

# Monitoring NSREC: Stakeholder Survey III & Project Team Feedback Forum III

December, 2009  
Genna Woolston

## Survey Introduction

- Response rate: 54/93(58%)
- 98% attended the November Consultation
- First meeting?
  - Sept – 44%
  - Oct – 19%
  - Nov – 37%

## Feedback on Consultation

- Objectives met?

	Sep (%)	Oct (%)	Nov (%)*
Completely met	32.5	15	8
Partially met	50	54	60
Somewhat met	17.5	24	25
Not met	0	7	8

- Satisfied your contribution was integrated in a meaningful way?

1 = Completely dissatisfied

5 = Completely satisfied

Average =  $3.6 \pm 0.9$  →  $3.4 \pm 1.0$  →  $2.8 \pm 1.0^*$

- Conducive table dynamics?

1 = Not conducive

5 = Completely conducive

Average =  $3.5 \pm 1.1$  →  $3.2 \pm 1.2$

3

## Feedback on Outcomes

- Synthesis paper an effective platform to further development?

1 = Completely ineffective

5 = Completely effective

Average =  $2.9 \pm 1.2$

- Remaining concerns and captured?

Yes = 56%

4

# Feedback on Process

- Trust in Dalhousie to run a fair and objective process?
  - 1 = No trust
  - 5 = Total trust
  - Average =  $3.9 \pm 1.1 \rightarrow 3.8 \pm 1.0 \rightarrow 3.5 \pm 1.0$
- Trust in Government to respond effectively?
  - 1 = No trust
  - 5 = Total trust
  - Average =  $2.9 \pm 1.0 \rightarrow 2.9 \pm 1.0 \rightarrow 2.8 \pm 0.9$
- Willingness to continue?
  - 1 = Not willing
  - 5 = Completely
  - Average =  $4.5 \pm 0.7 \rightarrow 4.6 \pm 0.8 \rightarrow 4.6 \pm 0.7$

5

# Discussion 1

- Which results demonstrate a need for action?
- What can be done to improve these results?

Feedback on:	Questions	Results
Stakeholder Consultation	Objectives met?	Completely – 8% * Partially – 60% * Somewhat – 25% * Not – 8% *
	Contribution integrated in a meaningful way?	2.8 *
	Conducive table dynamics?	3.2
Outcomes	Synthesis Paper an effective platform?	2.9
	Remaining concerns and solutions captured?	Yes = 56%
Process	Trust in Dalhousie?	3.5
	Trust in Government?	2.8
	Willingness to continue?	4.6

6

# Recommendations

- Recommendations on how to improve the process
- Of 54 completed surveys:
  - 44% responded
  - Oct survey – 82% responded
- Recommendations were summarized and organized
- (#) – indicates repeated comment

## Discussion 2

- How will the recommendation be addressed?

7

# Recommendations

## 1. On the workshop

### *Beforehand*

- Provide papers a week ahead of meetings

### *Table Discussions*

- Provide more time (3)
- Prevent domination (2): use facilitators at each table; ask for contrary views
- Limit interruption
- Change consultation approach; table discussion not effective

### *Plenary Discussions*

- Prevent domination(2): ask for contrary views (2); only 6 responded on how to continue the day
- Avoid talking over respondents at the mic

### *Other*

- Allow more flexibility; it seemed confined and controlled

8

# Recommendations

## 2. On Outcomes

### *Synthesis Paper*

- Clarify the process for providing feedback
- Provide more time during development
- Recognize it's a start of what should be a long term stakeholder consultation
- Do not commission authors unfamiliar with Nova Scotia's context (2)
- Ensure the synthesis report is properly guided and captures the essence of NS's challenges
- Reevaluate some of the assumptions;
  - Ex. 30% capacity factor (p.4,17) is very different than the comparable context for wind
- Do not cap net metering; this is a disincentive

9

# Recommendations

## 2. On Outcomes

### *Focus more on:*

- market structures that facilitate renewable energy development
- feed-in tariffs
- letting the market decide the lowest cost option
- how to avoid missing the renewable target again
- each renewable energy source; one per table
- biomass
- natural gas
- economic impacts
- that the pricing changes will need legislative changes
- lessons learned from Ontario, including the Porter Commission (June 1975)

10

# Recommendations

## 3. On Final Recommendations

- Emphasize stakeholder submissions over those in synthesis paper
- Explain the logic behind choosing certain recommendations over others

11

# Recommendations

## 4. On Process

### *Representation/Inclusiveness*

- Include more representation from the following groups:
  - continental and international expert
  - not-for-profit groups
  - ratepayers' views
- Prevent domination and lobbying by for-profit groups (3)

### *General*

- Hire a professional facilitation team

12

## Recommendations

### 5. To the NS Government

- start planning for long term stakeholder engagement
- should have initiated public consultation earlier

13

## Comments

“Not impressive/engaged.”

“Very ineffective meeting, poorly facilitated. Dal should be embarrassed at this point”

“I believe the process is close to losing effectiveness.”

“opinion remains that the results of this were a forgone conclusion. the major people in the room remain the same and are pushing the same ideas. you may be achieving your objectives but will it be the best result for NS?”

14

# Summary

- **Statistically significant results:**
  - the objectives of November's meeting were not met to the same degree as September's meeting
  - less satisfied that contributions were integrated in a meaningful way than in Sept and October
- **Less recommendations**
- **Still a strong desire to continue**