M12780

NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: ***The Public Utilities Act***

– and –

IN THE MATTER OF: **AN APPLICATION by EFFICIENYONE for approval of the 20272031 Demand-Side Management (DSM) Purchase Agreement between EfficiencyOne and Nova Scotia Power Incorporated, the establishment of a final agreement between the parties, and approval of a 2027-2031 Demand-Side Management (DSM) Resource Plan**

INFORMATION REQUESTS

To: **Synapse Energy Economics Inc.**
c/o William Mahody
Board Counsel
503-5475 Spring Garden Rd.
Halifax, NS B3J 3T2

From: The Consumer Advocate

Responses Due: **July 17, 2026**

Copies: 1 electronic copy (PDF searchable)

Contact Person: **David J. Roberts**
Consumer Advocate
Pink Larkin
1463 South Park Street
Halifax, NS B3J 3S9
Tel: (902) 423-7777
Email: droberts@pinklarkin.com

Request IR-1:

Synapse notes, at page 17 of its Report, that the primary focus of E1's DSM Plan is short-term affordability. However, on line 18 on page 17 and in footnote 13 on page 17, Synapse concludes that the level of spending on DSM in the Proposed Plan will increase electricity costs for ratepayers and is not in the best interests of ratepayers even in the short term.

A. Please explain in detail how the level of DSM spending in the Proposed Plan will increase electricity costs for ratepayers.

B. Please explain in detail how DSM provides downward pressure on the Fuel Adjustment Mechanism to the benefit of all ratepayers.

Request IR-2:

Does E1 acknowledge the apparent contradiction between its focus on short-term affordability and the affect the spending levels in its Proposed Plan will have on electricity costs for ratepayers?

Request IR-3:

Beginning at page 19 of the report, Synapse reviews the basis of E1's decision not to offer incentives for the implementation of electrification in the proposed plan.

A. What are the implications for the ability of the proposed DSM Plan to reduce energy costs and capacity challenges if Strategic Electrification is not promoted in the plan?

Request IR-4:

At page 22, lines 17 to 19 of the Report, Synapse observes that E1 did not provide a clear basis for its conclusion that Strategic Electrification did not meet the requirements of the modified PAC test.

A. What information has E1 failed to provide regarding its modeling of this question?

B. On what basis does Synapse conclude that E1 assessed the cost effectiveness of Strategic Electrification at the resource level, rather than as a part of the overall portfolio of DSM measures?

C. Please explain how Synapse reaches the conclusion that the Board's decision in M12282 would allow E1 to promote Strategic Electrification as long as it did not increase electricity costs at the portfolio level.

Request IR-5:

At page 25 of the Report, Synapse states that the previously modeled investment in Strategic Electrification of 12.2 million dollars in the DSM Plan would not materially impact the cost effectiveness of the plan measured at the portfolio level.

A. Please explain the basis of that conclusion.

B. How would the investment of 12.2 million dollars in Strategic Electrification affect the ability of the DSM Plan to reduce energy costs and capacity challenges?

Request IR-6:

As an alternative to funding Strategic Electrification based on previous modeling exercises, Synapse also reviews Strategic Electrification measures that focus on low and moderate income customers who heat with oil.

A. How would advancing Strategic Electrification for this target group of customers further the objectives of the DSM Plan?

Request IR-7:

With reference to Residential Demand Response programs, Synapse notes in the Report that program delivery costs amount to 63% of planned spending.

A. Does E1 provide an explanation for the high proportion of the costs of the Residential Demand Response program that are consumed by program delivery costs and, if so, what is the explanation?

Request IR-8:

On pages 37 and 38 of the Report, Synapse notes that an independent evaluation found that E1's proposed level of non-incentive spending in its Residential Demand Response program far exceeded the level for similar programs in other jurisdictions.

A. Does E1 provide an explanation for the high level of non-incentive spending in its Residential Demand Response program when compared to similar programs in other jurisdictions?

B. Has Synapse been able to determine the reason or reasons why the proportion of non-incentive spending in E1's Residential Demand Response program is so high?

Request IR-9:

What are the risks for ratepayers arising from the absence of any thresholds that would require mid-cycle adjustments from the Proposed Plan?