<u>Stakeholder Comment Matrix – Sep. 10, 2020</u> Request for feedback on proposed AESO Connection Project List & Map



Period of Comment: Sep. 10, 2020 through Oct. 16, 2020

Comments From: Greengate Power Corporation

Date: 2020/10/16

Contact:

Phone:

Email:

The AESO is seeking comments from stakeholders on its proposal for modifications to the AESO Connection Project List, and the addition of a project map.

- 1. Please fill out the section above as indicated.
- 2. Please respond to the questions below and provide your specific comments.
- 3. Email your completed matrix to stakeholder.relations@aeso.ca by Oct. 16, 2020
- 4. Stakeholder comments will be published to aeso.ca, in their original state, with personal or commercially sensitive information redacted, following Oct. 16, 2020. The AESO will not be responding directly to any submissions, but submission feedback will be considered for the final product.

	Questions	Stakeholder Comments
1.	The AESO has proposed an ISD Under Review process to flag projects on the list that are reevaluating their in-service date. Do you have any comments related to this proposal? Are there potential impacts that should be considered? And why?	Greengate supports this reasonable approach, as long as it is assured that the ISD Under Review Process flag is only put on a project according to step 2 of the AESO's proposed ISD Under Review Process and no earlier. That step is: "2. The Project Team would discuss the schedule, and determine if the current ISD was still achievable or needed to be re-evaluated." Project proponents should have the opportunity to discuss the ISD with the Project Team before the AESO changes the public status of the project's ISD. Overall, this is a reasonable and useful addition to the connection list.

	Questions	Stakeholder Comments
2.	The AESO has proposed adding the status categories and inclusion column to provide more information on the progress of projects. Does this provide adequate visibility on project progress? If not, please explain, or provide any other comments you have on these new additions.	This is a reasonable and useful addition to the connection list.
3.	Do the proposed project list changes provide more confidence in the accuracy of in-service dates? If not, please provide your comments.	Yes. The current list provides relatively little in determining projects' certainty of ISDs and this will be useful for market participants.
4.	Projects may have multiple energizations that span significant periods of time. The AESO is proposing to include this information in additional columns. Do you prefer this approach? If not, please explain how you would like projects with multiple energizations to be presented.	Yes, this is a useful tool. It is currently difficult to know the different stages of energization across many projects.
5.	The AESO is proposing to include projects that have energized or cancelled in the previous three months on the list and map. Do you agree with this proposal? If not, please describe any additional options you would recommend.	Yes, this is a useful proposal for the map and list. It should also allow the user to enable/disable viewing of each of the cancelled and energized projects.
6.	The AESO is proposing to provide stakeholders with an interactive map of projects on our website. Do you have any feedback related to the proposed project map?	The current use of colors and circles to represent different map layers should be changed such that multiple layers of information can be seen at once. The current implementation requires users to enable/disable map layers to access fuel type, status, and stage, whereas the AESO should attempt to show this information all at the same time. Greengate's suggested changes would be that:
		 instead of being represented as circles, projects should be shown as shapes, with different shapes according to the fuel type. This will help market participants understand what type of project they are seeing at a glance. The current use of color to distinguish fuel type is less clear. Perhaps the project size could be shown by the size of the shape with higher MW projects having a larger size.
		 alongside the use of shapes, either line/dot patterns or light/dark shades should be used to distinguish the stage a project is at. For instance, each stage could be represented by a pattern inside of the shape (i.e. dots for

	Questions	Stakeholder Comments
		stage 1, solid lines for stage 2, etc.).
		 the map should retain the current implementation of having colors inside the shape as indicators of the status of the project.
		 the map should retain the current option of disabling/enabling layers for status, stage, and fuel type information, alongside the suggestions above.
7.	Please explain in detail any additional features, functionality, or	The map includes some of the information market participants seek during
	information that you would like to see made available on the project map.	development, but Greengate encourages the AESO to consider it as a broader type of tool for those seeking to connect, rather than just a map of the information contained in the connection list. It is of significant value to market participants to see this information visually and geographically. Since the AESO has this information more readily than many market participants, it is best positioned to provide it in a timely manner at least cost.
		To achieve these ends, Greengate has included several suggested elements, features, and changes that would help the map be a more useful tool:
		 The map should include the option of enabling/disabling a layer that shows the transmission system and substations as a base layer of the map. This is useful information for connecting project proponents.
		 An additional layer for ISDs should be added that includes the following options for project ISDs for months in the current year and in each of the next three years:
		o Projects with ISDs this year,
		 Projects with ISDs next year,
		 Projects with ISDs in two years,
		o Projects with ISDs in three years
		When clicking on a project on the map, it should include the following additional information:



	Questions	Stakeholder Comments
		 Whether the project is a T-tap or in/out connect type, Whether the primary connection type is a DG project of transmission connection, The in-service date of the project, and The GUOC rates for that project/relevant region. An additional layer that includes all connected projects that have energized and are not in the connection process. In addition to the shape representing each of these projects, the map should show that project's most recent annual loss factor, written beside the shape an on the map. When clicking
8.	The AESO has provided guides for both the project list and map. Does the content of these guides cover any questions you may have? If not, please describe how they could be improved.	on the project, the popup should also list the loss factor in the pop-up. The guide appears to provide the necessary context and definitions currently.
9.	Currently the AESO provides a collection of historic project lists on the website. Do you find this historic information of value? Would providing only the current month project list be sufficient?	Greengate believes that it is in the interest of all market participants that the AESO provide all historical project lists alongside the updated ones. In addition to providing transparency, it offers tools for market participants that can be effective when cross-referencing historical data for the connection queue context. These could be maintained in an archive section of the connection list page of the AESO website.
10.	Please provide any additional comments or feedback you have related to the AESO's proposed project list and map.	n/a

Thank you for your input. Please email your comments to: stakeholder.relations@aeso.ca.