

IESO Engagement

From: SBlackwell
Sent: September 20, 2017 4:15 PM IESO
To: Engagement
Subject: Mid-Term Review Part 3 - Feedback

Please see below for input on the September 7th Mid-Term Review Public Webinar: Thank you, Sally

1. As mentioned on Slide 17 of the Sep 17 Mid-term Revenue Public Webinar, the length of time from submitting post project completion documentation for the Retrofit program to receiving the incentive can be lengthy. This also impacts the LDC-IESO stakeholder group which is not listed. Since program results are not recognized by the IESO until settlement occurs which is contingent upon the incentive being paid out, there can be a long delay between completion of a project and recognition of savings in IESO results. The time between completion of a project and submission of an invoice by a customer can be long and require extensive follow-up. This has the potential of negatively impacting achievement of mid-term targets. Will the IESO consider a different milestone than incentive payment to recognize savings such as approval of project/submission of post project documentation? This methodology would be similar to revenue recognition under CGAAP/IFRS - the savings have been "earned" even though the incentive has not yet been paid out.
2. Page 16-18 refer to assessment of tools/processes; identifying opportunities for improvement. LDCs/customers are heavily reliant on ICON for reporting/managing applications. Access to ICON and documentation management for the LDC's within ICON has been unstable/intermittent which poses a risk to reporting/achievement of targets, among others. How is this being addressed in the short-term? Further, is the IESO considering how LDCs currently use ICON/integrate with Temagami in their development of a replacement system?
3. Page 18 - Communication of EM&V - communication of changes requires advance notice and detailed explanation in order to determine impacts to savings vs. target on a timely basis; for example changes to NTG ratios were not communicated in advance and no explanation was given as to why NTG ratios differ in the same local region (e.g. Burlington vs. Halton vs. Milton). Similarly, realization rates are inconsistent and receipt after the fact makes performance tracking difficult. Utilities are looking for transparency and clear guidelines/rationale for the calculations.
4. Planning Integration - expand CDM to allow behind the meter renewable generation (solar specifically). CHP is made less attractive due to the province's carbon strategy and this would offer a good alternative.



Burlingtonhydro
energizing *our* community™

Sally Blackwell
Director, Regulatory Affairs



partner since **2009**

1340 Brant Street, Burlington, ON · L7R 3Z7 · (905) 336-4373
burlingtonhydro.com sblackwell@burlingtonhydro.com