

IESO Engagement

From: Andy Armitage
Sent: March 28, 2018 3:03 PM
To: IESO Engagement
Subject: Feedback Scope of Work Ap Study

Good Afternoon,

I have provided feedback during the meeting but I would also like to provide some written comment around the scope of work:

Task 1 Project Plan:

-the required data inputs should be vetted against the current catalogue of data available. Utilities should be informed what data would help the study moving forward so future studies will be better informed.

-asking here for a methodology, yet implying later on in the scope of work (ordered list of measures by PAC or TRC) how the study is to be done.

Task 2 Base Case Calibration:

-Restricting the inputs and outputs to IESO zones limits the study's use. As an example, the CFF targets were developed using previous studies which had outputs by utility distribution territory. Further to that, the Northwest Zone is roughly the size of France with a very large variability of customers types, weather and access to measures/programs/gas (rural, etc.) and infrastructure. Also I believe this would limit the usefulness of the end product to Utilities to guide in program development. This seems like a step backward as the last study gave utility level results.

-Is the disaggregation by Zone, sector and sub sector mutually exclusive? A small commercial business in Sudbury has different constraints/pressures/needs than a small commercial business in Toronto. In the same vein, a residential customer in Toronto is Different than a residential customer in Thunder Bay. There are differences between the two beyond the weather.

Task 3 Reference Forecast:

-Assumptions made in this section would greatly impact the outcome. For example, would it not be a better approach to just remove a certain percentage of the technical potential historically related to codes and standards? It seems that the outcome of this task vastly depends on the input of ALL conservation efforts. I'm unsure whether this is a realistic task.

-Be sure to include any local programs in the calculation.

Task 4 Energy Efficiency and Conservation Measures

-Measures should be mapped to current in market programs as well to give an idea of what the current programs are achieving vs. what is remaining to be achieved. This includes programs which are outside of CFF (GreenOn, AFT, etc).

-The local utility results should be consulted where available to inform the proponent what the actual participation rates are for each measure. (ie. viability of air source heat pump and air conditioner programs in Northwest Zone).

-Please ensure the measures list matches the program design currently in market. (last AP study had savings from LED lights which become the base case for IESO CFF programs). This is more of a concern in the short term 3-5 years.

Task 5: Technical Potential

-should the measures be separated by fuel source? I understand this is an integrated study with gas and electric, but the end result should help give each of the parties a clear delineation of what conservation measure applies to which fuel source.

Task 7: Achievable Potential

-Market penetration should be based on past results of similar programs. This is where a big difference exists between these AP studies and the conservation programs in Ontario. The customer is not implementing the measure, they are participating in a program, the program participation rates vary greatly based on implementation strategies used at the local level.

-Cost Curves should take into account geographical areas, specifically the concentration of customers. Availability of measures could be included here, as an example, some smaller centres may have only one store (potentially none) which to participate in a residential coupon program.

Task 8: MACC

-The MACC would hopefully take into account the current economic position different industries, this would greatly affect the ability to participate in programs.

Task 9: Sensitivity Analysis

-I thought this was supposed to be a result of the last study as well, I don't recall seeing it. A preliminary 'rough' idea of what inputs are more sensitive to the process should be provided to utilities (ASAP) in order to help guide focus toward useful data.

Task 10: Final Report

-Please ensure that the final report translates well to the intended audiences. It may be helpful to define who the intended audience is for the final report.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Some of this may have been repeat feedback from the meeting.

Thanks,
andy

Andy Armitage
Manager, Customer Service and Billing
Thunder Bay Hydro Electricity Distribution Inc.
34 Cumberland St. N
P7A 4L4