

January 11 EDA Conservation Council Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Nik Schruder (IESO)
Rouselle Gratela (IESO)
Sue Forcier, Niagara Peninsula Energy Inc.
Tim Wilson, Thunder Bay Hydro
Bruce Bibby, Hydro Ottawa
Katie Potts, Niagara Peninsula Energy Inc.
Matt Weninger, Guelph Hydro
Gary Rains, London Hydro
Jordan Sinclair, Entegrus Powerlines
Margaret Rodd, Entegrus Powerlines
Erin Connelly, Greater Sudbury Hydro
Joanne Van Panhuis, Brantford Power
Glen Farrow, Bluewater Power
Tim Collins, Erie Thames Power
Mike Marchant, Toronto Hydro
Gia DeJuilo, Alectra Utilities
Mary Steele, Festival Hydro (via teleconference)
George Katsuras, Hydro One (via teleconference)
Jesse Kulendran, EDA
Andrew Pride (consultant)

General:

- LDCs have requested to receive a revised IESO organizational structure when available.
- Feedback received that the Marketing Asset Portal is difficult to navigate.

LDC Collaboration Fund:

- Request for a more streamlined application for Working Group funding requests (i.e. memo funding request for CFIC-approved Work Plan).
- Suggestion to compel gas companies to match the level of funding from the Collaboration Fund to encourage greater electricity/gas collaboration.

Target Exchange:

- Feedback received that the IESO should be looking at dealing with LDCs that are pursuing a target exchange to “right -size” their target and budget differently
 - There is concern that the second key principle around protecting rate payer value penalizes LDCs that are making their best efforts to reach their target but are still unable to due to a lack of local achievable potential or other extenuating factors.
 - Potential for unintended consequences
- Feedback received that target exchange key principles may result in smaller LDCs spending more money to reach their target, which would also result in less cost effective savings and negative impact on the ratepayer.
- Feedback received that LDCs should not be prevented from receiving ATI and ETI performance incentives in cases where they are making their best efforts to meet their targets, but lack the local achievable potential in their service territory.

Whole Home

- Question received on whether LDCs will receive participant information so they are aware of which customers have already been reached.

Discussion Items

1. How can we ensure perspectives from customers, LDCs, and channel partners are regularly and effectively integrated into the framework?
 - Regular local outreach by LDCs.
 - IESO to leverage LDCs to assemble a group of customers, channel partners, associations, etc. to reach out to in order to ensure a representative group of stakeholders in engaged
 - Several LDCs are consistently engaging customers through dedicated sales staff. E.g. Alectra has 19 sales support staff who regularly get feedback from customers
 - There should be a balance between the scope of the feedback received from stakeholders, and the degree to which they are incorporated.
 - There is a lack of clarity in the IESO engagement process how and when feedback is incorporated
 - At what point do we take action on feedback received?
 - There is a lack of follow up: the IESO should close the loop with stakeholders that have provided feedback.
 - There should be greater clarity around the materiality for stakeholder engagement: at what point is a formal stakeholder engagement necessary? At what scale do we engage?
 - The IESO should leverage existing activities outside of a formal stakeholder engagement such as ongoing market research, program evaluations, customer outreach, events, training, etc.
 - Stakeholder fatigue is a key concern
 - Smaller customers or groups may be discouraged from participating when the stakeholder engagement process is too formal or large.
 - The IESO should consider putting together a panel of customers/associations that can be readily accessed for targeted engagement activities as necessary.
 - One approach to get greater feedback from smaller to mid-size LDCs is to focus and simplify the request into “bite size” and manageable requests – rather than large open end engagements
 - Opportunity to piggy back existing engagements – annual CEO meetings; weekly e-blast from EDA, etc.
 - Suggestion to leverage upcoming EDA AGM in late March to convene a discussion around conservation.
2. How can we ensure that CFF remains a cost efficient and cost competitive resource?
 - LDC joint program delivery/procurement.
 - Leverage peer networks for knowledge sharing instead of hiring dedicated resources for subject matter expertise (i.e. SWOG).

- Encourage LDCs to include “piggy back” clauses in their procurement documents that would allow other LDCs to leverage proposed pricing and bids
 - It was also suggested for the IESO to consider this for LDCs to leverage.
 - Ensure quality of service and customer coverage is not sacrificed for greater cost efficiency.
 - Encourage pay-for-performance pricing models in vendor procurements.
 - Shared resource libraries for RFPs, purchase orders, Statements of Work, etc.
 - Need to be mindful of “too efficient” which may disrupt the quality and/or coverage of Conservation
3. How can we improve the current governance structure and/or approval processes to facilitate more timely improvements of province-wide programs?
- Streamline business case submission requirements based on the scope and level of the program changes (i.e. minor vs. major).
 - There is an issue with the process following business case submission:
 - Decision-making is unclear
 - Current status of the review in the process is unclear
 - Lack of communication
 - Timeline is unclear.
 - Consider an escalation model similar to what was employed by the previous Information Systems Sub-Group of the Data and Reporting Working Group wherein there is a command structure for decision making in cases where there is a lack of consensus within the group
 - “Decision by committee” is not effective.
 - It was expressed that it is CFIC’s mandate to act as a governing body to make decisions
 - The LDC community trusts CFIC, and sees it as an important body to represent the broader interests of LDCs.
 - A clear and articulate scope for program changes is required
 - A consistent checklist of question and criteria should be developed and applied to scope out changes.