

Stakeholder Comment Matrix – May 14, 2020

Request for feedback on sub-hourly settlement, session 1 material



Period of Comment: Apr. 23, 2020 through May 14, 2020	Contact: [REDACTED]
Comments From: Campus Energy	Phone: [REDACTED]
Date: 2020/05/14	Email: [REDACTED]

The AESO is seeking comments from stakeholders on its approach to reviewing sub-hourly settlement, and content from session 1.

- 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 May 14, 2020*
- 4. Stakeholder comments will be published to aeso.ca, in their original state, with personal or commercially sensitive information redacted, following May 14, 2020.*

	Questions	Stakeholder Comments
1.	<p>In an effort to narrow the scenarios for implementation cost estimates, the AESO provided analysis that indicated, based on past observations, that a 15 minute interval would be the easiest to implement and that there were limited economic gains to be made from reducing the settlement interval to 5 minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you have comments related to the analysis presented? - Would you suggest additional analysis be completed to better understand the benefits of a shorter settlement interval? 	<p>Campus Energy’s assessment of the analysis thus far is that the benefits of sub hour settlement, at a 15 or 5 minute interval, is negligible.</p>
2.	<p>In an effort to narrow the scenarios for implementation cost estimates, the AESO provided assessments that sub-hourly settlement for all generation and load sites with interval meters could be mandatory and cumulative meter sites could be billed using: a) new shaping to account for 15 minute settlement or b) remain on an hourly billing approach with a true up payment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you have comments related to the participation approach suggestion made by the AESO? - Do you have comments related to the true-up analysis presented by the AESO? - Would you suggest additional analysis be completed to better understand participation options? 	<p>The associated costs have not been fully scoped, but even if the benefits suggest that they outweigh the costs by a small amount, Campus Energy would recommend delaying the adoption of sub hour settlement until the benefits are clear and meaningful.</p> <p>Increased costs associated with more detailed settlement could be passed on to consumers in the form of higher fees and this may erase any assumed savings to load.</p>

	Questions	Stakeholder Comments
3.	<p>At the session the AESO presented information, based on historical observations that suggested a move to sub-hourly settlement would provide limited economic benefits to load and generation in Alberta.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you have comments related to the analysis? - Do you have comments related to the qualitative benefits that would be provided to the market from a move to sub-hourly settlement? - Do you have suggestions on how the AESO could estimate the future benefits of sub-hourly settlement that could be included in the economic evaluation? For example, approaches to estimate load / generation operation changes? - Do you believe the sub-hourly settlement initiative should continue to be pursued by the AESO and industry? 	<p>The analysis and presentation of the analysis was well done and thorough. Incorporating and attempting to predict sub-hour behaviors could introduce error.</p>
4.	<p>At the session the AESO presented information that suggested energy market bids / offers could continue to be made on an hourly basis. Do you have comments related to this element of the analysis?</p>	
5.	<p>At the session the AESO presented information that suggested energy dispatch could continue to be made on an as-needed basis regardless of the settlement interval. Do you have comments related to this element of the analysis?</p>	
6.	<p>Cost question – given the narrowing of implementation options noted in questions 1 and 2, if your cost estimates will have changed from what you provided subsequent to session one, would you please provide an update here.</p> <p>LSAs and MDMs please do not answer; the AESO will be contacting you for participation in an additional session.</p>	
7.	<p>At the session, the AESO explored potential impacts to other areas. Are there other potential impacts that should be considered and why?</p>	

	Questions	Stakeholder Comments
8.	Please provide any other comments you have related to the sub-hourly settlement engagement.	Campus Energy recommends that further process on this effort be delayed until the initial analysis provides a compelling case for change.

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