

Meeting Summary



Regional Planning Process Advisory Group

Meeting Date: March 3, 2015

Time: 10:00 am – 4:00 pm

Location: 2300 Yonge Street, 25th Floor, ADR room

Attendees:

RPPAG Member	Organization	Representative
Bing Young	Hydro One Networks Inc. (Transmitter)	Regional Infrastructure Planning - Lead
Bob Chow	IESO	Integrated Regional Resource Planning - Lead
Ahmed Maria	IESO	Agency / System Operator
Kazi Marouf	Guelph Hydro Electric Systems Inc.	LDC
Bruno Pereira	Milton Hydro Distribution Inc.	LDC
Wade Morris	Cornerstone Hydro Electric Concepts Association Inc.	LDC
Dan Charron, Irv Klajman	Electricity Distributors Association (EDA)	LDCs
Edith Chin	Enbridge Gas Distribution	Gas
Jake Brooks	Association of Power Producers of Ontario (APPrO)	Generators
David Butters	Association of Power Producers of Ontario (APPrO)	Generators
Geoff Lupton	Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)	Municipality
Ray E. Quinn	Ray E. Quinn	Northern Region
Iain Angus	Iain Angus	Northern Region

Meeting Agenda

1. Discussion Item(s)

- a. Board Staff – Meeting Objectives
- b. Review and confirm Previous Meeting
- c. Summary Overview of the Regional Planning process (RIP & IRRP).
- d. Regional self sufficiency

2. Meeting Items

- a. Clarify scope of RPPAG with respect to RIP and IRRP
- b. Finalize ToR
- c. Prioritization of Appendix 1
- d. Commence First Priority item(s)
- e. Coordination of other industry advisory groups

3. Wrap up

4. Future Meeting

1. Discussion Item(s):

A. *Board Staff – Meeting Objectives*

OEB staff presented the expectation regarding the leadership of the RPPAG.

Group is expected to drive the discussion and agenda to examine the appropriate processes and products needed to support the Board regarding regional planning.

- i. OEB staff intended to provide support and liaison with the Board.
- ii. RPPAG are as representatives (engaging with the industry) with respect to their industry constituents and are expected to convey back discussions of the RPPAG and bring forward any feedback.
- iii. When the RPPAG members would be asked to present to the OEB periodically
- iv. Today's meeting to complete the ToR and what staff will be doing with that final draft.

B. *Review and confirm Previous Meeting*

OEB Staff reviewed the Previous Meeting Summary notes. RPPAG Members provide some final edits. The final draft is to be reviewed by the Chair and Vice Chair prior to its posting on the OEB Webpage.

C. *Summary Overview of the Regional Planning process (RIP & IRRP).*

Bing Young provided an overview of the Regional Planning process (RIP & IRRP). The overview provided context on why the PPWG was established and what were the key objectives for the regional planning process. The process developed by the PPWG was reviewed, including key deliverables for the transmitter and the IESO, and a status update of the regional planning activities was provided.

Action - Distribute to the RPPAG:

1. the generic Regional Planning process timeline chart;
2. the Overview presentation; and
3. the Transmitter Annual status report.

It was noted that Northern Ontario is unique in that the differentiation between the IRP and IRRP is not as obvious.

D. *Regional self sufficiency*

Kazi Marouf led a discussion on regional self-sufficiency. Highlights of the issues discussed included:

- To what extent and how do self-sufficiency initiatives such as community sustainability programs, distributed generation, district energy, net zero building designs etc. be reflected in regional planning;
- New approaches and funding models will need to be considered as well as more clarity on “who pays”;
- What degree of engagement is required from stakeholder groups and how do we make this engagement effective. How can this be resourced and funded appropriately?;
- Ways to create better coordination and alignment between municipal planners and LDC planning. Electricity and energy planning not always at the forefront of regional and municipal planning, including timing, planning cycles and needs requirements;
- Better information to the municipality from the LDC to help the municipality understand why this is important – needs a coordinated effort to address;
- The different perspectives from different regions of the province (e.g. Northern Ontario used to be self-sufficient as a Region);
- More coordination between gas and electricity to address local energy supply that is cost effective and what processes are needed to support the integration; and
- Customers adopting local solutions with emerging technologies independent of regional planning activities.

2. Meeting Item(s)

A. *Clarify scope of RPPAG with respect to RIP and IRRP*

Bing initiated the discussion on the RPPAG scope and inquired whether focusing on only the RIP process and not on the IRRP process was too narrow in scope given that many of the discussions so far involve issues and aspects beyond just the RIP process. There were subsequent discussions on what the scope should involve including:

1. RIP only;
2. RIP + IRRP (the 4 steps as proposed by PPWG); or
3. Broader aspects of regional planning beyond RIP & IRRP.

The suggestion adopted by the group was to develop the ToR first for just the RIP scope and once that is established, then subsequently (possibly 6 months later) review the need to expand the scope.

B. *Finalize ToR*

Various aspects of the Terms of Reference were discussed including:

- a) Comments on Issues Identification Template
 - Add a field to identify the source of the request.
 - Add a bullet to identify the person or party who is expected to resolve the issue.

b) Identified but requires further discussion

- First Nation and Metis should be represented in the RPPAG. The RPPAG to develop a process to ensure proper representation and engagement with this group as discussed in item #5. It was suggested that the OEB Chair issue an invitation letter to the FN & Metis group representative to participate on RPPAG.
- Mapping exercise to identify the linkages and other inputs in planning to ensure there is effective coordination.
- Customer focus on energy planning i.e. municipality and development community.
- Annual Review: This was not fully discussed and remains a pending item to complete the ToR. What are effective ways to measure the efficacy of the group (tasks completed, issues resolved, feedback from constituents etc.).
- Maximum number of members of the Group, and selection of delegates for member absences.

C. Prioritization of Appendix 1

Commence First Priority item(s) – did not start this activity (Attached List)

- Use Appendix 2 - Issue Identification Template (Attached Template)

D. Coordination of other industry advisory groups

The need for coordination of other industry advisory groups - did not start this activity

3. Wrap Up

No.	Action Item(s)	
1.	January 19 th Meeting Notes to be Posted	OEB
2.	March 3 rd Meeting Notes Drafted and Reviewed by RPPAG	RPPAG
3.	Final ToR: To be reviewed and approved	OEB
4.	Priority action item No. 2: OEB Staff to Draft letter to First Nations and Metis	OEB
5.	Priority action item: Work on action item No. 3 - Form of Broader Engagement	RPPAG
6.	Distribute generic timeline for the Regional Planning process steps	OEB
7.	Distribute Regional Planning Overview Presentation and Transmitters Annual Report	Hydro One

4. Future Meetings

The next RPPAG meeting will be on April 14, 2015

Appendix 1 – RPPAG Activity Table

Priority	Process Flow Type	PPWG Identified Process (May '13)	Status as of March 6, 2015
	Activity - Ongoing	1. Review regional boundaries and the criteria used to establish them;	
1	Activity / Decision	2. <i>Confirm the ToR</i>	Requires Final Review and Approval
2	Activity	3. First Nation and Metis to have a representative in the RPPAG. The RPPAG to develop a process to ensure proper representation and engagement with this group.	Letter of invitation from the OEB Chair on behalf of the RPPAG.
3	Activity	4. Review: Establishing the form in which broader engagement should take place before a Regional Infrastructure Plan is finalized;	
4	Activity	5. Review the Municipal Planning process and how it informs regional infrastructure planning. – <i>Invite the AMO planning rep (working technical session for the RPPAG)</i>	
5	Data Input	6. Identifying the information distributors should be required to provide to the transmitter and the frequency it should be updated;	
6	Activity	7. Identify the appropriate evaluative criteria to compare potential solutions to address regional needs	
7	Activity	8. The approach to increase transparency in the regional planning process;	
8	Decision	9. Proposed changes to Board's regulatory instruments needed to support the process for Board's consideration.	
	Activity	10. Identifying how it should be determined if a distributor's involvement is needed in the Regional	Resolved And Addressed

		Infrastructure Planning process;	
	Decision	11. Identifying whether the Board should “require” or “expect” distributors to participate in the Regional Infrastructure Planning process where the transmitter determines their involvement is necessary;	Resolved And Addressed
	Data Input	12. Providing input on Filing Requirements related to Regional Infrastructure Planning;	Resolved And Addressed
	Decision	13. Determining the role of the OPA in the Regional Infrastructure Planning process;	Resolved And Addressed

Appendix 2 - Issue Identification Template

What is the process issue?	Why is this an issue?
Describe the nature of the process issue. What are the triggers giving rise to the issue? Can you specifically define the process outcomes or results making this an issue? How does this issue impact integrated regional planning and its success?	What region does this impact? For each constituent represented in the RPPAG what specific process elements are important? Who are the individuals or organizations that have a stake or concern with this issue?

What are the risks if the issue is not addressed?	Who is involved in resolving the issue?
What are the risks from a technical view? What are the risks from a social view? What are the risks from an environmental and/or economic view? What are the risks from a process perspective?	Who is an enabler of mitigation actions? Who is an influencer of mitigation actions? Who is the audience of mitigation actions? Who is the decision maker?

Issue Presented: Individual Member RPPAG Member OEB Staff

--

Conclusion / Resolution

--

Supporting Activities