

Distribution System Code Report of the Task Force

As one of the co-chairs of the Distribution System Code Task Force I would like to take this opportunity to report to the Board and to Board staff on the process utilized in the development of the Draft Distribution System Code and the compilation of the Task Force's Summaries of Recommendations.

The Report of the Task Force being submitted for your consideration is the result of countless hours of Task Force debate and discussion. An understanding of the group dynamics, guiding principles and processes should be of assistance in your consideration of these documents.

The Process

In April of 1999, over thirty industry stakeholders responded to Ontario Energy Board's invitation to participate on the Distribution System Code Task Force. We are fortunate that the Board's invitation attracted and maintained interest from a representative cross-section of all the electrical distributors in the province in addition to all other major stakeholders with an interest in distribution matters. The attached list of participants indicates the spectrum of industry involvement.

At our first meetings, Ontario Energy Board staff provided orientation and explanation of the Board's mandate and, in general terms, the desired outcome of the project. It was recognized immediately that the task at hand required a somewhat systematic approach, given the large number of participants and the breadth of the items to be dealt with.

The full Task Force developed an initial issue list. The issues were then grouped together into common themes, with items being added as discussions advanced. Task Force members volunteered for sub-group participation based on issue groupings. Six main sub-groups were in operation at one time or another over the past year with most members doing double or triple duty. The sub-groups included Expansions

homogenous approach, it was decided that sub-groups would report to the full Task Force on a regular basis.

The full Task Force met every second week, with sub-groups meeting once or twice in the interim. A common format was adopted for sub-committee reports known as a Summary of Recommendation or, SOR. These summaries make up the Report of the Task Force and record the essence of the deliberations on the various issues.

The Task Force's process of decision-making was democratic in nature with recommendations being put forward on a simple majority basis. Opportunity to have dissenting opinions recorded was available on all recommendations, as you will note in the companion document. This process was front ended with a consensus-building environment that allowed for open and often spirited debate.

In reading the Report of the Task Force, one should be cognizant of the time span over which the recommendations were developed and all the other initiatives that were advancing in parallel to the DSC Task Force work. A good portion of our discussions took place in advance of policy decisions or code development on performance based regulation and associated rate handbook, retail settlement and standard supply service.

We were ever mindful of the pending decisions on these issues and avoided, wherever possible, showing prejudice or in any way pre-empting the work of other groups charged with related but separate mandates.

As decisions were made in areas, and some major ones did come late in our tenure, we adapted our thinking to them and tried to ensure that the Draft Code reflected the most current body of related knowledge. We did not however, retrace our steps back through the Summaries of Recommendations to edit them in view of up-dated information.

Principles and Practices

The overriding criteria or recurring litmus test in the development of all of our recommendations, was one of striking a balance. We consistently found ourselves

practices are in the area of system expansions, offers to connect, connections, alternative bid options for customers, metering requirements and requirements related to the anticipated increase of embedded generation. An area of the code that is less foreign to distributors in practice, but is new as terms of being a requirement is that area dealing with system operation and maintenance. We have attempted to preserve all that is good in our existing system while recommending changes to accommodate the new realities.

We drew on many sources for guidance when charting into these new areas. The work of the Market Design Committee and examples of practices from other electrical jurisdictions were often referenced in our deliberations. The Task Force's consideration of other codes, Market Rules, license requirements and the *Energy Competition Act* itself, was continuous in developing recommendations.

Acknowledgements

It was my observation that Task Force members considered all stakeholder interests in their deliberations, regardless of who they represented in an employment or consultant relationship. The Task Force was to ensure that the code was not an impediment to the new market place. I believe we have accomplished this and indeed maximized the opportunities available within the new business context.

This demonstration of the professional integrity of the individuals involved should give the Board comfort in presenting the Report of the Task Force to the public. The Task Force is looking forward to stakeholder scrutiny, and as was the case in our deliberations, recognizes that peer review will only enhance the product.

It has been a pleasure working with my co-chairs, John Alton of Lincoln Hydro and Ron LaPier of Sarnia Hydro. Special thanks to Board Staff member Kirsten Walli, whose participation in all our meetings provided valuable input and insight into other Board activities. Tanya Bodell of PHB Hagler Bailly, provided the expertise required to spin code language from the flax of our recommendations.

Many dedicated people provided immeasurable time and energy to this project and on their behalf I respectfully submit the fruit of their labour.

Distribution System Code Task Force Membership

Alton, John	Lincoln Hydro Electric Commission
Angemeer, Mike	Hydro Mississauga
Au, Stephen	Toronto Hydro
Bell, Kevin	Great Lakes Power
Brown, Graham	Ontario Power Generation
Forsyth, John	IntraLynx
Gatien, Rene	Guelph Hydro
Godfrey, Thomas	Sault Ste Marie PUC
Henderson, Kevin	Caledon HEC
Cesarin, Curtis	Caledon HEC
Hendry, Robert	H.V. Engineering
Keith, Gary	Deep River Hydro
Kraul, Randy	Lucan Granton HEC
LaPier, Ron	Sarnia Hydro
Marcucci, Peter	Electrical Safety Authority
Olechna, Ted	Electrical Safety Authority
Mychailenko, George	Brantford Hydro
O'Neill, John	Municipal Electric Association
Pasche, Lorne	Welland Hydro
Reade, Richard	Enterprise Canada

Savage, John	Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology
Scott, Jane	Ottawa Hydro
Vaiciunas, Darius	Collingwood PUC
Van Overberghe, Luc	Measurement Canada
Villanueva, Gerry	Direct Energy Marketing
Zapp, Angela	Schlumberger

Additional Task Force Sub-group Membership

Bacon, Bruce	Econalysis/Power Workers Union
Bailey, Kevin	Welland Hydro
Brockman, Bob	Ontario Hydro Services Company
Clarke, Wayne	Ontario Hydro Services Company
Potter, George	Ontario Hydro Services Company
Salt, Ron	Ontario Hydro Services Company
Yamashita, Gerry	Ontario Hydro Services Company
Butler, Jim	Hydro Mississauga
Charon, Dan	Chatham Hydro
Colangelo, Lou	Toromont
Gardiner, Christopher	Schlumberger
Hutchins, Mary	Econalysis/Power Workers Union

Flores, Denise	Toronto Hydro
Trafford, Don	Ottawa Hydro
Vanderheide, Tim	Sarnia Hydro
Wright-Hilbig, Rhonda	IMO