

7 Responses		Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
1.	Materials were sent to me well enough in advance.		2	3	2
2.	The webcast allowed me to participate equally and that no one person, company or association had undue influence on the outcome.		1	5	1
3.	The Chair made sure everyone had an opportunity to comment.		1	4	2
4.	I was able to hear/follow the presentations and conversations clearly.		3	4	
5.	For this meeting, the webcast was a better venue than a face to face meeting. Suggestions would be appreciated below.	1	3		2

Suggestions / Comments

- Good judgement and decision to hold via webcast. In future, similar decisions should be made based on meeting content and/or expected duration. Off the cuff, if any meeting is expected to be under 3 hours you should strongly consider offering only by webcast. There could be some consideration, also, that even for longer meetings or ones otherwise determined to hold in person, webcast could be performed as well to service participants that cannot attend. This can get very expensive however, and my experience with other ISOs is that if access is offered by phone as well as in person, this works well provided the chair and presenters recognize and respect the needs of those on the phone. The most obvious forms of this being to make sure slide numbering is used and mentioned, and periodic specific solicitation of phone comments made.
- It would be nice to get more lead time with respect to when and how the meetings are going to be conducted. For example for this last meeting held November 3rd there were probably a few folks that travelled to Toronto and was informed that the meeting would be held by webcast. This is not an issue with folks that live in Toronto. How meetings are scheduled, may exclude some market participants with the opportunity to participate. As suggested before meetings held on Mondays and Fridays create issues with respect to travel. Meetings held before 900 EST are an issue if a webcast meeting is scheduled.
- Phone problems interfered with the audibility of the conversations and statements between participants.
- Face to face is always better as there is the interaction socially (even with people who are on opposing sides) and one can get a feel of body language. Webcast should be provided for those who can't make it.
- Webcast should be limited to infrequent use only when the agenda is short. Face-to-face meetings provide a much richer opportunity to communicate through what is seen as well as what is spoken. It also allows participants and the IESO to network and have casual conversations. Webcasts often are difficult to hear some speakers. It is also awkward to know when it is a good time to comment.

Question #5 from 1 participant was not rated.