



California ISO
Shaping a Renewed Future

Survey Results

Generator Interconnection Procedures
Phase 3

April 4, 2012
Market and Infrastructure Development

1. Introduction

The ISO began the Generator Interconnection Procedures Phase 3 (“GIP 3”) stakeholder initiative with the posting of an issue paper on March 1. The issue paper presented a list of seven candidate topics for inclusion within the scope of the GIP 3 initiative and sought stakeholder input on those topics and other generation interconnection issues that should be considered in GIP 3.

Prior to the March 15 stakeholder meeting, the ISO posted a template for stakeholders to use to submit their written comments by March 23. The template provided criteria for stakeholders to rank each of the topics discussed in the issue paper. The comments template provided the following criteria to rank the seven topics: a score of 3 would be used for topics that are high priority and urgent (i.e., a candidate for the first phase of GIP 3); a score of 2 would be used for topics that are high priority but of less urgency (i.e., a candidate for the second phase of GIP 3); a score of 1 would be used for topics that have low priority (i.e., topic could wait until next GIP stakeholder initiative subsequent to GIP 3); and a score of 0 would be used for topics that are not appropriate to address in a GIP enhancement initiative. The comments template also solicited additional topics that stakeholders thought should be considered within the scope of GIP 3, and requested a proposal if a stakeholder had a specific proposal to address a topic.

Based on the written stakeholder comments received on March 23, the ISO compiled a comprehensive list of 27 candidate topics (i.e., the original seven topics in the issue paper plus 20 additional topics suggested by stakeholders in their written comments). Next, the ISO opened an on-line survey on March 27 and asked stakeholders to indicate their view on the relative priority of each topic using the same scoring approach as was used in the comments template. The on-line survey closed at noon on March 30.

This document presents the results of the on-line survey. At this time the ISO is still considering which topics to include in the scope of the first and second phases of GIP 3, and will provide its scope recommendations in the forthcoming straw proposal.

The ISO greatly appreciates the time and effort that stakeholders devoted to this effort.

2. Survey Results

Twenty one separate organizations completed the on-line survey. Several trade associations also participated in the on-line survey on behalf of the members they represent.¹ The ISO has compiled the results, and the scores by topic and the aggregate scores, expressed as simple averages, are presented below.

The scores by topic from the survey results are presented in Table 1. The results are presented in an anonymous format – all identifying information for each respondent was removed. As the reader will observe, the data suggests a wide range of opinions about the relative priority of each topic and a lack of clear convergence on any given topic.

¹ Although these trade associations took the on-line survey only once on behalf of their members (as was requested of them by the ISO), the ISO will give consideration to the membership numbers that they represent in interpreting the results.

Table 1 – Scores by Topic

Topic No.	Topic Description	Score																				
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7 ²	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1	Downsizing	0	1	3	3	3	3	0	2	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	1
2	Distribution of forfeited funds	1	3	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	2	2	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	3	0	1
3	Independent study process	1	1	3	2	0	0	2.5	0	3	3	3	1	1	0	1	0	3	1	0	3	3
4	Fast track study process	3	1	1	2	0	0	3	0	1	3	3	1	1	0	1	0	3	1	0	3	3
5	Behind the meter expansion	0	2	3	1	1	3	1.5	0	3	3	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0
6	External transmission lines	1	3	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	2
7	Timeline for tendering draft GIAs	3	2	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	0	1
8	Multiple project phases (Tariff & GIA)	0	2	3	1	3	0	1.5	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	2
9	Reliability and deliverability study methodologies	0	1	3	2	3	3	1.5	2	3	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	0	2
10	Increased disclosure around tariff timelines	1	1	1	0	1	0	3	1	0	3	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	1
11	Clarity on "Initial Review"	2	2	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1
12	Interest rate for transmission cost reimbursement	0	1	1	3	1	0	1.5	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	1	1	3	0	0
13	Unresolved PIRP solar issues	0	1	1	3	2	0	1.5	2	1	1	1	2	0	2	2	1	1	2	1	0	0
14	PTO cost estimation and benchmarking	0	1	2	2	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	3
15	Partial Termination issues	0	1	3	2	3	0	0.5	2	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	0	1
16	Affected System coordination	3	3	3	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	0	3
17	Additional time for post-Phase I project decisions	0	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	2	1	2	1	2	2	0	1
18	Project parking	0	2	3	2	1	0	1	1	3	0	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	0
19	GIP process refunds	0	1	2	2	1	3	0.5	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	1	1	2	2	1	0	2
20	Coordination with LRA procurement	0	2	3	3	3	0	1	2	2	3	2	2	0	2	2	3	2	1	3	0	3
21	Recovery of costs related to GIA negotiations	0	3	3	1	0	0	0.5	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2
22	IFS posting notification improvement	2	2	3	1	3	3	2	0	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	0	1
23	Permitting responsibilities for shared NUs	0	2	3	2	3	0	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2
24	Removal of GIA suspension provisions	2	3	3	1	0	0	0.5	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	2
25	LGIA negotiations timeline	3	3	3	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1
26	Increasing project MW size	1	2	3	1	1	0	1.5	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	0	2
27	TPP-GIP deposits and contingent liabilities	0	0	2	1	1	3	0.5	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	0	3	2	1	0	1

² Two representatives of the same company submitted survey responses. In fairness to other survey respondents, the ISO computed the average of the two separate survey responses and substituted the result here.

Using the data in Table 1, the ISO computed a simple average of the scores for each topic. These are provided in Table 2.

Table 2 – Average Score by Topic

Topic	Average Score
1. Downsizing	2.10
2. Distribution of forfeited funds	1.26
3. Independent study process	1.50
4. Fast track study process	1.43
5. Behind the meter expansion	1.21
6. External transmission lines	1.10
7. Timeline for tendering draft GIAs	1.43
8. Multiple project phases (Tariff & GIA)	1.88
9. Reliability and deliverability study methodologies	1.88
10. Increased disclosure around tariff timelines	1.38
11. Clarity on “Initial Review”	1.33
12. Interest rate for transmission cost reimbursement	1.17
13. Unresolved PIRP solar issues	1.17
14. PTO cost estimation and benchmarking	1.62
15. Partial Termination issues	1.88
16. Affected System coordination	1.90
17. Additional time for post-Phase I project decisions	1.24
18. Project parking	1.38
19. GIP process refunds	1.26
20. Coordination with LRA procurement	1.86
21. Recovery of costs related to GIA negotiations	0.79
22. IFS posting notification improvement	1.67
23. Permitting responsibilities for shared network upgrades	1.43
24. Removal of GIA suspension provisions	1.02
25. LGIA negotiations timeline	1.21
26. Increasing project MW size	1.55
27. TPP-GIP deposit requirements and contingent liabilities	1.31

The simple average scores by topic from Table 2 are presented in graphical form in Figure 1.

Figure 1 - Average Score by Topic

