

19 Responses	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I was informed in advance of this session in order to properly prepare for the meeting and to arrange travel plans.		6	8	4
2. Timely, accessible and accurate materials were available to me well enough in advance.		8	8	2
3. I felt that I was an equal team member and that no one person, company or association had undue influence on the outcome of the session.			13	6
4. The Chair did a good job in keeping us on time and focused and made sure everyone's comments were recognized and captured.			10	9
5. Others came equally prepared in order to communicate their views fully and openly in the meeting.	2	2	12	1
6. The meeting format worked well in generating discussion around the issues.		3	12	2
7. The presenters at today's session were professional and expert in fulfilling their role.			16	3

Suggestions / Comments

- Tight timelines between posting and event. "Who pays" is question with lots of implications to OEB processes. So need more info on integration with those.
- Strongly recommend outreach beyond EDA – try Coalition of Large Distributors (including Toronto Hydro & Enersource Mississauga).
- I am looking for the appropriate mechanism to include demand-side solutions as an option to address the SBG issue, over and above what is already being done with HOEP and DR.
- I am new to these discussions and I found it a bit hard to follow. These discussions are very interesting and I'm looking forward to contributing in the future.
- More time to review the material would be appreciated, > 1 week.
- General problematic with this type of session is that a good portion of participants, although they have been forwarded all the documentation and papers prior to the meeting, have difficulty or seem hesitant to unveil their concerns, comments, etc. However, I believe that many more comments should come through in writing, which should prove satisfactory.
- Some of the presentations were unavailable prior to the meeting. This should not occur except in exceptional circumstances.
- The scope of the committee was not clearly set out as including loads and so it is not surprising that loads did not attend.
- Key interests missing from the table.
- A lot of specific questions were presented asking the group to discuss. A better approach might have been to engage discussions on general issues instead of specific questions.
- Notice of meeting seems to have been short or poorly communicated. I and a few others found out about it yesterday.
- Few actual generator stakeholders in attendance.

- I did not receive notice of this event, even though I provided comment on the original SE-57 document. Please add me to the distribution list for future communications.
- Need more, and more focused, sessions, very soon in order to accommodate increasing expectations for more DG.
- Please make available all material which is presented in hard copy format for the participants.

Question #1 was undecided between agree/disagree by 1 participant.

Question #2 was undecided between agree/disagree by 1 participant.

Question #5 was not answered by 2 participants.

Question #6 was undecided between agree/disagree by 2 participants.