October 28, 2026

Request for Feedback

Gas-Electric Co-ordination Information Sharing (EB-2025-0227)

Introduction

The OEB requests feedback from forum participants to help finalize its gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework. Written responses are due by email to gaselectricforum@oeb.ca by November 13, 2026, and submissions will be posted on the OEB's WebDrawer.

The OEB is seeking:

1. **Geography**: Feedback on whether a regional or hotspot approach should be advanced for gas-electric co-ordination.
2. **Geography**: Feedback on how the initial subset of regions and/or hotspots should be selected, including specific examples.
3. **Standardized templates**: Volunteers to help develop the standardized templates using examples and parameters provided by the OEB.
4. **Standardized templates**: Examples of existing information-sharing templates.
5. **Information access**: Feedback on how non-utility participants, including municipalities, Indigenous communities and transit agencies, would use the 11 information types, including how this information would inform non-utility energy forecasting or planning.

Additional information is provided below to inform participants' feedback. Respondents are also encouraged to refer to the OEB's progress report and presentation deck for additional information.

Geography (Questions 1 and 2)

Background

Currently, gas and electricity planning do not use the same planning boundaries. Common boundaries are needed for meaningful co-ordination and information sharing. For example, forecast assumptions (e.g., weather, population, etc.) are only comparable if they are based on the same geographic planning area.

The OEB will establish common geographic areas for gas-electric co-ordination information sharing. This will inform where co-ordination occurs and how information should be segmented before it is shared. The OEB is considering two options: (1) regional or (2) hotspot approach.

Commonalities Between the Two Options

Both options involve gas-electric co-ordination information sharing an initial subset of five regions from Ontario's existing 21 electricity planning regions (refer to the IESO's presentation on how regions could be selected). Under both options, the OEB will encourage municipalities, Indigenous communities and transit agencies (hereafter collectively referred to as "non-utilities") in the selected regions to share information with utilities that serve them using standardized templates (see questions 3 and 4, below). The OEB will require utilities[1] to demonstrate they have considered the information received in their planning and applications to the OEB, where relevant. Utilities and the IESO will share information with non-utilities, where appropriate (see question 5, below).

The differences between the two options pertain to how gas and electricity utilities would segment and share their information with each other. The participation of non-utilities is identical between the two options, as described above.

Option 1: Regional

Under a regional approach, utilities operating within the same region (in the initial subset of five regions) would segment their planning information (i.e., the 11 information types, where relevant) to fit within the regional boundary and share it with other utilities in the that region. Most electricity utilities already segment or are familiar with segmenting their information to fit within the electricity planning regions.

Gas and electricity utilities would be required to discuss data similarities, differences and other co-ordination matters in the regional Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings. Where needed, additional utility-to-utility meetings and information sharing would be encouraged but not required. Where service territories overlap, utilities would be required to demonstrate that they have considered the information shared by others in their applications to the OEB.

Relative to the hotspot approach, described below, a regional approach would, generally, involve a larger number of utilities and provide broader visibility into energy trends across a wider area. It would also result in gas planning information that is more directly comparable with electricity regional planning information. However, because information would be considered across a larger geographic area (e.g., GTA North) it may provide less detail and be less relevant to specific local infrastructure needs than information shared at a more granular, hotspot level (e.g., City of Markham).

[1] Utilities refer to natural gas and electricity transmitters and distributors.

Option 2: Hotspot

Under the second option, one or more hotspots would be identified within the initial subset of five regions. A hotspot could be a municipality or portion of a distribution service territory where gas-electric co-ordination information sharing provides high value. Utilities operating within the same hotspot would segment their planning information to fit within the hotspot boundary and share it with other utilities in the hotspot (rather than in the entire region).

Utilities in the same hotspot would be required to meet to discuss data similarities, differences and other co-ordination matters. Outcomes, especially those with regional implications, would be brought to the regional TWG meetings for discussion. Utilities in the hotspot would demonstrate that they have considered the information shared by others in their applications to the OEB.

The main difference from the regional approach is that utility co-ordination and the discussions at the TWG meetings would focus on specific hotspot areas or municipalities. This approach would involve more granular information (e.g., municipal-level assumptions) that could be more relevant to local infrastructure discussions and decisions. For example, greater data granularity could enhance the comparability between assumptions in electricity Distribution System Plans and natural gas Leave to Construct applications. However, in general, this approach would involve smaller geographic areas and, therefore, involve fewer utilities. The shared information would also have less direct comparability with electricity regional plans. Under this approach, the hotspots identified would need to be reviewed regularly to ensure the co-ordination remains targeted to highest value areas.

Request for Feedback

The OEB is seeking feedback on:

1. Whether option 1 (regional) or option 2 (hotspots) should be advanced. Responses should provide a rationale and consider the impacts on utilities, infrastructure decisions, and the objective of avoiding overbuilding and underbuilding gas and electricity infrastructure.

2. How the initial subset of regions and/or hotspots should be selected, including specific examples. Responses should consider the IESO's presentation on this topic.

Standardized Information Sharing Templates (Questions 3 and 4)

Background

The OEB has identified 11 information types for gas-electric information sharing. Standardized templates will be developed to support the sharing of this information between gas and electricity utilities, the IESO, municipalities, transit agencies and Indigenous communities. These templates will support data comparability and use in energy planning, by ensuring it is

shared based on consistent characteristics such as formatting, units, granularity and timeframe. The granularity of information shared by utilities will also be impacted by the "geography"' consideration above.

As a starting point, OEB staff is developing example templates to support the sharing of the 11 information types. The Regional Planning Process Advisory Group (RPPAG)[2] and volunteers from the forum, as the future users of the templates, will help revise them, under guidance from the OEB, to enhance their practicality and usefulness. The templates will be subject to OEB approval, before being finalized.

Due to differences in data availability and use cases, there will be differences between the information shared by utilities, the IESO, municipalities, Indigenous communities and transit agencies. Table 1, below, describes the OEB staff's views about the types of information that planners should share with each other (subject to change as part of template development).

Table 1: Examples of information sharing responsibilities

Information Types	Shared between gas utilities, electricity utilities and IESO	Shared by municipalities and Indigenous communities with utilities	Shared by transit agencies with utilities	Shared by utilities and IESO with non-utilities
1) Forecasted Demand		✓	✓	Responses to question 5, below, will help determine the information non-utilities need from utilities and the IESO
2) Historic Demand		✓	✓	
3) Forecasted Customer Connections		✓	✓	
4) Heating Split	✓			
5) Heat Pump	✓			
6) Weather	✓			
7) Economic Growth	✓	✓		
8) Population	✓	✓		
9) Housing	✓	✓		
10) Fuel Switching and Electrification	✓	✓	✓	
11) Sector Trends and Public Policy	✓	✓	✓	

Request for Feedback

The OEB is requesting:

3. Volunteers to help develop the standardized information sharing templates. Volunteers should have technical expertise in the energy forecasting of utilities, municipalities, Indigenous communities or transit agencies. The RPPAG will be tasked with supporting the development of templates, therefore, members of the RPPAG do not need to

[2] The RPPAG is an existing advisory group comprised of gas and electricity utilities, the IESO and other planning experts. The OEB will task the RPPAG with supporting template development. This work is expected to begin in November 2026.

volunteer again.

4. Examples of existing information-sharing templates, for example, templates your organization currently uses to share information with utilities. The OEB aims to leverage existing templates, where relevant.

Information Access (Question 5)

Background

The OEB supports direct information sharing using the standardized templates, provided that planning entities get access to the information needed to enable co-ordinated and integrated planning. The OEB notes that information sharing requires significant effort, and the benefits must be proportionate to the associated costs to ratepayers and its burden on participants. As the regulator of gas and electricity utilities and the IESO, the OEB is familiar with how utilities and the IESO will use the information they receive from others.

However, the OEB is seeking input to better understand how information shared by utilities and the IESO would be used by municipalities, Indigenous communities and transit agencies in their planning. This feedback would help the OEB understand what information non-utilities need, who should receive it, when and how it should be shared, and what should be publicly available.

Importantly, the OEB notes that it plans to require utilities to demonstrate, in the evidence they file, that they have considered gas-electric co-ordination, as well as the information shared with them in their rate applications and facility applications to the OEB. This evidence would be publicly available and can be reviewed by interested parties to support their participation in the OEB's adjudicative processes.

Request for Feedback

The OEB is seeking feedback on:

5. How non-utility participants, including municipalities, Indigenous communities and transit agencies, would use each of the 11 information types, including how this information would inform non-utility energy forecasting or planning. Respondents should provide specific examples.