to increase your business? If so, by how much and in what specific areas?
26. What proportion of your business do energy efficiency products and services make up?

Firmographics

27. How many locations does your firm have in New York State?
28. What is the total number of employees who work out of those locations?
29. [If not clear from earlier responses] What lighting services does your firm provide?
30. What are the market segments [customer business types] you serve?
31. And what portions of your firm's business do they represent?

Summary

32. What is your overall assessment of the value of the Business Partners program to your business?
33. To your customers?
34. [If not addressed] What would you say are the greatest strengths of the program?
35. What are the most important improvements that still need to be made?
36. [If not addressed] Do you have any suggestions for how the program could work more effectively with you?
37. Do you have any other thoughts or comments about the Business Partners program that we have not discussed?

Thank you for your time.

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR INACTIVE LIGHTING PARTNERS

Name:

Title:

Date:

Interviewer:

Introduction

Hello, my name is _____. I'm with Research Into Action in Portland, Oregon. We have been asked by NYSERDA to conduct an evaluation of the Lighting component of the Business Partners program to help NYSERDA to improve the program. Our questions will focus on your experiences with program procedures, communications, and activities. We would like to have 15 to 20 minutes of your time. Is it convenient for you to talk now, or would you prefer to schedule another time? [Proceed or schedule appointment as appropriate.]

Call Back Number: 866-395-4641

Role

1. What are your job title and role?
2. Our records show your firm is a [Partner business type]. Is that correct?
3. According to our records, your firm hasn't completed any projects through the program in the last six months. Is that correct? *[If projects completed, obtain number and time of completion, and switch to "Active" interview guide]*
 - a. Have you completed any projects through the program since it transitioned from the small commercial lighting program to Business Partners at the end of 2008?
4. Has your firm received any other training, assistance, or any other services from the Business Partners program?

Administrative Processes

5. How long has your firm been involved with the Business Partners program?
 - a. [If unclear] Were you involved with the previous Small Commercial Lighting program?
 - b. [If involved in SCL] Did the program's transition from the Small Commercial Lighting program to Business Partners bring about any changes in the incentives or services that you receive or the ways that you interact with program staff?
6. How did you become aware of NYSERDA's Business Partners Lighting program? *[Distinguish from previous Small Commercial Lighting program (SCLP)]*
7. How did the program enrollment process work for you? In general, how smooth or difficult was the process?
 - a. Did you have any trouble with the paperwork requirements?
 - b. Was the support from program staff sufficient to meet your needs? *[Probe for paperwork requirements, sufficiency of staff support, smoothness or difficulty of process]*

Market Response

8. Why did your firm become a Business Partner? [Probe for participation in SCLP prior to Business Partners Lighting program]
9. What are the reasons your firm (has not completed/hasn't recently done) projects with the program?
10. [If not addressed] What is your perception of the costs and benefits associated with the program?

11. [If not addressed] Do you anticipate your firm will complete projects with the program? [If so] When might that occur?
12. Do you see any of the program's services as valuable to your firm? [If so] Which ones?
13. [If not addressed] What services are least valuable? Why?
14. What additional tools or training do you, or your firm, want or need in order to be more effective in the market place?
 - a. How would that be helpful to you?

Marketing and Outreach

15. Does offering energy efficiency products and services help you to increase your business?
16. What proportion of your business do energy efficiency products and services make up?

Firmographics

17. How many locations does your firm have in New York State?
18. What is the total number of employees who work out of those locations?
19. [If not clear from earlier responses] What lighting services does your firm provide?
20. What are the market segments [customer business types] you serve?
21. And what portions of your firm's business do they represent?

Summary

22. [If not addressed] Do you have any suggestions for ways the program could work more effectively with you?
 - a. Are there any services the program could offer that would make you more likely to complete projects through the program? [*Probe for changes that would induce contact's firm to become an "active" partner, that is, to complete projects*]
23. Do you have any other thoughts or comments about the Business Partners program?

Thank you for your time.