



EB-2007-0040

IN THE MATTER OF the *Electricity Act, 1998*, S.O.1998, c.15 (Schedule B);

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by the Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario under section 33 of the *Electricity Act, 1998* for an Order revoking an amendment to the market rules and referring the amendment back to the Independent Electricity System Operator for further consideration, and for an Order staying the operation of the amendment to the market rules pending completion of the Board's review.

DECISION AND ORDER

(Issued April 10, 2007 and as corrected on April 12, 2007)

BEFORE: Gordon Kaiser
Presiding Member and Vice Chair

Pamela Nowina
Member and Vice Chair

Bill Rupert
Member

The Application

On February 9, 2007, the Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario ("AMPCO") filed with the Ontario Energy Board (the "Board") an Application under section 33(4) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* (the "Act") seeking the review of an amendment to the market rules approved by the Independent Electricity System Operator (the "IESO") on January 17, 2007. The Board has assigned file number EB-2007-0040 to the Application.

The amendment that is the subject matter of the Application is identified as MR-00331-R00: “Specify the Facility Ramping Capability in the Market Schedule” and relates to the ramp rate assumption used in the market pricing algorithm within the IESO-administered markets (the “Amendment”).

The specific relief sought in the Application is the following:

- an order under section 33(7) of the Act staying the operation of the Amendment pending completion of the Board’s review of the Amendment;
- an order under section 33(9) of the Act revoking the Amendment and referring the amendment back to the IESO for further consideration; and
- an award of costs, such costs to be payable by the IESO.

On February 9, 2007, the Board issued its Notice of Application and Oral Hearing in relation to the Application.

Under section 33(6) of the Act, the Board is required to issue an order that embodies its final decision in this proceeding within 60 days after receiving AMPCO’s application.

This is the first application of its kind to proceed to a hearing before, and a decision by, the Board. An earlier application by a different applicant and in relation to a different amendment to the market rules was subsequently withdrawn.

Although the Board has considered the entirety of the record in this proceeding, the Board has summarized the record only to the extent necessary to provide context for those findings.

The Amendment

The Amendment relates to the calculation of the energy price (the market clearing price or “MCP” that is calculated in five-minute intervals) in the real-time energy market administered by the IESO and, more specifically, to a change (from 12x to 3x) in the assumption that is made about the ramping capabilities of generation facilities when determining market prices.

The algorithm that is used to compute MCP – known as the “market schedule” and sometimes referred to as the unconstrained schedule – contains a parameter (the “TradingPeriodLength”) that specifies the ramp rate multiplier to be used in determining energy market prices. Ramp rate, which is usually expressed in MW per minute, indicates how quickly the output of a generation facility can be increased or decreased.

Prior to the Amendment, the market rules authorized the IESO (then known as the Independent Electricity Market Operator or IMO)¹ to establish the “TradingPeriodLength” parameter for the pricing algorithm but did not define its value. Prior to market opening, the value of the parameter was set at 60 minutes, which is the equivalent of a 12x ramp rate. Most generation facilities, and in particular those that typically set market prices, can change their output from minimum levels to full output in roughly one hour. The result of the 12x ramp rate multiplier is that the market schedule has since market opening assumed that generation facilities are able to ramp output up or down 12 times faster than is, in fact, the case. It is widely acknowledged that use of the 12x ramp rate multiplier was implemented as a temporary solution to address extreme price excursions that were experienced during testing prior to opening of the wholesale market.

Further examination of the ramp rate multiplier issue was initiated by the IESO in December, 2005. Stakeholder consultations ensued, principally through the Market Pricing Working Group as well as through the IESO’s Stakeholder Advisory Committee.

At the end of this examination, the IESO proposed to amend the market rules by setting the value of the “TradingPeriodLength” parameter at 15 minutes, which is the equivalent of a 3x ramp rate. To that end, on December 27, 2006, the IESO published the Amendment for comment. Five submissions were received in response; one from AMPCO opposing the Amendment and four from generators supporting the Amendment as a move in the right direction albeit not as the preferred solution. The Board of Directors of the IESO approved the Amendment on January 17, 2007, and it was published on January 19, 2007. The Amendment was scheduled to go into effect on February 10, 2007, the earliest date permitted by section 33(1) of the Act.

¹ For convenience, this Decision and Order will refer throughout to the IESO even though, at the time relevant to the point under discussion, it may have been called the IMO.

Once implemented, the Amendment would result in the market schedule assuming that generation facilities are able to ramp output up or down 3 times faster than is, in fact, the case.

It is to be noted that the 3x ramp rate multiplier relates solely to the calculation of energy prices. The physical dispatch algorithm (known as the “real-time schedule” and sometimes referred to as the constrained schedule), which is used by the IESO to dispatch facilities to meet market demand in any given interval, reflects the actual ramping capabilities of generation facilities (in other words, the value of the “TradingPeriodLength” parameter is set at 5 minutes, equivalent to a 1x ramp rate).

The role played by, and the impact of, the ramp rate multiplier in the determination of real-time energy prices is discussed further below under the heading “Pricing and Dispatch in the Real-time Energy Market”.

The Proceeding

A brief description of the issues and the orders issued by the Board is summarized below.

1. *Stay of Operation of the Amendment*

The Amendment had an effective date of February 10, 2007. AMPCO’s arguments in support of its application for an order under section 33(7) of the Act staying the operation of the Amendment pending completion of the Board’s review of the Amendment were that: (i) it is in the public interest to order the stay; (ii) there are legitimate concerns with respect to the Amendment that should be considered by the Board; and (iii) the balance of convenience favours a stay.

On February 9, 2007, the IESO filed a letter with the Board indicating that it consented to the stay of the operation of the Amendment, such consent being without prejudice to any arguments that the IESO might make in relation to the Board’s review of the Amendment. The IESO noted that it had given due consideration to the balance of convenience and the short duration of the stay given the Board’s statutory deadline for completion of its review of the Amendment.

By Order dated February 9, 2007, the Board stayed the operation of the Amendment pending completion of the Board’s review of the Amendment and issuance by the Board

of its order embodying its final decision on AMPCO's application for review of the Amendment. The Board noted in particular that the balance of convenience favoured a stay of the operation of the Amendment, particularly given the long history of the ramp rate issue in the IESO-administered markets.

2. *Intervenors*

The following parties requested and were granted intervenor status in this proceeding: the Association of Power Producers of Ontario ("APPRO"); Coral Energy Canada Inc. ("Coral Energy"); the Electricity Market Investment Group ("EMIG"); Hydro One Networks Inc. ("Hydro One"); the IESO; Ontario Power Generation Inc. ("OPG"); TransAlta Energy Corp. and TransAlta Cogeneration L.P. (collectively "TransAlta"); TransCanada Energy Ltd. ("TransCanada"); and the Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition ("VECC").

In addition, the Board received on March 30, 2007 a letter of comment filed by Constellation Energy.

3. *Procedural Order No. 1*

On February 16, 2007, the Board issued its Procedural Order No. 1. In addition to establishing the process and timelines for this proceeding, Procedural Order No. 1 also:

- indicated that cost awards would be made available in this proceeding to eligible intervenors, and solicited written submissions on the issue of the party from whom cost awards should be recovered;
- directed the IESO to file materials associated with the development and adoption of the Amendment; and
- identified the following as the issues to be considered in this proceeding:
 - (i) is the Amendment inconsistent with the purposes of the Act?
 - (ii) does the Amendment unjustly discriminate against or in favour of a market participant or a class of market participants?

4. *Cost Awards*

Requests for eligibility for an award of costs were made by AMPCO, VECC and APPrO. TransAlta reserved its right to apply for an award of costs should special circumstances arise in the proceeding. In its letter of intervention, the IESO also indicated that it would seek an award of costs.

In response to Procedural Order No. 1, four parties made submissions in relation to the issue of the party from whom cost awards should be recovered. The submissions are summarized in the Board's Procedural Order No. 2 issued on March 9, 2007.

The Board determined that cost awards in this proceeding should be recovered from the IESO, for the reasons stated in Procedural Order No. 2. The Board also determined that VECC, APPrO and AMPCO are eligible for an award of costs in this proceeding, subject to any objections that the IESO might wish to make for consideration by the Board. By letter dated March 16, 2007, the IESO indicated that while it accepts and respects the Board's decision regarding cost eligibility, it reserved the right to ask the Board to limit the amount of costs recoverable by parties objecting to the Amendment in the event that it appears, at the end of the proceeding, that some or all of the grounds for the objection ought not to have been advanced.

5. *Production of Materials by the IESO*

As noted above, among other things Procedural Order No. 1 directed the IESO to file materials associated with the development and adoption of the Amendment. By letter dated March 2, 2007, AMPCO alleged that the IESO's filing in response to Procedural Order No. 1 was deficient in a number of respects. By letter also dated March 2, 2007, the IESO replied to the allegations contained in AMPCO's letter, stating that there is no merit to AMPCO's allegations and that the IESO had produced all of the materials required by Procedural Order No. 1.

In its Procedural Order No. 2, the Board among other things ordered the IESO to produce certain materials, including material prepared by the IESO in the context of the Day Ahead Commitment Process and/or the Day Ahead Market initiative that directly relates to ramp rate (the "DAM/DACP Materials"). In ordering the IESO to produce the DAM/DACP Materials, the Board expressly recognized that the relevance of those Materials to the criteria set out in section 33(9) of the Act, which form the basis of the issues list set out in Procedural Order No. 1, is not clear. Procedural Order No. 2 thus also invited parties to make submissions on the issue of the relevance to this

proceeding of the DAM/DACP Materials, and more specifically to the criteria set out in section 33(9) of the Act and the issues list set out in Procedural Order No. 1.

On March 12, 2007, the IESO filed a letter with the Board in response to Procedural Order No. 2. In that letter, the IESO stated that the nature and extent of the task involved in satisfying the document production requirements of Procedural Order No. 2 makes completion of the task within anything remotely close to the specified timeframe completely impractical. Without waiving any of its rights or accepting the relevance to this proceeding of the materials identified in Procedural Order No. 2, the IESO put forward a proposed plan to meet the Board's information requirements within the requisite timeframes. On March 14, 2007, AMPCO filed a letter with the Board expressing its concerns regarding the IESO's proposed plan. The concerns related principally to the scope of the IESO's production in respect of the subject matter and time period to be covered.

On March 14, 2007, the Board issued its Procedural Order No. 3. The effect of Procedural Order No. 3 was to revise the nature of the production required of the IESO under Procedural Order No. 2, generally in line with the proposed plan submitted by the IESO in its letter of March 12, 2007 but with the exception that the production should cover a longer period than that proposed by the IESO.

6. *Technical Conference*

Procedural Order No. 1 made provision for a technical conference to be held in this proceeding. On March 20, 2007, and in response to inquiries received by certain parties, Board staff communicated with the parties to confirm whether they wished to proceed with the technical conference. Based on the responses received to that communication, the Board decided to cancel the technical conference and the parties were so advised by Board staff on March 21, 2007.

7. *Submissions on the "Relevance Issue"*

On March 21, 2007, AMPCO filed with the Board a letter setting out a proposal for submissions on the issue of the relevance of certain materials to this proceeding. As noted above, in its Procedural Order No. 2 the Board invited parties to make submissions on the relevance of the DAM/DACP Materials. AMPCO's proposal, made with the consent of the IESO, was to the effect that AMPCO would provide the Board and all parties with a "comprehensive submission on the relevance of materials

produced by the IESO in relation to a central theme contained in AMPCO's application: "that the Amendment violates fundamental principles of procedural fairness". The proposal also suggested that, rather than filing submissions in accordance with Procedural Order No. 2, parties should await production of AMPCO's comprehensive submission and respond to that document.

On March 22, 2007, the Board issued its Procedural Order No. 4 setting out the timeframe for the filing of AMPCO's submissions on relevance. The Board encouraged intervenors to make written submissions in response to those of AMPCO but, given the imminence of the commencement of the oral hearing, indicated that it would allow all intervenors to make oral submissions on the relevance issue at the beginning of the oral hearing.

Written submissions on relevance were filed by AMPCO, the IESO, APPrO and Coral Energy. The positions of the parties are summarized below under the heading "The Board's Mandate".

8. *The Oral Hearing and Final Written Argument*

The Board held an oral hearing in this proceeding, commencing on March 29, 2007 and concluding on March 30, 2007. The first day of the hearing was devoted almost exclusively to submissions by the parties on the "relevance issue", as described in greater detail below under the heading "The Board's Mandate". On the second day of the hearing, witnesses gave evidence on behalf of AMPCO, the IESO, APPrO and TransCanada, principally in relation to the nature and impact or effect of the Amendment. The position of the parties in this regard is discussed in greater detail below under the heading "The Impact of the Amendment".

During the hearing, proposals were also made by certain of the parties in relation to the filing of final written argument, and these were accepted by the Board. AMPCO filed its final written argument on April 2, 2007. VECC filed its final written argument on April 3, 2007. The following parties filed their final written argument on April 4, 2007: the IESO; APPrO; and TransCanada. OPG filed a letter with the Board indicating its support for the final argument filed by APPrO. Coral Energy did not file final written argument, but did indicate during the oral hearing that it would address the substantive issues associated with the Amendment through APPrO. AMPCO filed its written reply argument on April 5, 2007.

The Board's Mandate

The “relevance issue”, as it has been referred to in this proceeding, arose initially in relation to the DAM/DACP Materials. As stated in Procedural Order No. 4, the issue is relevance of materials – and hence of the position or argument that the materials support – relative to the criteria set out in section 33(9) of the Act. This issue, of necessity, requires consideration of the scope of the Board's mandate on applications to review amendments to the market rules under section 33 of the Act.

As the proceeding progressed, it became clearer that AMPCO's views as to the scope of the Board's mandate differs markedly from the views of other parties. A number of the concerns raised by AMPCO regarding the Amendment relate not to the impact or effect of the Amendment, but rather to the process by which the Amendment was made by the IESO. Many of the materials filed by the IESO in response to the Board's Procedural Orders are relevant to those concerns, but have little or no relevance to the issue of the impact or effect of the Amendment.

The position of the parties in relation to the scope of the Board's mandate, as expressed in the written submissions filed in response to Procedural Order No. 4 and/or in oral submissions made at the commencement of the oral hearing, may be summarized as follows.

AMPCO's position is that the Board's mandate is not limited to the grounds set out in section 33(9) of the Act. Rather, the Board has a “plenary review jurisdiction” that would allow the Board to address what AMPCO alleges as significant failures of procedural fairness by the IESO. In support of its position, AMPCO referred to and relied on sections 33(4), 33(5) and 33(6) of the Act, on section 19(4) of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*, on the Board's authority to determine all questions of law and fact in all matters within the Board's jurisdiction, and on the Board's public interest role. On that basis, in AMPCO's view the criteria expressed in section 33(9) of the Act are better understood as the two instances in which the legislature has directed the Board on how it must exercise its review discretion, leaving the Board otherwise able to exercise its review discretion as the Board sees fit.

By contrast, the position of the IESO, APPrO, Coral, OPG and TransCanada is that the Board's mandate is limited by section 33(9) of the Act to a determination of whether (a) the amendment is inconsistent with the purposes of the Act; or (b) the amendment unjustly discriminates against or in favour of a market participant or a class of market

participants. On that basis, whether the IESO has, and breached, a common law duty of procedural fairness or acted in a manner giving rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias (both of which allegations were denied by the IESO), are not matters for consideration by the Board on a market rule amendment review application under section 33 of the Act. Materials produced by the IESO that are relevant only to the IESO's processes in making the Amendment should therefore be disregarded. The IESO also specifically requested that the Board strike AMPCO's March 26, 2007 submission from the record.

On March 29, 2007, the Board rendered an oral decision on this issue. Specifically, the Board determined that its mandate under section 33 of the Act is limited to an examination of the market rule amendment against the criteria set out in section 33(9) the Act. The Board also ordered that any evidence relating to the IESO's stakeholdering process, including AMPCO's March 26, 2007 submission, be struck from the record. An excerpt from the transcript of the oral hearing that contains the Board's decision and order in this regard is set out in Appendix A to this Decision and Order.

The parties agreed to, and filed with the Board, a list of the materials affected by the Board's decision (i.e., those to be struck from the record and those to remain on the record).

The Impact of the Amendment

It remains for the Board to determine whether the Amendment is inconsistent with the purposes of the Act or unjustly discriminates against or in favour of a market participant or a class of market participants.

A brief summary of the position of the parties is set out below, followed by the Board's findings.

In order to better understand the position of the parties, however, it is necessary to provide some further context around the setting of prices in the IESO-administered energy market and the role that the ramp rate multiplier plays, if only at a high and simplified level.

1. *Pricing and Dispatch in the Real-time Energy Market*

The MCP, which is calculated in five-minute intervals, is determined using a market schedule (pricing algorithm) that calculates the price based on the most economical offers submitted by generators that would satisfy the demand for energy in a particular five-minute interval. Dispatchable generators receive the MCP for their output, and dispatchable loads pay MCP for the energy they consume. All other generators and loads receive or pay, respectively, the Hourly Ontario Energy Price (“HOEP”). HOEP is a simple average of the 12 MCPs determined for the hour. Ontario currently has a uniform pricing system and MCP (and thus HOEP) are the same everywhere in the province. The introduction of locational marginal pricing for the province, which has long been the subject of discussion, is not expected to occur at least in the short term. However, the IESO does calculate what the prices would be in different locations were locational marginal pricing to be in place. These are referred to as “shadow prices”.

Three aspects of the market schedule are of particular relevance to this proceeding:

- the market schedule is “myopic”, in that it ignores expected demand in future intervals and sets the MCP based solely on demand conditions in each five-minute interval;
- the market schedule ignores transmission constraints, and assumes for pricing purposes that the cheapest available generation facility anywhere in Ontario is available to satisfy demand in any interval when, in fact, it may be unavailable due to transmission constraints; and
- the market schedule assumes for pricing purposes that generation facilities are able to ramp output up or down faster than they might actually be able to do so (by a factor of 12 currently or by a factor of 3 under the Amendment).

By contrast, the algorithm used by the IESO to dispatch facilities has the following characteristics:

- the dispatch algorithm has, since 2004, incorporated multi-interval optimization (“MIO”), which “looks ahead” to expected demand in future five-minute intervals;
- the dispatch algorithm takes account of all physical constraints on the system; and

- the dispatch algorithm respects the actual ramping capabilities of generation facilities.

The result is that MCP does not necessarily reflect what the prices would have been had the prices been determined on the basis of the offers submitted by generation facilities that are actually dispatched to provide energy to meet demand in a given five-minute interval. The ramp rate multiplier allows the market schedule to set prices on the basis of generation facilities that are cheaper but unavailable due to actual ramping restrictions, and as a result reduces both price volatility and the average level of prices. The same can be said for the market schedule assumption that the system is unconstrained.

A consequence of the lack of complete alignment between the pricing algorithm and the dispatch algorithm is that generation facilities that were assumed by the market schedule to be supplying energy in a five-minute interval might not in fact be dispatched due to the presence of transmission or ramping constraints. A generation facility may have to be dispatched even though it had offered to supply electricity at a price that is higher than HOEP. These generation facilities will be “constrained on”, and under the market rules are entitled to an additional payment referred to as a Congestion Management Settlement Credit (“CMSC”) payment. Similarly, when a cheaper generation facility is not dispatched due to the presence of transmission constraints or because it can ramp down more quickly than a more expensive generation facility, the cheaper facility will be “constrained off” and also entitled to a CMSC payment. In both cases, the CMSC payment reflects the difference between HOEP and the offer made by the generation facility that has been constrained on or constrained off, as the case may be. CMSC payments are not reflected in the energy price, but are recovered through uplift charges from wholesale market participants on a pro-rata basis based on their energy consumption at the time at which the CMSC payments were incurred.

2. Position of the Parties on the Impact of the Amendment

The following summary is based principally on the final arguments filed by the parties. For the most part, these largely reflect the tenor of each party’s participation in this proceeding.

The position of the parties to this proceeding fall into two distinct camps: AMPCO and VECC oppose the Amendment while the IESO, APPRO, Coral Energy (through APPRO),

OPG and TransCanada support it. The letter of comment received from Constellation Energy also supports the Amendment. TransAlta was not an active participant in this proceeding, but is one of the generators that indicated its support for the Amendment as an interim solution in response to the IESO's request for submissions referred to above. EMIG (of which Coral Energy and Constellation Energy Group Inc. are members) was also not an active participant in this proceeding, but noted in its letter of intervention its belief that "in order to support new private investment in generation, Ontario must transition towards a competitive market where prices reflect the true cost of power". Hydro One did not take a position in this proceeding.

A number of the arguments made by AMPCO and VECC challenge the validity or reliability of the IESO's assessment of the costs and benefits associated with the Amendment, and are therefore better understood if the position of the parties supporting the Amendment is presented first.

Parties Supporting the Amendment

Active participants in this proceeding that support the Amendment assert that the Amendment is consistent with the purposes of the Act and does not unjustly discriminate against or in favour of a market participant or a class of market participants. Certain parties have added that the evidence in this proceeding is overwhelmingly to that effect.

The IESO's position is that the Amendment is consistent with, and will promote, a number of the purposes of the Act. Specifically, the IESO submits that the Amendment will: enhance overall reliability, better protecting the interests of consumers in that regard (sections 1(a) and 1(f) of the Act); encourage conservation and demand management (sections 1(b) and 1(c) of the Act); promote economic efficiency (section 1(g) of the Act); and cultivate a financially viable electricity industry (section 1(i) of the Act). According to the IESO, the Amendment will contribute to the achievement of these objectives by: more closely aligning the dispatch and pricing algorithms; resulting in more accurate price signals for consumers and producers; reducing uneconomic exports out of Ontario with resulting efficiency gains realized through the mechanism of export arbitrage; providing immediate efficiency gains for the Province; reducing fossil fuel generation; and achieving a significant improvement in efficiency for the Ontario market.

The IESO further submits that the Amendment, a superior solution to the available alternatives (including incorporation of MIO in the pricing algorithm), will be simple and inexpensive to implement and will achieve the noted benefits with minimal, if any, impact on average prices for consumers. The IESO has estimated that the impact of the Amendment on HOEP will be an average 2.6 percent increase. However, the IESO has also estimated that the impact on consumer bills will be mitigated by: the export arbitrage response that is expected to follow implementation of the Amendment; the global adjustment; the rebate that is currently paid out on revenues earned by OPG on its non-prescribed assets (the "OPG Rebate"); savings in CMSC payments; and savings in Intertie Offer Guarantee payments (these being payments made to importers to reduce price risks for imports that result from the fact that they are scheduled based on pre-dispatch prices but settled on the basis of real-time prices). After accounting for such mitigation, and based on 2006 market prices, the impact of the Amendment would, according to the IESO, vary from a net cost of \$6.68 million or 0.004 cents/kWh (assuming an export arbitrage response of 50%, which the IESO considers conservative) to a net saving of approximately \$13 million or 0.008 cents/kWh (assuming an export arbitrage response of 100%). As a supplementary mitigation measure, the IESO intends to disburse surplus funds from the transmission rights clearing account (the "TR Clearing Account") over 12 consecutive months to begin in conjunction with implementation of the Amendment.

With respect to the issue of unjust discrimination, the IESO argues that discrimination, in the context of a market for electricity, refers to economic discrimination. As such, more must be involved than an economic advantage accruing to one party rather than the other. The IESO further states that, by lessening subsidies and better aligning prices and dispatch costs, the Amendment plainly lessens inappropriate economic treatment of market participants.

Similar to the IESO, APPrO submits that improvements resulting from implementation of the Amendment are consistent with the purposes set out in sections 1(b), 1(c), 1(f), 1(g) and 1(i) of the Act. According to APPrO, the Amendment addresses many of the challenges and inefficiencies resulting from the use of the 12x ramp rate multiplier by creating just price signals for generators and loads, and does so with minimal, if any, customer cost impacts. APPrO also argues that the effects resulting from the 12x ramp rate multiplier are prejudicial to, and discriminate against, consumers and suppliers. APPrO states that, by more closely aligning the pricing algorithm with the dispatch algorithm, the Amendment would mitigate those prejudicial and discriminatory effects

(such effects including that consumers are not paying the true cost of the electricity they consume and are paying for inefficiencies through uplift charges).

TransCanada's position is that the Amendment will improve the operation of Ontario's competitive electricity market and, since many of the purposes of the Act have as their object the promotion of a competitive market, improvements to the market support the purposes of the Act. According to TransCanada, by moving the market closer to real prices, the Amendment will also specifically encourage conservation (section 1(b) of the Act) and promote the use of cleaner energy sources (section 1(d) of the Act).

TransCanada also submits that market efficiency will be promoted by: more closely aligning the pricing and dispatch algorithms; increasing the internal consistency of the market rules; improving price signals and inducing more efficient investment; and improving price transparency and reducing less transparent uplift payments (by reducing CMSC payments). While not a perfect solution, in TransCanada's view the Amendment represents an important step in the right direction.

On the issue of unjust discrimination, TransCanada agrees with the view expressed by Coral Energy in submissions made before and during the oral hearing to the effect that "unjust" discrimination equates with "inefficient" discrimination.

Parties Opposing the Amendment

AMPCO and VECC take the position that the Amendment fails when considered in light of the criteria set out in section 33(9) of the Act, and should therefore be revoked and referred back to the IESO for further consideration.

AMPCO's position is that the Amendment is inconsistent with certain of the purposes of the Act. The purposes of the Act that underlie this position are: (i) ensuring the adequacy, safety, sustainability and reliability of electricity supply in Ontario through responsible planning and management of electricity resources, supply and demand (section 1(a) of the Act); and (ii) protecting the interests of consumers with respect to prices and the adequacy, reliability and quality of electricity service (section 1(f) of the Act). AMPCO also submits that the Amendment unjustly discriminates against consumers (by increasing prices) and in favour of generators (by providing "windfall profits" to generators – such as nuclear generators – that are unable to respond quickly to changing demand conditions).

In support of its position, AMPCO submits that the IESO is not at liberty to pick and choose the purposes of the Act that it will further while ignoring others in favour of perceived improvements in efficiency. The Act does not assign differing weights or priorities to the various purposes of the Act and, if anything, the protection of the interests of consumers has been given priority.

AMPCO also submits that the IESO's estimates of the costs and benefits of moving to a 3x ramp rate multiplier in terms of determining the wealth transfer implied by the Amendment are unreliable. According to AMPCO, the efficiency gains flowing from the Amendment, as articulated by the IESO and other parties, are: (i) not supported by economic theory having regard to the "Theory of the Second Best"; (ii) based on the mistaken view that uneconomic exports are principally the result of the 12x ramp rate multiplier rather than being largely attributable to Ontario's uniform pricing structure; and (iii) overstated. AMPCO states that, by contrast, the impact of the Amendment on consumers – a price impact variously estimated by the IESO at approximately \$225 million, \$197 million, \$112 million and \$100 million depending on whether the effect of arbitrage is taken into account – has been understated. AMPCO notes that a number of the price mitigation mechanisms identified by the IESO are of short (the OPG Rebate and the disbursement of funds from the TR Clearing Account) or uncertain (the global adjustment) duration or are speculative (export arbitrage), and a longer term price mitigation strategy is required. AMPCO also notes that the 3x ramp rate multiplier solution is inferior to incorporation of MIO in the pricing algorithm, which is a superior solution that could be implemented at a modest cost, and is not the preferred option identified by any market participant.

In its reply argument, AMPCO submits that the evidence in this proceeding does not, contrary to the position expressed by APPrO, answer the question of whether the Amendment will result in a HOEP that more closely approximates the price that would result were the pricing and dispatch algorithms perfectly aligned. AMPCO also submits that the evidence does not address what the "true cost" of electricity might be, nor how such notion compares based on the current HOEP versus HOEP calculated on the basis of the Amendment. Moreover, given the hybrid nature of the market, prices are not in AMPCO's view expected to have more than a marginal impact on investment decisions. AMPCO also notes that, contrary to the view articulated by TransCanada, the Act does not have as one of its objectives the promotion of a competitive market.

VECC's position is that the Amendment unjustly discriminates against consumers because it results in a pricing algorithm that moves away from, rather than towards, the

prices generated by the IESO's dispatch algorithm, resulting in overall inefficiency in the setting of HOEP by unjustifiably increasing the prices consumers pay on a province-wide basis. While agreeing that the Board's role is not to "remake" the IESO's decision in relation to the Amendment, VECC submits that the Board must determine whether the decision-making process was sound and led to a reasonable result in that: the issue was clearly defined; the criteria used by the IESO were comprehensive and consistent with the purposes of the Act; and the criteria were applied on a consistent and balanced basis throughout the decision-making process. VECC argues that the IESO's characterization of the issue changed over time from a focus on the differences between the pricing algorithm and the dispatch algorithm to a focus on inefficient exports. According to VECC, there is no confidence that the Amendment is the best way to address the newly framed issue without unjustly discriminating against consumers. In VECC's view, the IESO should therefore be directed to reconsider alternative solutions to the inefficient export issue that do not unjustly discriminate against consumers by inexplicably raising domestic prices.

VECC also expressed concern regarding use of the IESO's cost/benefit analysis as the measure of economic efficiency for changes in rules dealing with the market schedule and the determination of energy prices, noting that: uneconomic exports are largely the result of the fact that Ontario has uniform pricing; the IESO has narrowly redefined the issue of economic efficiency as reducing exports to New York; certain of the benefits that the IESO has identified in relation to the Amendment are unsubstantiated; and any amendment to the market rules that increased market prices would be judged as economically efficient when based on the IESO's analytical framework.

3. *Position of the Parties on the Burden of Proof*

An issue that arose most squarely in the exchange of final written argument is the question of which party bears the burden of proof in an application under section 33 of the Act.

Certain references in the IESO's final written argument make it clear that, in the IESO's view, in an application under section 33 of the Act the burden of proof is on the applicant to demonstrate that the market rule amendment is inconsistent with the purposes of the Act or is unjustly discriminatory.

AMPCO takes a different view, and submits that the burden of proof is ultimately on the IESO to show that the market rule amendment at issue in fact satisfies the test to be

applied by the Board as set out in section 33(9) of the Act. In support of that view, AMPCO notes that a market rule amendment review is fundamentally different from a more typical proceeding before the Board in that, among other things, applicants have no ability to pursue the relief of their choice by seeking an alternative or different amendment to the one adopted by the Board of Directors of the IESO. AMPCO also notes that the 60-day timeline within which the Board must issue its order on an application under section 33 of the Act supports AMPCO's position on the burden of proof issue. It would be patently unreasonable to expect that any applicant could develop a traditional applicant's filing complete with a full array of econometric and other analyses in the time allowed.

4. *Board Findings*

a. The Burden of Proof

In applications before the Board, the burden of proof is typically on the applicant to satisfy the Board that the requested relief should be granted. The Board certainly expects that the IESO will participate fully in proceedings relating to applications under section 33 of the Act in support of the amendment that is under review. However, the Board has heard no compelling reason that would cause it to take a different approach and place the burden of proof on the IESO in the circumstances of this case.

b. The Merit of Addressing the 12x Ramp Rate Multiplier Issue

Before turning to an examination of the impact or effect of the Amendment, the Board considers it useful to provide further context regarding the history and impact of the 12x ramp rate multiplier in the marketplace. Several parties noted that, as the wholesale market was designed for implementation at market opening, inputs to both the pricing algorithm and the dispatch algorithm were aligned in relation to the value to be used to reflect the ramping capabilities of generation facilities (in both algorithms, the value of the "TradingPeriodLength" was set at 5 minutes). To this day, that remains the case for the dispatch algorithm. As noted above, however, prior to market opening the market rules were amended to allow the IESO to set a different value for the "TradingPeriodLength" parameter in the pricing algorithm as a temporary measure to address extreme real-time price excursions that occurred during market testing. This is reflected in the "Explanation for Amendment" contained in market rule amendment proposal MR-00189-R00, dated April 16, 2002, which proposed the amendment to the

market rules that would allow the IMO the discretion to set the value of the TradingPeriodLength parameter in the pricing algorithm:

The proposed amendment would permit the IMO to establish a longer Trading Period Length in the market schedule (unconstrained) to overcome the [price excursion] problems identified above. With a longer Trading Period Length within the market schedule (unconstrained), generation facilities will have large ramping capability and there will be less need to select additional higher cost resources to meet the increasing demand. As a result, less extreme price excursions will occur.

The real-time schedule (constrained) will continue to use the 5 minute Trading Period Length. Therefore, discrepancies will increase between the real-time schedule and the market schedule (unconstrained). As a consequence, congestion management settlement credit (CMSC) payments will increase. However, the decreases in energy prices, resulting from the change in the ramp time in the market schedule, are expected to offset increases in CMSC payments.

It should be noted that using a longer Trading Period Length in the determination of the market schedule is judged to be a transitional provision. It is expected that a longer term solution will need to be considered which could include a day-ahead market with unit commitment, increased generator self-scheduling, contracted ramp capability, or multi-period optimization.

The Board has not heard any evidence in this proceeding that would point to the introduction of the 12x ramp rate multiplier as having a basis rooted in market economics. To the contrary, the evidence in this proceeding is that the 12x ramp rate multiplier distorts wholesale market prices downwards and engenders adverse consequences for the marketplace in the form of generation and demand side inefficiencies. For example, dampened wholesale prices diminish incentives for conservation, load management and demand side management. The evidence in this proceeding is also that the 12x ramp rate multiplier contributes to inefficient exports. Inefficient exports, in turn, can increase the need for coal-fired generation to meet Ontario demand and thereby contribute to increased emissions. These adverse consequences were identified and discussed at some length in the evidence filed by, and the testimony given on behalf of, the IESO and APPRO, and are also discussed in the evidence filed by TransCanada. That adverse consequences flow from the 12x ramp rate multiplier was not seriously contested by evidence to the contrary filed by

AMPCO, although AMPCO did challenge the strength of any causal connection between the 12x ramp rate multiplier and inefficient exports.

The Board also notes that the 12x ramp rate multiplier issue has been the subject of comment by the Market Surveillance Panel. Specifically, the potential adverse market impact of the 12x ramp rate multiplier has been referred to or discussed in the following Market Surveillance Panel semi-annual monitoring reports, which were referred to by a number of parties to this proceeding: December 13, 2003 (covering May 2002 to October 2003); December 13, 2004 (covering the period May to October 2004); June 9, 2005 (covering the period November 2004 to April 2005); June 14, 2006 (covering the period November 2005 to April 2006); and December 13, 2006 (covering the period May to October 2006).

For example, after concluding that a significant portion of the difference between the constrained and unconstrained real-time prices, and of the remaining difference between HOEP and the unconstrained pre-dispatch price, is due to the 12x ramp rate assumption, the Market Surveillance Panel stated as follows in its December 13, 2004 report (at page 66):

The Panel is of the view that the continued understatement of the HOEP leads to inefficient decisions by both loads and generators in both the short-term and the long-term. This takes the form of an inefficient load profile and of under-investment in both conservation and generation.

With respect to the argument that the assumption that ramp rates are 12-times their true value results in a more stable HOEP, the Panel recognizes that price stability can be beneficial to market participants. The Panel observes, however, that it is open to market participants to insulate themselves contractually from price variation. Moreover, price volatility presents a profit opportunity for more price responsive generation and loads. To the extent that it is efficient to do so, volatility can be reduced by the actions of market participants. This is much better, in the Panel's view, than suppressing price variation by artificial means, especially when this has the side effect of understating the average price. The Panel strongly recommends that actual ramp rates be used to determine the HOEP.

Eighteen months later, the Market Surveillance Panel further commented on the issue in its June 14, 2006 report (at page 79) as follows:

For these and possibly other reasons, arbitrage between Ontario and New York is focused on the HOEP. The result is inefficient exports and the effective extension of the cross-subsidy inherent in Ontario's uniform price regime to New York loads. This problem has been exacerbated by market rules that, other things being equal, would have reduced the HOEP relative to prices in the constrained schedule. For example, the 12 times ramp rate assumption, which has the appearance of systematically lowering the HOEP (i.e., because it removes ramp effects in price), may simply lead to more exports than would otherwise occur.

In its most recent report, dated December 13, 2006, the Market Surveillance Panel stated as follows on page 106:

There are two major causes of socially inefficient exports from Ontario to New York. First, like privately inefficient exports, the lack of accurate price signals or information can lead to "guessing wrong" and hence socially inefficient exports ex post. Improvements in price signals should result in a higher frequency of socially efficient exports. Socially inefficient exports can also occur, however, if there are defects in the market design. Ontario's uniform pricing regime is poorly designed in the sense that it admits to the possibility that the prices that exporters pay do not reflect the incremental cost of supply. Other aspects of the unconstrained pricing algorithm such as the 12 times ramp rate assumption can further misalign the HOEP and the relevant nodal prices thereby contributing to the potential for ex post socially inefficient exports... (footnote omitted)

And again at pages 147 and 148:

Moreover, with the Global Adjustment dampening the redistributive effects of changes in HOEP and mitigating any harm that might be said to be visited upon consumers from potentially higher HOEP, the Panel contends that there may be no better time than now to address the remaining sources of inefficiency in the design of the Ontario spot market. Artificially reducing the HOEP, as is the outcome under the current market design, simply means that consumers pay more (or receive a smaller rebate) through the Global Adjustment, all the while inducing market inefficiencies from which all Ontarians lose.

The real-time price signals generated by an efficient wholesale market are central to the economic success of the new hybrid market for several reasons:

- First, the real time production and consumption decisions of many wholesale market participants will continue to be guided by real-time prices. If these price signals continue to ignore certain system realities such as transmission constraints or the actual ramping capabilities of generation facilities, they will at times induce these participants to make decisions that reduce the short-term dispatch efficiency. As we have indicated in Chapter 3, factors such as the uniform pricing system and the 12 times ramp rate assumption create a wedge between the HOEP and local shadow prices. This can result in inefficient production and consumption decisions such as the inefficient exports from Ontario to New York that we began documenting in our last report....(footnote omitted)
- Second, even though long-term investment will be guided through central planning in the near term, price signals from an efficient wholesale market can and should play an important role in guiding this planning process...Furthermore, as we have argued above, attempts to subsidize consumers by suppressing real-time prices leads to over-consumption and could ultimately lead to over-investment by the planners at [the Ontario Power Authority].

These comments reinforce the evidence in this proceeding as to the inefficiencies to which the 12x ramp rate multiplier contributes.

The observations of the Market Surveillance Panel in its most recent (December 13, 2006) report also support the assertion made by the IESO and others that addressing efficiency of the market remains a relevant objective even in the context of the hybrid framework under which Ontario's electricity sector operates at this time. Even AMPCO's expert witness, Dr. Murphy, who questioned the relevance or merits of the Amendment in light of the evolution of the market to a hybrid structure, conceded on cross-examination that improvements in wholesale market efficiency and accurate price signals are important even in a hybrid market.

The Board accepts that the 12x ramp rate multiplier, introduced as a temporary measure, has price distorting effects that can and do engender inefficiencies. The Board therefore also accepts that, in principle, there is merit in addressing the 12x ramp

rate multiplier issue if and to the extent that efficiency improvements can be expected to result, and that this is so even in the context of the hybrid market.

c. Evaluation of the Amendment as a Solution

The IESO has put forward credible evidence that the Amendment will result in greater efficiency in the IESO's real-time market as compared to the status quo. The benefits from this improved efficiency include, but are not limited to, reduced uneconomic exports to New York. The impact of this latter benefit is quantifiable, and has been quantified by the IESO. The other benefits are less easily quantified, but bear consideration nonetheless.

The Board does not agree with AMPCO's argument that the Amendment is inconsistent with the purposes of the Act and that the IESO has selectively chosen the purposes of the Act it will further while ignoring others. AMPCO asserts that the Amendment is contrary to section 1(a) of the Act ("responsible planning and management of electricity resources, supply and demand"). The Board concurs with the IESO's view that greater economic efficiency will further that objective. AMPCO also argues that the Amendment is inconsistent with section 1(f) of the Act ("protect the interests of consumers with respect to prices and the adequacy, reliability and quality of electricity service"). As discussed more fully below, the Board finds that the IESO has carefully considered the impact of the Amendment on consumers' average bills and determined that the impact is likely to be relatively modest. It may even be positive. The IESO has also noted that, while there may be a modest impact on consumers' bills, the Amendment is consistent with the purpose of protecting the interests of consumers with respect to the adequacy and reliability of supply.

There is no evidence before the Board in this proceeding that would lead the Board to take issue with the assertion made by the IESO and others that improvements in the economic efficiency of the electricity system in Ontario will promote adequacy and reliability of supply by providing more accurate price signals and triggering more appropriate price responsive behaviour. The same can be said for the assertions that the Amendment will encourage conservation, load management and demand side management and will, by reducing inefficient exports, also reduce the need for coal-fired generation to meet Ontario demand and thereby contribute to a lessening of emissions.

AMPCO and VECC both assert that the "3x myopic" Amendment is, by the IESO's own submission, inferior to a "1x MIO" solution. They support this view by reference to

documents that were prepared by the IESO at various times in the Amendment development process. They submit that this is a valid basis on which the Board should revoke the Amendment.

The Board does not accept that view. Although it is obvious that the IESO reviewed several alternatives in the course of developing the Amendment, it has consistently taken the position in this proceeding that a “3x myopic” rule is superior to a “1x MIO” option. This conclusion appears in the document issued by the Board of Directors of the IESO when the Amendment was approved, and it is supported by the IESO’s and APPRO’s experts. Other than referring to earlier assessments that the IESO does not currently support, AMPCO and VECC provided no evidence that “1x MIO” is a superior solution.

d. The Anticipated Impact on Consumer Bills

The Board has also considered the possible impact of the Amendment on consumers’ electricity bills.

As noted above, the IESO has calculated that the net annual cost to consumers of adopting the 3x ramp rate assumption in the pricing algorithm is \$6.68 million, or 0.004 cents/kWh. That calculation is based on the following assumptions and estimates:

- an average annual HOEP of \$49 per MWh (the average price in 2006);
- an increase of 2.6% in the average HOEP as a result of the Amendment, before consideration of mitigating factors;
- mitigation of 50% of the estimate increase in HOEP due to “export arbitrage”;
- mitigation of 80% of the net price increase (that is, after the export arbitrage effect) due to the global adjustment and the OPG Rebate; and
- reductions in CMSC payments and Intertie Offer Guarantees that are paid through uplift charges.

In its calculation of the net consumer impact, the IESO also takes into account a planned distribution to consumers of approximately \$54 million from the IESO’s TR Clearing Account. The Board does not believe that this particular distribution is

appropriately considered as a mitigation measure in relation to the Amendment. Elimination of this particular mitigation measure does not affect the Board's overall assessment of the Amendment.

Dr. Rivard of the IESO testified that, on the basis of additional analysis on the elasticity of export response, the export arbitrage effect on HOEP would likely be higher than 50%, which would reduce further the net cost of the Amendment to consumers. He noted that were the export arbitrage effect to reach approximately 65%, and keeping the other assumptions the same, the impact of the Amendment would be a net reduction in consumers' bills.

AMPCO disputes most of the assumptions and estimates that underlie the IESO's calculations. It claims that the IESO's estimates are unreliable, although it provided little evidence about the estimates it believes should be used.

Predicting the net effect of the Amendment on consumer's bills is a complex exercise and is not something the Board believes can be done with precision. The Board does, however, view the IESO's calculation as an indicator of the order of magnitude of the net effect of the Amendment. The Board agrees with AMPCO that the base price of \$49 per MWh, which is the starting point of the IESO's calculation, is low by historical standards. The Board notes, however, that the IESO provided additional information on a range of net consumer costs using higher average HOEPs. The Board also acknowledges AMPCO's comment that the OPG Rebate is scheduled to expire in two years. Even if the OPG Rebate is discontinued at that time, the IESO has estimated that the global adjustment would still provide significant price mitigation, approximately 60% compared to the current 80% from the combined global adjustment and OPG Rebate.

The Board finds that the expected impact on consumers' bills is relatively modest. The IESO's published calculation shows a very minor impact – just 0.004 cents/kWh – based on estimates that the IESO considers to be conservative. Even if a higher base price were used (an average annual HOEP of \$70 per MWh based on 2005 prices), and assuming no replacement for or extension of the OPG Rebate in two years, the estimated net impact would be larger but still relatively small. The difference resulting from the use of a higher base price relative to use of the lower one would be much less than 1/10th of a cent/kWh.

e. Conclusions

The Board concludes that the efficiency benefits that are anticipated to arise as a result of the Amendment are consistent with the purpose of the Act that speaks to promoting economic efficiency in the generation, transmission, distribution and sale of electricity. The Amendment also supports the purposes that relate to encouraging electricity conservation, demand management and demand response; ensuring the adequacy, safety, sustainability and reliability of electricity supply in Ontario; and protecting the interests of consumers in relation to the adequacy and reliability of electricity service. While the Board acknowledges that the Amendment may result in an increase in average consumer bills, that increase is anticipated to be modest.

The Board is also of the view that, in the context of its mandate under section 33 of the Act, unjust discrimination means unjust economic discrimination.

Based on the record of this proceeding, the Board finds that the Amendment is consistent with the purposes of the Act. The Board also finds that the Amendment does not unjustly discriminate for or against a market participant or a class of market participants.

Other Matters

1. *Stay of the Amendment Pending Appeal*

By the terms of the Board's February 9, 2007 Order, the stay of the operation of the Amendment applies pending completion of the Board's review of the Amendment. Issuance of this Decision and Order completes the Board's review, and has by the terms of the Order the effect of lifting the stay. For greater certainty, however, the Board will include an order to that effect in this Decision and Order.

In its final written argument, AMPCO requested that, in the event that the Board does not revoke the Amendment, the Board order a stay of the Amendment pursuant to section 33(6) of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* pending appeal to the Divisional Court.

In the letter accompanying its final written argument, the IESO noted that this request for relief was not included in the Application and is out of time. While the IESO therefore did not address this request in its final written argument, the IESO did in its

letter express the view that the Board does not have jurisdiction to grant such relief, and that if AMPCO wants a stay it must apply to the Divisional Court. APPRO's position is to the same effect.

In the circumstances of this case, the Board has decided not to extend its February 9, 2007 order staying the operation of the Amendment.

The Board understands that the IESO may wish to proceed with implementation of the Amendment on a timely basis, and that parties that are supportive of the Amendment would be equally supportive of prompt implementation. However, the Board does not believe that it is in the best interests of the wholesale electricity marketplace to face the prospect of the Amendment being implemented one day and suspended shortly thereafter further to the invocation of a judicial process. The Amendment is not urgently required for reasons such as reliability and the ramp rate issue is one that has been outstanding for several years. In the circumstances, the Board expects that the IESO will act responsibly by allowing AMPCO a reasonable opportunity to request judicial recourse prior to taking whatever steps may be required to implement the Amendment. The Board similarly expects that AMPCO will act responsibly by ensuring that any request for a stay of the operation of the Amendment that it may wish to make to the Divisional Court is made without undue delay.

2. *New Obligations for IESO under its Licence*

In its final written argument, AMPCO requested that the Board require the following, either under an existing condition of the IESO's licence or by way of a new licence condition:

- that the IESO prepare and submit to the Board, for every proposed market rule and market rule amendment, a report supported by appropriate analysis and available to the public, that explains how the proposed rule or amendment is consistent with the objects of the IESO and promotes the purposes of the Act; and
- that, in relation to the Amendment and such other market rules or market rule amendments as the Board considers appropriate, the IESO report publicly on an annual basis with respect to whether and the extent to which the amendments have met the IESO's objectives and provided the benefits anticipated by the IESO at the time each of the amendments were made.

In the letter accompanying its final written argument, the IESO noted that this request for relief was not included in the Application, is out of time, was not dealt with in any way in this proceeding and is entirely inappropriate.

Whatever the Board may think of AMPCO's request on the merits, the Board does not consider it appropriate to address the request at this stage in the proceeding. The issue of new reporting requirements for the IESO in relation to amendments to the market rules was not raised by AMPCO on a timely basis, and the other parties to this proceeding will not have had a fair opportunity to consider and respond to the request. AMPCO may, if it so wishes, pursue this matter further outside the context of this proceeding.

3. *Cost Awards*

Parties eligible for an award of costs, as identified in Procedural Order No. 2, shall submit their cost claims by April 24, 2007. A copy of the cost claim must be filed with the Board and one copy is to be served on the IESO. The cost claims must comply with section 10 of the Board's *Practice Direction on Cost Awards*.

The IESO will have until May 8, 2007 to object to any aspect of the costs claimed. A copy of the objection must be filed with the Board and one copy must be served on the party against whose claim the objection is being made.

A party whose cost claim was objected to will have until May 15, 2007 to make a reply submission as to why its cost claim should be allowed. Again, a copy of the submission must be filed with the Board and one copy is to be served on the IESO.

The Board will issue its decision on cost awards at a later date once the above process has been completed.

THE BOARD ORDERS THAT:

1. The Application by the Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario for an order under section 33(9) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* revoking the market rule amendment identified as MR-00331-R00: "Specify the Facility Ramping Capability in the Market Schedule" and referring the amendment back to the IESO for further consideration is denied.

2. The stay of the operation of the market rule amendment identified as MR-00331-R00: "Specify the Facility Ramping Capability in the Market Schedule", as ordered by the Order of the Board dated February 9, 2007, is lifted.

DATED at Toronto, April 10, 2007.

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Original signed by

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary

APPENDIX A

to

**Decision and Order
April 10, 2007**

**Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario
Review of Market Rule Amendment
EB-2007-0040**

Excerpt from Transcript of Oral Hearing Held March 29, 2007

(see attached document)

1 our binder. I apologize, it might just be me, but the
2 record, the decision does not bear out the quote that that
3 included.

4 MR. RUPERT: Mr. Rodger, I was going to mention, I
5 think the page 5 reference, at least as I read it here,
6 didn't refer to the page that was doing what you thought it
7 did. Maybe there is a cross-reference issue in your
8 submissions.

9 MR. RODGER: I'll certainly check that. Sorry, Mr.
10 Rupert.

11 MR. KAISER: Why don't you have a look now, and see if
12 you can help us.

13 MR. RODGER: Mr. Chair, we'll endeavour to get copies
14 during the lunch break.

15 MR. KAISER: All right. We'll take the lunch break
16 now. We'll come back at 2 o'clock.

17 --- Recess taken at 12:34 p.m.

18 --- On resuming at 2:11 p.m.

19 **DECISION:**

20 MR. KAISER: Please be seated.

21 The Board has decided to issue a decision now on the
22 matter of the relevance of the evidence with respect to the
23 process, rather than deferring it, as Mr. Rodger suggested,
24 in order that we can proceed with the case in a more
25 orderly manner.

26 We are dealing with an application by AMPCO under
27 section 33(4) of the *Electricity Act* for review of the
28 three times ramp rate market rule amendment. In that

1 context there has been a discussion and a concern about the
2 scope of the case, and particularly whether evidence
3 regarding the process by which the IESO reached this rule
4 is relevant.

5 AMPCO submits that the three times ramp rate market
6 rule amendment should be revoked by this Board and referred
7 back to the IESO for stakeholder consultation, based on the
8 following grounds: First, that the process followed by the
9 IESO in the three times ramp rate stakeholder consultation
10 process violated IESO's common-law duty of procedural
11 fairness, by breaching AMPCO's legitimate expectation that
12 the IESO would follow its published stakeholder engagement
13 process and apply its stakeholder engagement principles,
14 and raising a reasonable apprehension of bias that the IESO
15 favoured the interests of generators; secondly, that the
16 integrity of the statutorily-mandated consultation process
17 has been undermined. They say this is inconsistent with
18 the purposes of the *Electricity Act* and unjustly
19 discriminates against Ontario consumers in favour of
20 Ontario generators.

21 They also allege certain substantive failures, as
22 well, which are not at issue in the proceeding this
23 morning.

24 Accordingly, AMPCO argues that the materials produced
25 by IESO relating to procedural matters are relevant both to
26 the issue of procedural fairness and also the substantive
27 issues.

28 The starting point in this discussion is section 33(9)

1 of the *Electricity Act*. It has been referred to by
2 virtually everyone this morning. It provides that:

3 "If, on completion of its review, the Board finds
4 that the amendment is inconsistent with the
5 purposes of this *Act*, or unjustly discriminates
6 against or in favour of a market participant or a
7 class of market participants, then the Board
8 shall make an order revoking the amendment on the
9 date specified by the Board and referring the
10 amendment back to the IESO for further
11 consideration."

12 AMPCO argues that all of the IESO materials are
13 relevant because they demonstrate that the IESO failed to
14 follow procedural fairness in developing the amendment.
15 According to AMPCO, the lack of procedural fairness
16 demonstrates that the amendment unjustly discriminates
17 against its members in favour of generators.

18 In other words, AMPCO argues that it has rights of
19 natural justice in IESO rule-making and that those rights
20 should be enforced by the Board in the market review
21 amendment process.

22 All of the other parties appearing before us this
23 morning state that this is an incorrect interpretation of
24 section 33(9), because it equates the term "unjustly
25 discriminates" with a violation of the rules of natural
26 justice and it equates the Board's review process with a
27 judicial review application.

28 They argue that the purpose of the Board's review in a

1 market review amendment should be aimed at economic
2 efficiency and not natural justice.

3 They say that the OEB should be reviewing an amendment
4 to the IESO rules and not the IESO stakeholdering process;
5 that the scope of the Board's review should be aimed at the
6 rule itself, and the impact of that rule, not the process
7 by which the amendment was made.

8 In other words, it's argued before us that the issue
9 is whether the rule is unjustly discriminatory. The Board
10 agrees with that position.

11 Sections 19(1) and 20 of the *OEB Act*, read together,
12 provide that the Board has general authority to determine
13 any question of law or fact arising in any matter before it
14 except where that authority is limited by statutory
15 provision to the contrary.

16 In the case of a market rule amendment, another
17 statutory provision does limit the Board's jurisdiction.
18 Section 33(9) of the *Electricity Act* specifically sets out
19 certain grounds on which the Board may make an order.

20 Accordingly, we find that section 33(9) of the
21 *Electricity Act* is a jurisdiction-limiting provision, not
22 another jurisdiction-granting provision. That is, with
23 respect to a market rule amendment, the Board's
24 jurisdiction is not as broad as suggested by section 20 of
25 the *OEB Act*, but limited by section 33(9) of the
26 *Electricity Act*.

27 In this regard, the Board has also considered the
28 submissions of various parties, and agrees, that the 60-day

1 time limit for disposing of this review is consistent with
2 the conclusion that the Board's scope of review is limited
3 to the criteria set out in section 33(9).

4 The legislature can be taken as having known that an
5 exhaustive review of the process would render it impossible
6 to meet these timelines.

7 We then come to what can be seen as a second and
8 distinct issue. That is whether there is a common-law
9 principle of administrative law that the IESO has violated
10 in the course of this market rule amendment process which
11 yields a separate and distinct remedy.

12 The IESO says the common-law principles of
13 administrative law do not assist AMPCO in extending the
14 jurisdiction of the Board to review the details of the
15 stakeholdering process. They say that the IESO is a
16 statutory corporation whose affairs are managed and
17 supervised by an independent board of directors, and the
18 functions carried out by the IESO under the review at issue
19 in this proceeding is a rule-making function and is
20 essentially a legislative function.

21 They rely upon the Supreme Court of Canada's 1980
22 decision in the Inuit Tapirisat as support for the
23 proposition that in legislative functions these rules do
24 not apply.

25 AMPCO takes a different view and it relies upon the
26 Supreme Court of Canada 1990 decision in Baker, as well as
27 the Divisional Court decision in Bezaire.

28 The aspects of the decision that AMPCO relies upon can

1 be found at pages 15 and 14, where the Court stated that
2 one of the criteria that must be looked at in determining
3 whether the rules of natural justice apply to a process is
4 whether the parties had a legitimate expectation that those
5 rules would be followed. The Court states, in part:

6 "Fourth, the legitimate expectations of the
7 person challenging the decision may also
8 determine what procedures the duty of fairness
9 requires in given circumstance."

10 They go on to say:

11 "This doctrine as applied in Canada is based on
12 the principle that the circumstances affecting
13 procedural fairness take into account the
14 promises or regular practices of administrative
15 decision-makers and it would generally be unfair
16 for them to act in contravention of
17 representations as to procedure or to backtrack
18 on substantive promises without according
19 significant procedural rights."

20 The Court also noted that another factor to be
21 considered in determining the nature and extent of the duty
22 of fairness that's owed to the parties is the importance of
23 the decision to individuals involved.

24 As has been pointed out, there's no question that
25 there's a significant amount of money involved in this
26 decision; it's an important decision. With respect to the
27 expectations of the parties, there is a provision in
28 section 13.2 of the *Electricity Act* requiring the IESO to

1 establish processes by which consumers, distributors and
2 generators may provide advice. AMPCO makes the point that a
3 framework was established to govern the process by which
4 these rules would be amended and implemented. They say
5 that this procedure, despite the expectation they were
6 entitled to, has not been followed.

7 That may or may not be the case, but this Panel is of
8 the view that that is not a matter for our consideration.
9 Mr. Vegh in his submissions questioned whether the Board
10 should be a parallel Divisional Court. We don't think it
11 should be.

12 IESO may or may not have followed the rules of natural
13 justice. And they may or may not have been required to do
14 so based upon the different authorities that have been
15 cited by the different parties. But that, we believe, is a
16 matter to be determined by the Divisional Court, not the
17 Ontario Energy Board.

18 Mr. Rodger did refer us to a decision of this Board on
19 September 20th, 2005. That appears at tab 11 of Ms.
20 DeMarco's brief. I'm reading in part:

21 "The Board concludes that stakeholder concerns
22 have been substantially met. The true test will,
23 however, be the experience of stakeholders in the
24 new process. Stakeholders and the Board will
25 have opportunities to review how well the process
26 works over time as they are implemented. The
27 Board therefore approves the IESO proposals on
28 its stakeholdering process. It should be noted,

1 however, that this approval relates to the
2 processes that the IESO has proposed. It does not
3 change the Board's obligation to review IESO
4 programs that have implications for IESO fees,
5 expenses and revenue requirements, even when
6 these programs have been subjected to the IESO
7 stakeholdering process."

8 Mr. Rodger's submission was that having approved the
9 stakeholdering process it was incumbent upon the Board to
10 follow through and police, if you will, the rule-making
11 process.

12 We differ on that. The two are distinct functions.
13 The review at question is a judicial review and best
14 reserved for the courts.

15 That leads us to the Order requested. Pursuant to
16 this decision, the Board will order that any evidence
17 relating to the stakeholdering process be struck. That
18 would include Mr. Rodger's submission of March 26th. If
19 the parties are unable to agree on what evidence is to be
20 excluded or not excluded, the Board may be spoken to.

21 That completes the Board's ruling in this matter.

22 **PROCEDURAL MATTERS:**

23 Mr. Rodger and Mr. Mark, we were going to suggest,
24 subject to your convenience, that you may want to adjourn
25 for the rest of the day and regroup in light of that.

26 MR. MARK: It probably makes sense.

27 MR. KAISER: Unless there be some debate and
28 discussion as to what evidence is to be struck and what