

## IESO Engagement

---

**From:** Katherine Sparkes  
**Sent:** June 20, 2017 2:10 PM  
**To:** IESO Engagement  
**Subject:** RE: Comments: Topic 4 Report (Governance & Operations)

**From:** Jesse Kulendran  
**Sent:** June 13, 2017 4:42 PM  
**To:** Katherine Sparkes  
**Subject:** Comments: Topic 4 Report (Governance & Operations)

Good afternoon Katherine,

Hope you're having a great week.

The EDA has been meeting regularly with LDCs through our Conservation & Sustainability Council to discuss the progress on the Mid-Term Review. Comments from these discussions have been provided to the Advisory Group through Raegan and Margaret as well as others.

At the last Council meeting, we reviewed in detail the Topic 4 report (Governance and Operations). For your consideration, please find below comments from the EDA and LDCs. Nathalie incorporated some of these points into her comments at the Advisory Group meeting.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Regards,

**Jesse Kulendran**  
**Electricity Distributors Association**  
3700 Steeles Ave W, Suite 1100  
Vaughan, ON L4L 8K8  
| Main: 905 265 5300  
[EDA Website](#)



This e-mail message may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not an intended recipient please notify the sender and destroy this message and any copies. By using e-mail to communicate with the EDA you assume the risk that your privacy may be compromised by a third party.

---

### **COMMENTS ON TOPIC 4 REPORT (GOVERNANCE & OPERATIONS):**

- Navigant should look at conservation is operationalized and delivered by LDCs, not just roles and responsibilities per the ECA or CFIC charter.
- The role of the Ministry of Energy should be captured in the report (e.g. slide on roles and responsibilities for delivery programs).

- Report should also consider the direct/indirect influence of Ministry of Environment and Climate Change.
- The descriptions of CFIC's role appears too narrow and doesn't reflect the latest charter or mandate. CFIC provides recommendations to IESO on issues.
- The description of roles and responsibilities doesn't highlight an LDCs role in program design, delivery, marketing, and capacity building – LDC role should be better defined.
- Slide 10 depicts as information flowing up to the IESO but doesn't depict how information disseminates back down to CFIC, Working Groups or LDCs.
- Key performance indicators for each governance layer would help focus priorities.
- Navigant should also look at the metrics for program and pilot approvals from beginning to end, not just for each stage of the review.
- Scorecard should be revised to show results from previous process vs current process
- Metrics should be clarified (days vs. business days)
- Break out these numbers by sector, pilot vs local, vs existing vs new
- LDCs support re-doing the survey on the impression of IESO's conservation division.
  - The new survey should include ALL LDCs and should consider processes and operations (e.g. slide 122 questions).
  - The current survey uses a very small sample size (one LDC is 3%) and the scale distorts the results (e.g. 5/10 = good)
- Slide 33: The description of iCon should clarify which programs it supports.
- Slide 37: Ranked Processes:
  - Sales channel management is critical - LC4 should move to "high" severity of impact
  - Marketing/sales should add channel relationships
  - LC6 is infrequent, should move to "low frequency"
  - IC2 should be EM&V, not M&V; this is also a significant impact, should move to "high"
  - Add IL8 – Audit and Compliance → bottom right, frequency is low, and severity is high
  - Add iLC1 – Application Process (e.g. iCon) → high impact and high frequency (highest point in the top right corner)
- Slide 61: Benchmarking of Incentive and Non-Incentive Costs
  - Perhaps this chart would be more useful if Navigant measured administration costs per kWh of delivery? For central services vs what IESO is delivering