

Linking Utility Performance and Regulatory Review

RRF – Roadmap for Regulatory Reform

Report of the Board
Renewed Regulatory Framework for Electricity Distributors: A Performance-Based Approach

October 18, 2012

- Shift focus from utility cost to value for consumers
- Better align utility reliability and quality of service levels with customer expectations
- Institutionalize continuous improvement and innovation
- Provide for a comprehensive approach to network investments to achieve optimum results
- Better align timing and pattern of expenditure with cost recovery
- Provide a sustainable, predicable, efficient and effective regulatory framework

Evolution in Rate-setting

Flexible rate-setting methods

Custom IR, Price Cap IR and Annual IR

Access to capital between re-basing

- Mechanisms developed to pace investments and manage impact on customers
 - Incremental Capital Module
 - Advanced Capital Module

Robust return on equity

 Opportunity to earn reasonable returns to finance investment

Value for Customers

- ✓ Transparent performance reporting (scorecards)
 - To allow customers to assess value and performance of their utility year over year, and across LDCs
- ✓ Customer engagement in utility investment and service planning
 - To help inform utility investment and service plans and provide helpful information to customers
- ✓ OEB community meetings for rate hearings
 - To give customers direct access and a voice in regulatory decisions
- ✓ Consumer Charter
 - To provide accessible and transparent information for customers on their rights and responsibilities

Performance Outcomes	Performance Categories		
Customer Focus Services are provided in a manner that responds to identified customer preferences.	Service Quality		
	Customer Satisfaction		
Operational Effectiveness	Safety		
Continuous improvement in productivity and cost performance is achieved; and distributors deliver on system reliability and quality objectives.			
	System Reliability		
	Asset Management		
	Cost Control		
Public Policy Responsiveness Distributors deliver on obligations mandated by government (e.g., in legislation and in regulatory requirements imposed further to Ministerial directives to the Board).	Conservation & Demand Management		
	Connection of Renewable Generation		

RRF – Expected Outcomes

- Financially sustainable LDCs
- Robust, reliable networks
- Value for customers
- Supporting Innovation
- Recognizing performance

Enhanced Adjudicative Process



Proportionate Review

Adjudicative Process Review - What did we do?

- Mapped and reviewed our current processes, metrics and results
- Researched and assessed various regulatory models
- Considered our legislation, history and legal obligations
- Listened to regulated entities and other stakeholders
 - Regulatory process should be more flexible
 - More focus on outcomes

The Result

Enhanced Adjudicative Process

- Designed to:
 - Align regulatory review with performance based regulation
 - > Focus on utility performance
 - Recognize utility efficiency, good governance and customer focus
 - Optimize time and resources to focus on utilities and issues that require more detailed review
 - Ensure regulatory flexibility to adapt to a rapidly changing sector

Proportionate Review Recognizes Performance

- Performance
 - **Financial**
 - Operational
 - Organizational
 - Quality of service
- > Enablers
 - Robust benchmarking
 - Performance reporting and monitoring
 - Good corporate governance
 - Customer engagement
- ➤ Level of performance **Level of review**



PREFORMANCE

EMPOWERED

Consumers

Regulation EFFECTIVE and **ACCESSIBLE**

Proportionate ≠ Less Rigorous

- The OEB will:
 - Maintain a fair and independent process
 - Leverage the expertise of its staff
 - Focus regulatory effort where it is most needed

Assessment: Determining Level of Review

We plan to use criteria from three areas to determine level of review:

Historical Applicant
Performance Against
Benchmark &
Continuous
Improvement

RRR, stretch factor group, customer feedback and complaints, audit

RRFE outcomes
Scorecard

Trend analysis

Application Specific Factors

Application type (e.g. number of years, rebasing vs. IRM, DVAs, etc.)

Support for requests

DSP, capital projects, workforce changes and other OM&A, innovations

Responsiveness to customer feedback

OEB Policy Alignment

New issues for which no current policy exists

Deviations from existing OEB policy

Corporate governance practices

Proportionate Review: Four Main Streams

	Community Meeting	Issues	Hearing Process	Cost Awards	Process & Scope
No hearing	✓	Case-by- case	-	-	No legal notice or hearing
Abridged hearing	✓	√	✓	-	Minimal Process Few issues
Focused hearing	✓	✓	✓	For selected issues only	Moderate process Selected Issues only
Fully adjudicated	✓	✓	✓	✓	Full Process All Issues Open

Proportionate Review: Looking Ahead

- More emphasis on:
 - past performance
 - benchmarking performance
 - continuous improvement
 - corporate governance
 - customer satisfaction
 - public policy alignment
 - nature of requests in application
- More effective use of monitoring
- Ongoing refinement of review process to incorporate continuous learning and greater proportionality

First Steps

- Assess all 2018 rebasing applications against criteria
- Test the proportionate review concept with two 2018 cost of service applicants
 - Use the up-front assessment to select a proportionate review process for those applications
- Evaluate the results of the assessment and proportionate review
- Seek stakeholder feedback
- Revise the criteria and the assessment process as needed
- Target implementation for May 1, 2019 rates applications

Questions?

