



Meeting Notes

Regional Planning Process Advisory Group (EB-2020-0176) RPPAG Meeting #5

Meeting Date: July 14, 2021

Time: 9:30 am – 3:00 pm

Location: Ontario Energy Board
Zoom

Attendees:

RPPAG MEMBER

ORGANIZATION

Riaz Shaikh

Alectra Utilities

Charles Conrad

Association of Power Producers of Ontario (APPrO)

Amber Crawford

Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO)

Iain Angus

Common Voice Northwest

Faisal Habibullah

Elexicon Energy

Ajay Garg

Hydro One Networks

Ahmed Maria

Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO)

Devon Huber

Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO)

Travis Lusney

Non-Wires Solution Working Group

Michael Brophy

Pollution Probe

Mark Rubenstein

School Energy Coalition

Matthew Higgins

Toronto Hydro-Electric System Ltd.

Chris Codd

Versorium Energy



Ontario Energy Board staff

Ryan Holder

Chris Cincar

Jason Craig

Natasha Gocool

These notes summarize the discussion during the working group meeting and key points of the issues presented in the published materials.

Meeting Agenda

1. Introduction:

- OEB staff outlined the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the following:
 - Draft RPPAG Recommendations – IESO-related
 - Access to the Asset Demographic List information
 - Load Forecast Standardization Guidelines with an update by the subgroup
 - ‘Other’ Potential RPPAG recommendations

2. RPPAG Recommendations – IESO-related and ‘Other’

- A table summarizing the OEB staff’s understanding of the RPPAG’s response to the IESO’s Final Report recommendations was circulated to the RPPAG members prior to the meeting for review.
- RPPAG members provided feedback on changes they felt were required and/or stated their approval of the RPPAG recommendations as it was drafted.
- In relation to the recommendation for OEB staff to prepare a document explaining the OEB’s cost responsibility rules, one member suggested it should not be a “plain language” and, rather, it should be drafted as a “technical” document since it is for LDCs. OEB staff noted that such a document would be prepared for a broader audience – not only LDCs. Another member also expressed the view that it should be “easy to understand” because Commercial & Industrial (C&I) customers that connect to the system often do not fully understand the OEB’s cost responsibility rules.
 - OEB staff noted that a plain language document had been previously prepared that provided a synopsis of the changes to the Transmission System Code in 2005 and it would be circulated to the RPPAG members to provide an idea of what OEB staff intended in referring to “plain language”.
- In relation to the cost recovery issue related to DERs (i.e., disincentive to use a third-party provider), since there was uncertainty in terms of timing based on the discussion in the [FEI letter](#) on “priority workstreams” – Workstream #1 (i.e., related to “incentives”) or a “future phase” (i.e., related

to “renumeration”) -- the RPPAG requested that OEB staff seek clarification from the OEB management lead on the Framework for Innovation (FEI) initiative.

- *Note: These meeting notes do not attempt to provide a detailed discussion of all the RPPAG member feedback on each IESO-related recommendation. The track changes reflected in the revised table that was circulated to the group on August 12th attempts to summarize that discussion (i.e., where the group landed). Only those that triggered action items are discussed above.*
- Some “Other” additional recommendations were proposed by members which included the following:
 1. Recommendation for broader sharing of planning information.
 - It involved IESO publicly sharing detailed planning data and information, to support stakeholder analysis that could be used in an OEB application process.
 - It was also suggested that IESO explain how the planning information is used in decision making on the recommended solution.
 - IESO noted they are currently working on developing a process to share more planning information with stakeholders but are still discussing internally the specific planning information. IESO asked the group not to be prescriptive in terms of the information.
 2. Increase coordination with other “planning” processes including bulk planning, distribution planning, municipal planning and natural gas planning.
 - This would help provide a better understanding for the OEB when reviewing applications.
 - Travis Lusney (Non-Wire Solution WG) and Amber Crawford (AMO) committed to work together in drafting a more detailed recommendation and sharing the document with the group.
 3. In the regional planning process, identify existing hydro electric capacity that is not being utilized (i.e., spilled) in northern Ontario.
 - The member proposing it saw it as a valuable information tool for planning purposes in identifying capacity that is available to use.
 4. Recommend the IESO and OEB coordinate processes for regional planning and other related processes.
 - Build on the one pager created for DER purposes to describe the linkages in more detail between all the IESO and OEB processes that are related to regional planning
- OEB staff noted that the ‘other’ recommendations including any further proposed recommendations that are circulated after the meeting will be

incorporated into the revised table with the IESO related recommendations for RPPAG member review.

Key Discussion: RPPAG members provided feedback on the initial draft table that provided a summary of the RPPAG’s recommended approach to address each IESO-related recommendation. OEB staff committed to incorporate that feedback in a track change version of the table. so the changes would be clear to the group. A summary of the “other” additional recommendations being proposed by RPPAG members would also be incorporated in the table to consolidate all recommendations in one document. OEB staff will circulate the revised table reflecting the RPPAG recommendations before the next meeting. OEB staff will also circulate a plain language document previously prepared for another initiative and obtain clarity on the DER cost recovery issue that is to be addressed by the FEI WG.

Action Item: OEB staff will undertake to do the following

- Draft a track change version of the table setting out the RPPAG recommendations and circulate it to the members for review and discussion at the next meeting. It will reflect feedback on the IESO related recommendations during this meeting as well as any new “Other” recommendations that RPPAG members suggest be considered by the group
- Circulate an example of a plain language document that was previously prepared for members to review some of it in order to be better understand the type of language intended for the Cost Responsibility document
- Consult internally and report back to the group to clarify *when* the cost recovery issue related to DERs/non-wire alternatives (i.e., non-LDC owned scenario) will be addressed by the FEI WG (i.e., Workstream #1 or future phase after Workstream #2).

3. Load Forecast Standardization Guidelines- Subgroup Update

- An update to the group was provide by Matthew Higgins (Toronto-Hydro) on the Load Forecast Standardization Guidelines.
- A [presentation](#) on the update was circulated to the group for review prior to the meeting and is posted on the OEB’s RPPAG webpage.
- It was noted that the Subgroup had conducted three meetings and found that scope and guiding principles are a primary focus before attempting to standardize aspects of the load forecast.
 - The scope and guiding principles will focus on maximizing efficiency, effectiveness and adaptability of regional planning while investigating opportunities for alignment of regional planning with other forecast processes.

- The subgroup will strive to ensure there is adequate flexibility, so the guidance can be used in each region.
- A member stated that the subgroup should use scenario-based planning (i.e., low vs. high).
- Another member indicated there are challenges related to forecasting DERs over the medium- to long-term as they have seen material deviations in what has actually happened versus what was expected.
- The subgroup provided a list of key areas to take into consideration for load forecasting.
- It was also noted that they felt the scope of their work should be expanded to provide a recommendation on the Annual Review.
- The subgroup also discussed revisiting the Load Forecast Option it had recommended (and the RPPAG agreed with) at the previous meeting.
- OEB staff raised a concern related the Annual Review being revisited since the RPPAG reached a conclusion on that matter. Staff noted that the subgroup was behind schedule on its intended scope of work in taking a step back with Guiding Principles still being discussed at the third meeting.
 - OEB staff noted the excerpt from the prior Meeting Notes would be circulated where the RPPAG reached a conclusion on the Annual Review issue.
 - OEB staff further noted that another excerpt from previous Meeting Notes would also be circulated where the subgroup made a compelling recommendation to adopt Option 2 and set out the reasons for recommending that option.
- OEB staff added that it was important for the Load Forecast subgroup to remain cognizant of the fact that the subgroup was limited to large LDCs (i.e., London Hydro the smallest) and all LDCs in Ontario will ultimately need to implement the Guideline, including those that are quite small and do not have the same capability and resources to prepare load forecasts.

Key Discussion Outcome: The Load Forecast subgroup provided an update in developing the Guideline. Since the last RPPAG meeting, the subgroup felt there was a need to take a step back and focus on the key considerations, scope and guiding principles first due to a wide range of views within the subgroup. Future meetings will include a review of the current load forecast methodologies used by certain LDCs and the IESO. They will then develop recommendations on key issues and the draft Guidelines for RPPAG member review by October 2021. The subgroup does not anticipate providing an update at the next meeting (Meeting #6) but will provide an update at Meeting #7. Key target dates are as follows

- Develop recommendations on key issues (*August-September*)
- Drafting process to develop proposed load forecasting guidelines for review by the broader RPPAG (*September-October*)

Action Item: OEB staff to circulate excerpts from prior Meeting Notes where the RPPAG reached a conclusion on the following issues: (1) Annual Review; and (2) Load forecast option.

4. Access to Asset Demographic List- HONI Update

- Agreement to date was the Asset Demographic list information will not be kept confidential, nor will the sharing of the information be limited to the IESO. However, the information will also not be posted publicly for anyone to have access without any conditions due to system security considerations.
- The focus of the discussion was therefore on how access will be provided to interested stakeholders and the basis upon which it will be provided (i.e., middle ground between keeping information confidential and full public access).
- OEB staff noted the interconnected [New York ISO \(NYISO\)](#) appears to provide a model that could be used for Ontario, which can be modified as needed.
- OEB staff asked the RPPAG members if they had any concerns with using a similar model to NYISO's. Members agreed to use NYISO's as a basis, but it should be less stringent given the nature of the Asset Demographic information relative to information being shared by NYISO.
- Members enquired who the 'host entity' would be and asked if the host entity would control who can access the information.
 - OEB staff noted that, if the RPPAG were to remain consistent with neighboring markets (e.g., NYISO), it would be the IESO and the IESO would be responsible for establishing a process to access the information.
- It was suggested that the RPPAG make a recommendation to the IESO in relation to determining how to best implement making the information accessible to stakeholders.
 - IESO indicated they would canvas opinions from the ESL/EOL subgroup in terms of how to make this information available to stakeholders.
- Another member asked what happens if a stakeholder is denied access to the information. It was suggested that a process be created for when this situation occurs and IESO's process should include explaining why it was denied.

Key Discussion Outcome: RPPAG members agreed the Asset Demographic information should be available to interested stakeholders on a conditional basis similar to NYISO's approach and the information should be centralized with the IESO as the repository. Given the nature of the Asset Demographic information, access does not need to be as stringent as NYISO's involves "critical" information – expected service life of assets is not similarly sensitive. Members also felt there needs to be a process

developed for a potential scenario where IESO denies access to a certain stakeholder (like a dispute resolution process).

Action Item: No action at this time.

5. Next Steps and Action Items

- OEB staff noted the next meeting will focus on striving to finalize the RPPAG Recommendations (“IESO-related” and “Other”) and, if time permits, discuss the format of the document setting out the recommendations that will be submitted by the RPPAG members for review by the OEB Executive team.
- OEB staff also identified that the next meeting would be held the week of August 16th.

Action Items (OEB staff):

1. Draft a track changes version of the table setting out the RPPAG recommendations and circulate it to the members for review and discussion at the next meeting. The table will reflect feedback on the IESO-related recommendations during this meeting as well as any new “Other” recommendations that RPPAG members propose for consideration by the group.
2. Circulate a plain language document so members can review some of it for the purpose of better understanding the type of language that is intended for the document explaining the OEB’s Cost Responsibility rules (that the RPPAG is recommending OEB staff prepare).
3. Consult internally with OEB management overseeing the FEI initiative and report back to the group to clarify when the cost recovery issue related to non-wire alternatives (i.e., non-LDC owned scenario) will be addressed by the FEI WG (i.e., Workstream #1 or future phase after Workstream #2).
4. Circulate excerpts from prior Meeting Notes related to load forecast standardization to identify where the RPPAG reached a conclusion on the following issues: (1) Annual Review; and (2) Load forecast option.

Action Items (RPPAG Members):

1. Review revised draft table reflecting a summary of the RPPAG Recommendations for discussion at the next meeting.
2. Review enough of the sample plain language document prepared by OEB staff (Synopsis of Changes to the TSC) to get a flavour of the type of language.
3. If any RPPAG member wants to propose an “Other” recommendation for consideration, circulate it to the group for discussion at the next meeting.

Next RPPAG Meeting: August 19, 2021