|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Period of Comment:** | May 4, 2020 | through | May 20, 2020 | | **Comments From:** | Company Name | | | | **Date:** | [yyyy/mm/dd] | | | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Contact:** | Company Representative | | **Phone:** | Contact Phone Number | | **Email**: |  | |

## Document purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide a structured and consistent guide to workshop participants to evaluate each of the proposals.

## Instructions

1. Please fill out the section above as indicated.
2. Please complete an evaluation on each of the proposals using the tables below (Tables 2-7). Please provide your reason(s) as to why you think the proposal does/does not meet each of the evaluation criteria.
3. Once you have completed an evaluation on each of the proposals, please choose your preferred proposal with an explanation as to why in Table 1: Overall evaluation.
4. **Please submit one completed evaluation per organization.**
5. Email your completed evaluation to [tariffdesign@aeso.ca](mailto:tariffdesign@aeso.ca) by **May 20, 2020**.

## Table 1: Overall evaluation

| **Questions** | **Stakeholder Evaluation** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Which proposal did you prefer? Please explain why. |  |
| 1. What are the challenges or unresolved questions with your preferred proposal? |  |
| 1. What aspects from the other proposals would you like to see applied to your preferred proposal? |  |
| 1. Additional comments |  |

## Table 2: Evaluation of Proposal: Canadian Solar Solutions Inc.

| **Questions** | **Stakeholder Evaluation** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Please rate your support of this proposal on a 1-10 basis, with 10 being completely supportive and 1 being not at all supportive. Please provide your rationale. |  |
| 1. Is the proposal an unbiased solution and evenly weighted in its analysis? |  |
| 1. Is the proposal feasible? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are best served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are least served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Do the objectives/principles outlined in the proposal seem fair and reasonable? |  |
| 1. Does the proposal align with the consolidated principles (see Appendix A) presented in Technical Session 1 as well as the additional principle of “Ease of understanding and implementation (simplicity)”? This additional principle was added based on stakeholder feedback.   If not, are you supportive of the principles that are used in the development of the proposal? |  |
| 1. What are the unresolved questions or challenges you would want to see answered in this proposal? |  |
| 1. Additional comments |  |

## Table 3: Evaluation of Proposal: DCG Consortium

| **Questions** | **Stakeholder Evaluation** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Please rate your support of this proposal on a 1-10 basis, with 10 being completely supportive and 1 being not at all supportive. Please provide your rationale. |  |
| 1. Is the proposal an unbiased solution and evenly weighted in its analysis? |  |
| 1. Is the proposal feasible? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are best served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are least served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Do the objectives/principles outlined in the proposal seem fair and reasonable? |  |
| 1. Does the proposal align with the consolidated principles (see Appendix A) presented in Technical Session 1 as well as the additional principle of “Ease of understanding and implementation (simplicity)”? This additional principle was added based on stakeholder feedback.   If not, are you supportive of the principles that are used in the development of the proposal? |  |
| 1. What are the unresolved questions or challenges you would want to see answered in this proposal? |  |
| 1. Additional comments |  |

## Table 4: Evaluation of Proposal: FortisAlberta Inc.

| **Questions** | **Stakeholder Evaluation** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Please rate your support of this proposal on a 1-10 basis, with 10 being completely supportive and 1 being not at all supportive. Please provide your rationale. |  |
| 1. Is the proposal an unbiased solution and evenly weighted in its analysis? |  |
| 1. Is the proposal feasible? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are best served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are least served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Do the objectives/principles outlined in the proposal seem fair and reasonable? |  |
| 1. Does the proposal align with the consolidated principles (see Appendix A) presented in Technical Session 1 as well as the additional principle of “Ease of understanding and implementation (simplicity)”? This additional principle was added based on stakeholder feedback.   If not, are you supportive of the principles that are used in the development of the proposal? |  |
| 1. What are the unresolved questions or challenges you would want to see answered in this proposal? |  |
| 1. Additional comments |  |

## Table 5: Evaluation of Proposal: Lionstooth Energy

| **Questions** | **Stakeholder Evaluation** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Please rate your support of this proposal on a 1-10 basis, with 10 being completely supportive and 1 being not at all supportive. Please provide your rationale. |  |
| 1. Is the proposal an unbiased solution and evenly weighted in its analysis? |  |
| 1. Is the proposal feasible? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are best served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are least served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Do the objectives/principles outlined in the proposal seem fair and reasonable? |  |
| 1. Does the proposal align with the consolidated principles (see Appendix A) presented in Technical Session 1 as well as the additional principle of “Ease of understanding and implementation (simplicity)”? This additional principle was added based on stakeholder feedback.   If not, are you supportive of the principles that are used in the development of the proposal? |  |
| 1. What are the unresolved questions or challenges you would want to see answered in this proposal? |  |
| 1. Additional comments |  |

## Table 6: Evaluation of Proposal: Solarkrafte

| **Questions** | **Stakeholder Evaluation** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Please rate your support of this proposal on a 1-10 basis, with 10 being completely supportive and 1 being not at all supportive. Please provide your rationale. |  |
| 1. Is the proposal an unbiased solution and evenly weighted in its analysis? |  |
| 1. Is the proposal feasible? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are best served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are least served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Do the objectives/principles outlined in the proposal seem fair and reasonable? |  |
| 1. Does the proposal align with the consolidated principles (see Appendix A) presented in Technical Session 1 as well as the additional principle of “Ease of understanding and implementation (simplicity)”? This additional principle was added based on stakeholder feedback.   If not, are you supportive of the principles that are used in the development of the proposal? |  |
| 1. What are the unresolved questions or challenges you would want to see answered in this proposal? |  |
| 1. Additional comments |  |

## Table 7: Evaluation of Proposal: URICA

| **Questions** | **Stakeholder Evaluation** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Please rate your support of this proposal on a 1-10 basis, with 10 being completely supportive and 1 being not at all supportive. Please provide your rationale. |  |
| 1. Is the proposal an unbiased solution and evenly weighted in its analysis? |  |
| 1. Is the proposal feasible? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are best served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Which stakeholders are least served by this proposal? Why? |  |
| 1. Do the objectives/principles outlined in the proposal seem fair and reasonable? |  |
| 1. Does the proposal align with the consolidated principles (see Appendix A) presented in Technical Session 1 as well as the additional principle of “Ease of understanding and implementation (simplicity)”? This additional principle was added based on stakeholder feedback.   If not, are you supportive of the principles that are used in the development of the proposal? |  |
| 1. What are the unresolved questions or challenges you would want to see answered in this proposal? |  |
| 1. Additional comments |  |

## Appendix A

| **Principle** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| **Overarching** | Tariff design and implementation facilities a fair, efficient and openly competitive market (FEOC)   * Fosters competition and encourages new market entry * Efficiency * Avoidance of undue discrimination * Fairness |
| **Principle 1** | Parity between transmission interconnection costs calculation for transmission connected customers and distribution connected customers while enabling effective price signals to ensure to optimal use of existing distribution and transmission facilities   * Fairness * Effective price signals |
| **Principle 2** | Market participants should be responsible for an appropriate share of the costs of transmission facilities that are required to provide them with access to the transmission system (may include paying a contribution towards facilities paid for by other customers and refund to the customer that paid)   * Fairness * Cost Causation |
| **Principle 3** | DCG participants should have cost certainty when making their final investment decision (FID)   * Certainty of future costs * Stability |
| **Principle 4** | DFOs should be provided with reasonable certainty re: cost treatment/recovery   * Certainty of future costs * Stability |
| **Principle 5 (added)** | Ease of understanding and implementation   * Simplicity * Stability |