

Feedback Form

2024 Grid Innovation Fund – April 23, 2024

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Robert Sinclair

Title: President

Organization: EnerStrat Canada

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: May 7, 2024

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the [2024 Grid Innovation Fund Engagement](#) web page unless otherwise requested by the sender. If you wish to provide confidential feedback, please mark as "confidential".

Following the April 23, 2024, engagement webinar, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback on items discussed. The webinar presentation and recording can be accessed from the [engagement webpage](#).

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by May 7, 2024.

Specific Comments/Feedback

Topic	Response
<p>Do you have any comments or feedback on Stream 1 objectives including the minimum project size targets for sub-streams 1A and 1B?</p>	<p>Objectives related to both the design of a program and the demonstration of an innovative technology seem appropriate. Flexibility services appear to include capacity, reserve and energy services.</p> <p>1 B – the 100-kW minimum threshold is reasonable for a demonstration; however, the vehicle count should be scaled by size class of vehicle. For example, if we are using MD/HD vehicles 100 kW would be provided by 2 vehicles and if we are aggregating across sites that would be a min of 1 MD/HD EV and charge port per site across 2 sites. We suggest the follow vehicle count thresholds.</p> <p>Min EV/charge port thresholds for EV size classes</p> <p>LD – 30 for V1G and 20 for V2H/B (assume L2 - 32 amp as an average charge port capacity)</p> <p>MD – 5 for V1G and 2 for V2H/B (assume min 40 kW/charge port, but average of 50 kW)</p> <p>HD – 1 per site and 2 total for V1G or V2H/B (assume min 100 kW/charge port and 150 kW average)</p>
<p>Do you have any comments or feedback on Stream 2 objectives including the minimum project size targets for sub-streams 2 and 2B?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are the Key Performance Indicators clear?</p>	<p>KPIs are generally clear. There should be some flexibility in meeting individual aspects of the KPIs. Agreement between proponent and IESO on which KPI aspects should be applied can be agreed during due diligence and formalized in the funding agreement.</p>

Topic	Response
Are the Evaluation Criteria clear?	<p>One category of evaluation criteria is Demand-Side Program Design and Innovation. However, under project types, programs are only 1 of the 3 project types. If a proponent is seeking to demonstrate a new technology, must it also demonstrate a new program to earn points from this category? There don't appear to be points related specifically to technical innovation even though there is a section dedicated to it. Is this section optional if it is not scored? Will brevity in 1.8.1 affect other scored sections?</p>
Do you have any comments or feedback on the Proposal Template Part A or Part B?	<p>1.6.2 – Details on program cost. Is this intended to be the cost of the program in demonstration or if/when adopted and scaled?</p> <p>The level of detail required in the various templates is extensive and will be very challenging for proponents to develop within the timelines available, given that most will not have previously developed programs or technical innovations.</p> <p>1.7 – There is little discussion regarding the technical innovation's design or capabilities. The evaluation criteria are primarily focused on program design and the description of the program aspects captured in KPI and service descriptions. It appears that technical innovations are not very important in this call and any proponents bringing a technical innovation must also bring a new program design as well. Is this the intention?</p> <p>1.8 Why are no points provided for technical assessment?</p> <p>Part 3 References – The requirement to provide references that are not 3rd party participants would limit the available references to members of the organizations that are applying. It is likely due to competitive interests that people outside of the participating organizations would have little or no knowledge of the project. For example, an</p>

Topic	Response
	<p>EV charging company might provide a site host organization as a reference regarding its general ability to provide charging services or a trucking company providing transportation services gives a customer who could speak to service quality, but they would have no understanding of the proponent's ability to provide grid flexibility services. Therefore, it is unclear who should be provided as references.</p>

General Comments/Feedback

Existing IESO funded program designs should be permitted as a basis for a program in this call, as long as the existing program does not permit EVs, V2G, direct energy injection or the use cases that we are interested in exploring for this demonstration, i.e. as long as new capabilities are being explored in the existing program design it should be permitted.

If no Indigenous participation is planned, due to there being no direct involvement/impact based on sites or activities with indigenous communities (project will be on commercial sites within urban commercial/industrial areas) and there is no duty to consult. Will this result in a lower evaluation score or restriction from participation? There don't appear to be points related to indigenous Participation.