

Wind Power Standing Committee

Stakeholder Feedback (13 Responses)



1. In general, what is your preferred method for meetings?

Face to Face = 12

Webcast/Conference Call = 1

2. Would you like the meeting to be

Pre-arranged dates set at the beginning of the year (as currently is done) = 12

Ad-hock meetings only when needed for stakeholder input on items = 1

3. Do you find that the meeting materials sent in advance give you all the information you need, therefore attending the meeting is not necessary?

Yes = 3

No = 10

4. Do you find the wind topics being discussed at the meetings are of value to you?

If no, provide comments.

- Definitely.
- Apart from the technical content, the opportunity to informally exchange views with other participants is valuable. I found that the current set-up doesn't always allow this. It is primarily driven by the agenda, and the interaction could be improved by a few structured breaks within the day, of say 20-30 minutes, to get a change to stretch ones legs and talk.
- Yes - and one can never expect to be interested by every agenda item.
- Committee members should be polled as to their interests. Their agenda items should be added to IESO items to create a draft agenda. Each item should be marked as either coming from committee member or IESO and distributed to members for one final send out via email with a 7 - 14 day response time. If there are no responses within that time then the draft agenda should be set as final for the next meeting.
- I haven't been able to attend yet. Once we hire an Ontario policy manager, I expect that that person will attend on a regular basis.
- So far, I enjoy the topics that were discussed in the meetings.
- If there is relevant material to discuss.
- I have been opportuned to attend any of the meetings yet.
- Yes, they are of value to me. However I'm concerned that due to poor attendance at the meetings the information is not reaching all the stakeholders who should become aware of these issues.

5. Do you want that we continue with inviting one external presenter/ organization in each meeting to present on wind matters?

Yes = 13

6. What are the top three topics/areas or issues you would like to see addressed at the meetings?

- (1) practises of other jurisdictions,
(2) identification of barriers to wind connection,
(3) steps to remove these barriers.
- (1) Wind Forecasting,
(2) Experiences in other jurisdictions,
(3) Impact of wind on ancillary services.
- (1) IESO's and committee member thoughts on a feed-in-tariff model that would work in Ontario;
(2) how to structure a feed-in-tariff to address all forms of renewable power in Ontario; and,
(3) how to value clean 'attributes' such as black start and who should own emission credits.
- (1) Wind Connection Process Updates,
(2) Integration of Wind, including forecasting requirements,
(3) Simple round table of participants'' questions/issues.
- (1) Regulatory streamlining,
(2) Wind integration,
(3) Transmission constraints.
- (1) Wind forecast,
(2) System reliability and wind,
(3) European wind experience, (community power, feed-in tariff, offshore wind, etc.).
- (1) Scheduling,
(2) Scheduling,
(3) Scheduling.
- Don't have any, see question #9.
- (1) Impacts of market changes (Day-Ahead Process Changes) to wind operators,
(2) Value of wind given changing generating portfolio,
- (1) awareness of initiatives or policies being implemented in other jurisdictions or organizations, such as NERC IVGTF, UWIG or CWIWG,
(2) potential for wind/hydro integration given Ontario's significant hydro resources,
(3) how smart grid initiatives may be related to wind integration.
- (2) Barriers to overcome community opposition.

7. If you are a regular attendee of the Wind Power Standing Committee, what is it you find most valuable in attending? What would you most like to see improved?
- Gaining insight into how the IESO deals with wind power internally advances our understanding as to how intermittent sources are dealt with. It is also a learning experience as to other jurisdictions' practises, however, due to various reasons, this point has been discussed but not fully elaborated.
 - The informal interaction with other participants.
 - Keeps me up to date with the issues.
 - Meeting face to face can allow greater interaction between committee members on side-bar discussions. Structure of meetings topics is sometimes too slow. A half day (0800hrs to 1200hrs) meeting time would allow committee members to attend and still affect their other daily activities. At present, meetings are a bit slow and by the time they end it does not let many participants much time for their other activities.
 - Understand how IESO handle wind power in terms of capacity credit and system reliability.
 - Opportunity to interface with other wind operators/IESO to learn of common issues.
 - Presentations are often the most valuable.
 - I think the IESO staff are presenting good information at the meetings. Unfortunately, as I mentioned above, I'm not sure it is being noticed by enough of the right people. Unfortunately I find that the meetings consist mostly of the IESO disseminating information out to the audience. Often the room setup does not seem conducive to group discussion. Sometimes one or two people seem to dominate the 'discussion'. At times some attendees express their particular stakeholder interest very strongly, but their interest may not be consistent with that of the majority of other stakeholders, however it seems somewhat awkward for other attendees to disagree. I think related discussions with particularly important stakeholders (eg. OPG) should be taking place away from the committee meeting.
8. If you are no longer attending the Wind Power Standing Committee meetings, how can we improve these to make you attend?
- As mentioned above, once we have a new Ontario policy manager, they will attend.
9. Do you have any additional comments as to whether the Wind Power Standing Committee should continue or not?
- I believe that it should continue as the goal is to remove current barriers to wind connection.
 - Continue.
 - Your question #2 is not fully correct. Dates are not set at the beginning of the year and adhered to. If they are set they should stay that way. I have not been able to attend 2 meetings over the past year because the dates were changed (even though I had blocked off the time) and I could not change my timetable. In other cases I had to attend meetings out of the country and my schedule changed. If the dates are locked at the beginning of the year everyone can plan their long-term itineraries.

- Not at this time - but we do appreciate IESO facilitating these meetings!
- Invite representatives from other system operators and understand how other jurisdictions deal with wind generation.
- Your control staff and our account contact Rick Romeo can manage most of our concerns as they arise and to our satisfaction. What is my main concern as site manager is the scheduling. In particular the need to do the short term scheduling in the field. I feel strongly that this role should be performed at the IESO by someone that can manage the whole province.
- It may have "run its course" as there does not seem to be many issues or topics to be discussed.
- As time has passed it seems that the IESO staff have somewhat settled on what the critical or more complex issues in need of particular study and discussion are. Because of this, I have found the more recent meetings to be more focused and more valuable. I was not able to attend the last meeting (May 2008) but I found that the previous meeting (Feb 2008) was the most useful of the ones that I have attended (I believe I have attended the majority of the meetings). I did review the material from the May meeting on the website and I think that it was also very significant. I'm sorry to have missed that discussion in person. Given that wind integration is an issue which many grid operators around North America are addressing simultaneously, Ontario does not need to work on this independently. I have looked at the content from the NERC Integration of Variable Generation TF and I understand that Dr. Kahn is representing the IESO at this group. This seems to me to be the most impactful organization to be discussing wind integration at this time. I think it would be useful for the Ontario committee to be updated about this NERC activity, or any other North American initiatives (such as any carried out by the IEEE or UWIG) and how their results may be relevant to the Ontario situation. Because these groups draw members and attention from the widest number of constituents, they will provide the best available guidance to the IESO. The IESO's reference to these activities could save significant duplication of efforts, leading to effective solutions with the most efficient use of IESO resources. As far as Ontario specific issues, I think it would be interesting for the IESO to investigate what potential there is (if any) for wind/hydro integration. This is a topic that occasionally comes up amongst members of the public, wind industry proponents and in the media. Many people see Ontario's significant large hydro resources as an obvious opportunity to integrate large amounts of wind power into our grid. The IESO needs to be aware of these popular discussions and develop a plan to explore this potential. I believe wind integration is an important and complex topic that needs to be addressed. However the current committee structure and composition may not be the most appropriate means. It seems to me the main objective being served by the meetings is to disseminate topical information to wind energy project operators, proponents and other market participants (generators and customers). As I said above, the recent meetings have been doing this well, but due to limited attendance this information is not reaching many stakeholders. Therefore, the current schedule of quarterly meetings may not be the best use of IESO resources. Perhaps one annual meeting or technical session which could be widely publicised among stakeholder groups would attract a larger audience and would efficiently transfer more information to more stakeholders. Alternatively, if the IESO wishes for more focused commitment and balanced participation by key stakeholders they could establish a panel of invited stakeholder representatives (somewhat like the recently established Smart Grid Forum) who could provide appropriate input.