

Meeting Summary



Regional Planning Process Advisory Group

Meeting Date: January 19, 2015

Time: 9:30 am – 4:00 pm

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

The Meeting Summary provides a high level review of the discussion at the Regional Planning Process Advisory Group (RPPAG). All materials relating to meetings held by the RPPAG are available on the OEB [webpage](#).

Attendees:

Contact Information	Organization	Representative	Email
Bing Young	Hydro One Networks Inc. (Transmitter)	Regional Infrastructure Planning - Lead	Bing.Young@HydroOne.com
Bob Chow	Ontario Power Authority	Integrated Regional Resource Planning - Lead	Bob.Chow@powerauthority.on.ca
Ahmed Maria	IESO	Agency / System Operator	Ahmed.Maria@ieso.ca
Kazi Marouf	Guelph Hydro Electric Systems Inc.	LDC	kmarouf@guelphhydro.com
Bruno Pereira	Milton Hydro Distribution Inc.	LDC	brunopereira@miltonhydro.com
Wade Morris	Cornerstone Hydro Electric Concepts Association Inc.	LDC	wadem@innisfilhydro.com
Dan Charron, Irv Klajman	Electricity Distributors Association (EDA)	LDCs	dan.charron@entegrus.com irv.klajman@powerstream.ca
Edith Chin M. Sc.	Enbridge Gas Distribution	Gas	Edith.Chin@enbridge.com
Jake Brooks	Association of Power Producers of Ontario (APPrO)	Generators	jake.brooks@appro.org
Geoff Lupton	Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)	Municipality	Geoff.Lupton@hamilton.ca
Iain Angus	Iain Angus	Northern Region	iangus@thunderbay.ca

Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome & Introduction

Opening remarks

Introduction of Facilitator

2. Overview of Session

3. Group's Purpose and Scope of Work

- a. What is our process? How do we identify and deal with issues
- b. Review and refine Issue Identification template
- c. Discussion of Stakeholder Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary Roles
- d. Define the need and role of each
- e. Qualifications of group membership

4. Finalize ToR

5. Schedule next Meeting

1. Board Staff Overview

Board staff provided the RPPAG with an overview of the Regional Planning; the role of the group; the role of Board staff

- Information relating to the development of the regional planning process. Details as to the objective set out for the industry to support the application submitted by LDCs to ensure that their planning is more informed and achieves best value solutions for the rate payers.
- First year completion of regional planning activities identified lessons learned and initial adjustments/improvements made to the process by the PPWG. General response from the industry has been positive and overall view is that the industry feels more informed in the planning and coordinating these activities.
- Enhanced understanding of the process Leads – distributions and transmission. The RIP is delivering overall resource solutions to all participants.

Advisory Group Objectives:

- Communications – expected to act as a representative and engage with your constituency
- Enhancing the Regional Infrastructure Planning process

OEB / Board Staff Role:

- Facilitate not own this process
- We are the link to the Board to support advancing the process where needed through Code.

Prior to the meeting Board staff sent the RPPAG a draft Terms of Reference (ToR). This document was intended to bring focus to the group's discussion. The RPPAG members agreed to provide input / views or pose questions for each section of the document.

The following is therefore a summary of the member's discussion which include the member's general understanding of the role of the RPPAG ; the identification of *in scope* and *out of scope* work; and reflects consensus on specific matters relating to RIP. Lastly the notes reflect items that would require further discussion at the next scheduled meeting.

2. Meeting Item(s)

The specific process elements highlighted as 'key' by the PPWG are outlined in the Planning Process Working Group's Final Report (p. 17):

1. *Predetermined regional boundaries*: to develop the mechanism to review the boundaries and develop the process to amend
2. *Identifying the information distributors should be required to provide to the transmitter and the frequency it should be updated.*

In endorsing the PPWG process the Board issued a number of Code amendment that include data frequency and requirements (criteria). The RPPAG in considering the importance of this element of the RIP process is in agreement that it should on a go forward basis:

- a. Assess if there have been any changed since the process was established.
- b. Review data requirements from time to time based on input from the industry
- c. Develop a mechanism to acquire information from industrial customers
- d. Consider the benefits for unregulated entities to forward information on load forecasting and if needed develop the mechanism to collect the information

3. *Determining the role of the IESO in the Regional Infrastructure Planning process:*

To be reviewed further.

4. *Identifying the appropriate evaluative criteria to compare potential solutions to address regional needs.*

Evaluative Criteria: to review the criteria(s) already established in support of the RIP as needed.

5. *Establishing the form in which broader engagement should take place before a Regional Infrastructure Plan is finalized.*

The RPPAG members identified a number of activities to ensure there is sufficient engagement and identified the benefits it would have to inform the members of any process issues, identify process gaps. It will also afford its constituents the opportunity to express matter concerning the process.

Number of points for further discussion and agreement were:

- Type of Engagement
 - What are the types and purposes for the engagement?
- Ownership
 - Whose role is it to carry out engagement?
 - What is the mechanism to review efficacy of the engagement?
- Method
 - Process to determine if and how the engagement impacts deliverable in RIP.
 - *[Note related to item #9]: Communications about regional planning - How will the RPPAG reach the various audiences – newsletter, outreach, etc.*
- Issue
 - Avoid duplication in engagement activities; leverage engagement by other “Groups”.

6. *Identifying how it should be determined if a distributor's involvement is needed in the Regional Infrastructure Planning process.*

This is established in the amended Codes. [Resolved And Addressed, no further action required]

7. *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, no further action required]

This is established in the amended Codes

LDC are all required to participate in the planning process to include embedded LDC

- Establish when your role is one of being a stakeholder or an active participant at the table.
- For First Nation Communities it is expected that "participation" occurs through the engagement activities. (see item #5)

8. *Providing input on Filing Requirements related to Regional Infrastructure Planning.* The established process has a number of products and requirements to support LDC filings. [Resolved And Addressed, no further action required at this time].

- a. Needs Assessment Report - where LDC involvement is not required in RIP process;
- b. Regional Plan Status Letter - where LDC involvement is required in RIP and/or IRRP process but RIP is not yet complete at time of application filing;
- c. Regional Infrastructure Plan - where LDC involvement is required in RIP and/or IRRP process and RIP completed at time of application filing; and

The RPPAG may consider a review (lessons learned) of these inputs as well as to identify gaps [Test cases to establish if more will be needed].

Note: The Board only requires the RIP to be filed. The IRRP is not required to be filed. The RPPAG will monitor and identify if there is a need to require the IRRP be filed.

9. *The approach to increase transparency in the regional planning process; and Increase transparency.*

Any increase in transparency would be achieved through the activities discussed in Item # 5 - Broader Engagement

10. *Proposed changes to Board's regulatory instruments needed to support the process for Board's consideration.*

The RPPAG is expected, as part of the "in scope" work, to c to make recommendations to the Board that may result in further amendments to Codes.

Additions to List

11. First Nations and Metis to be represented in the RPPAG.

Issue Identification Template:

- The RPPAG members accepted as the tool to be implemented by the RPPAG (See Appendix 2).

Stakeholder Chair/Vice-Chair/Secretary of the RPPAG:

- Role of Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary were discussed. Members volunteered in the respective roles for a term of 2 years (See Appendix 3).

Term of RPPAG members:

- Consensus reached that the term would be for 2 years.

Meeting Frequency and Preparation:

- Consensus reached – RPPAG Chair to propose meeting dates and solicit agenda items from the members

3. Items for discussion:

1. Role of Board staff.
2. RPPAG Annual Review: This was not fully discussed and remains a pending item to complete the ToR.
3. The need for coordination of other industry advisory groups. RPPAG to perform an industry wide scans on other group's activity / communication.
4. Prioritization of Appendix 1 – RPPAG Activity Table: Process to review and determine highest importance of activity to be undertaken by the RPPAG.
5. Identified but requires further discussion: First nation to be a representative in the RPPAG.

4. Future Meetings

- March 3, 2015
- April 14, 2015