

Funding for energy and resource efficiency

Loan (all types and sizes of organizations)	Bond (larger companies or agencies)	Stock or Share Sale (companies)	Outright Purchase - Retained Earnings	Lease (aka a True or Operating Lease)	Capital Lease																																																
<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Process of obtaining a loan is understood.</td><td>Some administrative effort needed to apply for loan.</td></tr> <tr><td>All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.</td><td>No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.</td></tr> <tr><td>Depreciation and interest payments are both tax-deductible.</td><td>Increases debt; lender may require collateral or a security against an asset.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Process of obtaining a loan is understood.	Some administrative effort needed to apply for loan.	All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.	Depreciation and interest payments are both tax-deductible.	Increases debt; lender may require collateral or a security against an asset.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>US govt bonds may be interest-free, lowering rates.</td><td>More complex to administer than a loan.</td></tr> <tr><td>All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.</td><td>No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.</td></tr> <tr><td>Depreciation and interest payments are both tax-deductible.</td><td>Increases debt for the organization.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	US govt bonds may be interest-free, lowering rates.	More complex to administer than a loan.	All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.	Depreciation and interest payments are both tax-deductible.	Increases debt for the organization.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Issuing shares does not increase debt. Dividends not fixed.</td><td>In practice, shares are not usually issued to fund one purchase.</td></tr> <tr><td>All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.</td><td>No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.</td></tr> <tr><td>The depreciation of the equipment is tax-deductible.</td><td>Dilutes existing shareholders. Dividends not tax-deductible.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Issuing shares does not increase debt. Dividends not fixed.	In practice, shares are not usually issued to fund one purchase.	All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.	The depreciation of the equipment is tax-deductible.	Dilutes existing shareholders. Dividends not tax-deductible.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Simple.</td><td>Procurement may be time consuming if this is an unfamiliar product category.</td></tr> <tr><td>All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.</td><td>No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.</td></tr> <tr><td>No interest payments.</td><td>Because interest is tax-deductible, this may be a less efficient form of funding.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Simple.	Procurement may be time consuming if this is an unfamiliar product category.	All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.	No interest payments.	Because interest is tax-deductible, this may be a less efficient form of funding.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Usually relatively straightforward to administer.</td><td>May be more expensive than purchase - depending on tax treatment.</td></tr> <tr><td>All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.</td><td>No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.</td></tr> <tr><td>Lease payments are fully deductible. Lessor may pay some maintenance costs.</td><td>Lessee cannot depreciate the equipment.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Usually relatively straightforward to administer.	May be more expensive than purchase - depending on tax treatment.	All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.	Lease payments are fully deductible. Lessor may pay some maintenance costs.	Lessee cannot depreciate the equipment.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Usually relatively straightforward to administer.</td><td>May be more expensive than purchase - depending on tax treatment.</td></tr> <tr><td>All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.</td><td>No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.</td></tr> <tr><td>Can depreciate the equipment. Ownership at the end of the lease.</td><td>Treated as CAPEX. Can only expense the interest element, not capital costs.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Usually relatively straightforward to administer.	May be more expensive than purchase - depending on tax treatment.	All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.	Can depreciate the equipment. Ownership at the end of the lease.	Treated as CAPEX. Can only expense the interest element, not capital costs.
Pros	Cons																																																				
Process of obtaining a loan is understood.	Some administrative effort needed to apply for loan.																																																				
All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.																																																				
Depreciation and interest payments are both tax-deductible.	Increases debt; lender may require collateral or a security against an asset.																																																				
Pros	Cons																																																				
US govt bonds may be interest-free, lowering rates.	More complex to administer than a loan.																																																				
All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.																																																				
Depreciation and interest payments are both tax-deductible.	Increases debt for the organization.																																																				
Pros	Cons																																																				
Issuing shares does not increase debt. Dividends not fixed.	In practice, shares are not usually issued to fund one purchase.																																																				
All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.																																																				
The depreciation of the equipment is tax-deductible.	Dilutes existing shareholders. Dividends not tax-deductible.																																																				
Pros	Cons																																																				
Simple.	Procurement may be time consuming if this is an unfamiliar product category.																																																				
All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.																																																				
No interest payments.	Because interest is tax-deductible, this may be a less efficient form of funding.																																																				
Pros	Cons																																																				
Usually relatively straightforward to administer.	May be more expensive than purchase - depending on tax treatment.																																																				
All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.																																																				
Lease payments are fully deductible. Lessor may pay some maintenance costs.	Lessee cannot depreciate the equipment.																																																				
Pros	Cons																																																				
Usually relatively straightforward to administer.	May be more expensive than purchase - depending on tax treatment.																																																				
All savings from the investment are retained by the organization.	No risk-sharing with lender, if investment does not pay organization loses.																																																				
Can depreciate the equipment. Ownership at the end of the lease.	Treated as CAPEX. Can only expense the interest element, not capital costs.																																																				

Guaranteed Savings EPC (90% of US EPCs)	Shared Savings EPC	On-Bill Financing (linked to tariff)	Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE)	Utility Incentive Programmes	Investor Ready Energy Efficiency™	Carbon Credits																																																								
<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Well-established model. Particularly appropriate for long-term projects.</td><td>Administratively complex and time-consuming to set up.</td></tr> <tr><td>ESCO organizes finance and there usually is a simple fixed repayment.</td><td>Debt may not be off-balance sheet. Separate contract with finance co.</td></tr> <tr><td>ESCO brings skills and guarantees performance of installed technology.</td><td>Organization has debt and market (energy price) risks.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Well-established model. Particularly appropriate for long-term projects.	Administratively complex and time-consuming to set up.	ESCO organizes finance and there usually is a simple fixed repayment.	Debt may not be off-balance sheet. Separate contract with finance co.	ESCO brings skills and guarantees performance of installed technology.	Organization has debt and market (energy price) risks.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Well-established model. Particularly appropriate for long-term projects.</td><td>Administratively complex and time-consuming to set up.</td></tr> <tr><td>ESCO gives performance guarantee and finance. Single payment.</td><td>Organization has risks associated with movements in energy prices.</td></tr> <tr><td>Simpler contractual relationship between the parties.</td><td>May be more expensive as ESCO taking on greater risk.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Well-established model. Particularly appropriate for long-term projects.	Administratively complex and time-consuming to set up.	ESCO gives performance guarantee and finance. Single payment.	Organization has risks associated with movements in energy prices.	Simpler contractual relationship between the parties.	May be more expensive as ESCO taking on greater risk.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Collecting payments is simple.</td><td>Utilities do not see this as a core business activity and so may resist this facility.</td></tr> <tr><td>Does not conflict with mortgage debt, landlord can recover in service charge.</td><td>Only really works if final bill is lower than initial bill.</td></tr> <tr><td>Householder pays while they own the property. Obligation attaches to the meter.</td><td>New owner may not value the benefit in the same way. Could affect property price.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Collecting payments is simple.	Utilities do not see this as a core business activity and so may resist this facility.	Does not conflict with mortgage debt, landlord can recover in service charge.	Only really works if final bill is lower than initial bill.	Householder pays while they own the property. Obligation attaches to the meter.	New owner may not value the benefit in the same way. Could affect property price.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Well-established model which avoids debt being added to property.</td><td>Requires changes to laws in each municipality to allow PACE liens.</td></tr> <tr><td>Lien on property so may have low risk and lower cost.</td><td>Opposed by mortgage lenders, so town may need to take some credit risk.</td></tr> <tr><td>Householder pays for benefit while they own the property.</td><td>New owner may not value the benefit in the same way. Could affect property price.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Well-established model which avoids debt being added to property.	Requires changes to laws in each municipality to allow PACE liens.	Lien on property so may have low risk and lower cost.	Opposed by mortgage lenders, so town may need to take some credit risk.	Householder pays for benefit while they own the property.	New owner may not value the benefit in the same way. Could affect property price.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Simple proposition for recipient of the incentive.</td><td>Adds to the energy cost of all customers. "Giving away stuff for free" is harder than it appears.</td></tr> <tr><td>Incentives overcome market failings.</td><td>Utility is committed to savings and takes on performance risk.</td></tr> <tr><td>No debt is usually involved (although some incentives are "soft loans")</td><td>Effort may be focused on more expensive but scaleable solutions.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Simple proposition for recipient of the incentive.	Adds to the energy cost of all customers. "Giving away stuff for free" is harder than it appears.	Incentives overcome market failings.	Utility is committed to savings and takes on performance risk.	No debt is usually involved (although some incentives are "soft loans")	Effort may be focused on more expensive but scaleable solutions.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Standardization lowers costs and "friction" for investors.</td><td>Depends on investor education to develop market at sufficient scale.</td></tr> <tr><td>Independent M&V and assurance underpins performance expectation.</td><td>More expensive than purchase due to overheads as investment.</td></tr> <tr><td>Secondary market can develop which would make investments "liquid".</td><td>Market is not nearly large enough yet. Ratings agencies not involved yet.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Standardization lowers costs and "friction" for investors.	Depends on investor education to develop market at sufficient scale.	Independent M&V and assurance underpins performance expectation.	More expensive than purchase due to overheads as investment.	Secondary market can develop which would make investments "liquid".	Market is not nearly large enough yet. Ratings agencies not involved yet.	<table border="1"> <tr><th>Pros</th><th>Cons</th></tr> <tr><td>Additional source of funds which can complement other sources.</td><td>Need to demonstrate additionality.</td></tr> <tr><td>Supporting sustainable development as well as generating funds.</td><td>Early projects had reputational problems due to gaming of system.</td></tr> <tr><td>Credible certification assures buyers of credits that these are legitimate.</td><td>At present there are more sellers than buyers in the market so prices are very low.</td></tr> </table>	Pros	Cons	Additional source of funds which can complement other sources.	Need to demonstrate additionality.	Supporting sustainable development as well as generating funds.	Early projects had reputational problems due to gaming of system.	Credible certification assures buyers of credits that these are legitimate.	At present there are more sellers than buyers in the market so prices are very low.
Pros	Cons																																																													
Well-established model. Particularly appropriate for long-term projects.	Administratively complex and time-consuming to set up.																																																													
ESCO organizes finance and there usually is a simple fixed repayment.	Debt may not be off-balance sheet. Separate contract with finance co.																																																													
ESCO brings skills and guarantees performance of installed technology.	Organization has debt and market (energy price) risks.																																																													
Pros	Cons																																																													
Well-established model. Particularly appropriate for long-term projects.	Administratively complex and time-consuming to set up.																																																													
ESCO gives performance guarantee and finance. Single payment.	Organization has risks associated with movements in energy prices.																																																													
Simpler contractual relationship between the parties.	May be more expensive as ESCO taking on greater risk.																																																													
Pros	Cons																																																													
Collecting payments is simple.	Utilities do not see this as a core business activity and so may resist this facility.																																																													
Does not conflict with mortgage debt, landlord can recover in service charge.	Only really works if final bill is lower than initial bill.																																																													
Householder pays while they own the property. Obligation attaches to the meter.	New owner may not value the benefit in the same way. Could affect property price.																																																													
Pros	Cons																																																													
Well-established model which avoids debt being added to property.	Requires changes to laws in each municipality to allow PACE liens.																																																													
Lien on property so may have low risk and lower cost.	Opposed by mortgage lenders, so town may need to take some credit risk.																																																													
Householder pays for benefit while they own the property.	New owner may not value the benefit in the same way. Could affect property price.																																																													
Pros	Cons																																																													
Simple proposition for recipient of the incentive.	Adds to the energy cost of all customers. "Giving away stuff for free" is harder than it appears.																																																													
Incentives overcome market failings.	Utility is committed to savings and takes on performance risk.																																																													
No debt is usually involved (although some incentives are "soft loans")	Effort may be focused on more expensive but scaleable solutions.																																																													
Pros	Cons																																																													
Standardization lowers costs and "friction" for investors.	Depends on investor education to develop market at sufficient scale.																																																													
Independent M&V and assurance underpins performance expectation.	More expensive than purchase due to overheads as investment.																																																													
Secondary market can develop which would make investments "liquid".	Market is not nearly large enough yet. Ratings agencies not involved yet.																																																													
Pros	Cons																																																													
Additional source of funds which can complement other sources.	Need to demonstrate additionality.																																																													
Supporting sustainable development as well as generating funds.	Early projects had reputational problems due to gaming of system.																																																													
Credible certification assures buyers of credits that these are legitimate.	At present there are more sellers than buyers in the market so prices are very low.																																																													