|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Period of Comment:** | Apr. 23, 2020 | through | May 14, 2020 |
| **Comments From:** | Company Name |
| **Date:** | [yyyy/mm/dd] |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contact:** | Company Representative  |
| **Phone:** | Contact Phone Number |
| **Email**: |  |

 |

***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**  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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. * 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?
 |  |
|  | 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.* 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?
 |  |
|  | 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. * 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?
 |  |
|  | 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? |  |
|  | 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? |  |
|  | 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.LSAs and MDMs please do not answer; the AESO will be contacting you for participation in an additional session.  |  |
|  | At the session, the AESO explored potential impacts to other areas. Are there other potential impacts that should be considered and why? |  |
|  | Please provide any other comments you have related to the sub-hourly settlement engagement. |  |

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