



Meeting Summary

Regional Planning Process Advisory Group

Meeting Date: February 14, 2017 **Time:** 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: 2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor, Main Boardroom

Attendees:

RPPAG Members: Iain Angus (City of Thunder Bay), Bob Chow (IESO), Edith Chin (Enbridge), Alexander Constantinescu (HONI), Wayne Dyce (Centre Wellington Hydro/CHEC), Ajay Garg (HONI), Ray E. Quinn (Northern Region), Ismail Sheikh (London Hydro/EDA), Tom Wasik (Hydro One Brampton), Michael Whittemund (Guelph Hydro), Bing Young (HONI)

OEB Staff: Ashley Dawn Hayle, Andres Mand, Azalyn Manzano, Andrew Stewart

Meeting Agenda:

1. Review of Last Meeting Notes
2. Meeting Items
 - a) Finalize Draft Terms of Reference (ToR)
 - b) Appoint Interim Chair
 - c) Draft Conceptual Outline for Workshop
3. Next Meeting

1. Review of Last Meeting Notes

Members approved the final document for posting on the OEB website without changes.

2. Meeting Items

a) Finalize Draft Terms of Reference (ToR)

Group had the following comments and suggestions for the ToR:

- RPPAG Scope of Work:
 - A member suggested that rather than waiting to receive feedback from case managers regarding the value and the impact of regional plans in supporting applications, that the Group should actively request information from case managers.
 - It was also noted that the Group would not be soliciting feedback from intervenors.
- RPPAG Member Support:
 - A member raised the point of finding an alternate where appropriate, as some members may not be able to find alternates who are as well versed in the electricity sector or regional infrastructure planning. The Group accepted this as an amendment to the ToR.
 - There was some discussion regarding the approval process for alternate members in conjunction with Appendix 3B.
 - Group agreed to remove Appendix 3B.
 - Members are expected to find their own alternates and ensure the transfer of knowledge, as expected professionalism.
- Decision Making:
 - The Group agreed that alternates will not be able to vote, but can cast a proxy vote for the original member.
 - There was some discussion about whether only the Chair could bring up a recommendation, since the language in the ToR says "...at the time that the Chair tables a recommendation to the RPPAG..."
 - A member noted that there is nothing preventing a member from putting forward a recommendation, even if the Chair is the one tabling it.
 - There was also some discussion of the difference between the "Not accepted" outcome versus the "Return to Group for additional examination".

- OEB staff suggested that “Not accepted” immediately closed the door on the recommendation, while “Return to Group” meant the recommendation would be examined again before deciding whether or not to close the door on it.
 - The last bullet should specify “RPPAG” rather than “Group”.
- Stakeholder Chair/Vice-Chair/Secretary of the RPPAG:
 - Delete the phrase “non-OEB” members, as OEB staff is not considered official members. One member remarked that when the OEB created the RPPAG, the OEB was not listed as a member group.
 - Grammar correction for the first sentence in the third paragraph “...to the role of Vice Chair of the RPPAG.”
 - The Group discussed staggering the terms of the Chair and the Vice-Chair so that they do not end at the same time.
 - It was noted that only five of the original members of the group were left, raising issues of continuity.
 - A Group member recommended adding a paragraph to say efforts would be made for continuity, so as not to bind the Group to the idea of staggered terms.
- Composition/Term
 - One member raised the fact that the terms for most group members were ending, and whether or not the meeting was actually legitimate.
 - OEB staff raised the issue of how members could express their interest in being reappointed to the RPPAG.
 - A member suggested that perhaps it would not be ideal to re-issue the letter expressing a call for nominations given the Group’s attrition and concerns regarding the Group’s knowledge base.
 - A member brought up the discussion in the previous meeting about appropriate nominations from the sector, including small LDCs, the North, HONI and IESO.
 - A member mentioned that they had previously sent some names from potential LDCs to OEB staff, and that they would re-send them.
 - A member suggested that some language be added to the ToR to say that current members’ terms are extended until replacements are appointed. The member also asked if there should be a formal message from the RPPAG to the OEB to let them know the

members' two-year terms have ended and to ask for reappointment.

- OEB staff asked members to confirm their appointment dates, including the new members who just started.
 - There was also some discussion about whether replacements would re-start the clock on their terms or if they took over the term of the person they were replacing, since this could be a way for an LDC to continue to appoint successors, rather than allowing new LDCs to come in.
 - This precipitated a discussion on the composition of the Group. The Group has had some turnover in the past two years, and replacements have been made by the OEB with OEB staff serving as surrogate decision-makers. A member observed that the original letter for the Group said that OEB staff would select the representatives.
 - A member noted the lack of representatives from the East.
 - Given that the composition touches on the mandate of the Group, and that the membership of the Group is to be decided by the OEB, the Group decided to ask the OEB Executive Sponsor to provide some guidance regarding the composition and the terms for new appointees/reappointments/replacements. Members can decide only the Chair and Vice-Chair themselves.
 - The Group suggested adding a section under Term regarding the replacement of a member during their term.
- Appendix 1:
 - Delete Priority 2 in the RPPAG Activity Table
 - A member pointed out that it would be a good time to review the first cycle of regional planning, before the next cycle starts, and that it would be good to have a timeline for what products the RPPAG could put out at the right time, since some things required a lead time (e.g. surveys).
 - A member suggested putting the Work Plan for next year in a different document, rather than the ToR.
 - Add the activity items identified in the last meeting to the list, update the list to reflect completed items in a separate table.
 - Appendix 2:

- There was some discussion about the value of having Appendix 2 in the ToR.
 - OEB staff stated that the Issues Identification Template had originally been included to provide a high level overview of how the Group identified issues.
 - A member suggested putting the Issue Identification Template in a different document than the ToR.
 - OEB staff suggested deleting Appendix 2 but to include some reference in the ToR that speaks to the RPPAG’s role to develop and implement a process to put issues and recommendations forward.
 - Group wished to review and update the Issue Identification Template. To better align with their needs.
- Appendix 3:
 - Delete Irv Klajman entry in the Member list, given his retirement.
 - Replace London Hydro with Electricity Distributors Association (EDA), as Ismail Sheikh, while part of London Hydro, is representing the EDA.
 - Members to confirm total term served and interest to be extended as a member for 1 year.
 - For Appendix 3a, put in Interim Chair.
 - There was some discussion as to whether this section should be in the ToR since the member list would have to be updated, and the ToR is meant to be an enduring document.
 - Note the Chair and Vice Chair in separate Appendix – “Member List”
 - Delete Appendix 3b
“.
- Appendix 4:
 - A member suggested that Appendix 4 should be a separate document, but with a note in the ToR to say that the Group will have an evaluation process.

Action Items:

1. OEB staff will revise the ToR as per the Group’s instructions and send the final draft out for approval.

2. Member will send the list of recommended LDCs and representatives to OEB staff.
3. Members to confirm their dates of appointment to OEB staff.
4. OEB staff will consult with the OEB Executive Sponsor regarding guidance as to the terms and composition of the RPPAG.

b) Appoint Interim Chair

There was some discussion about how to elect members, voting requirements, and term for Chair and Vice Chair.

- Group initially thought to elect a Chair in the interim for 6 months to allow for other RPPAG membership activities to be completed (i.e. new members).
- OEB staff noted that the process to appoint new members may take some time and RPPAG should consider extending the interim period for 1 year. This would allow for the incumbent to assist the elected member with transitioning.
 - How many missing members? Answer – 3
 - How many vacancies? Answer – further discussion suggesting there may be 3 vacancies; 2 LDCs; 1 Other
- A member requested clarification on OEB staff being Chair as in some respect OEB staff would be most attuned to what the Board is thinking, may be good link.
 - OEB staff noted that Chair should be the representative of the group and Board staff works and supports the Chair – the Chair role is mostly listening whereas the original five members seem to do a lot of the talking.

Discussion on Term for Chair (and Vice Chair)

- Group decided that these appointments are two year term and this appointment should be permanent. Need to consider how assist with the transfer (extend term to allow incumbent to transfer knowledge).
 - Note: Reflect transition period in the ToR
- OEB staff note that perhaps the Chair or Vice Chair could be selected one from the foundation group and the other from the newer group of members.
- A member proposed that individuals offer their application which would be reviewed by the executive and then put forward to the group for a vote – also wondered if the RPPAG has the mandate to select the Chair and Vice Chair.
 - OEB Staff confirmed that the selection of Chair and Vice Chair is the responsibility of the group

Nominated Members

- Bing Young (Angus Nomination, second by Chin)
- Iain Angus (Dyce Nomination, second by Bing)

Vote Unanimous:

- 1 year term
- Group noted that for any voting it needs 2/3 quorum – which we have

c) Draft Conceptual Outline for Workshop

The workshop concept changed to a discussion on the current task activities that may need to be initiated, or expanded on to ensure it continues to meet its objective as a Committee.

1. Annual Update on RIP Report (HONI and IESO)

There was some discussion on reporting on all the Regional Planning completed.

- OEB staff informed Group that annually IESO and HONI as the lead transmitter file a report in November to the OEB. Last year IESO and HONI gave a presentation to the Group in the spring; suggest this as a recurring event.
 - A member noted that the first annual report of the RPPAG was a presentation to the Board panel composed of Chair, Vice Chair and maybe a few others and with IESO provided update and questions.
 - A member separately discussed that the IRRP part of the presentations may be interesting to the Group, but be slightly different to the needs of the group.
 - A member inquired as to whether or not reporting to the Board is mandatory? Is there an expectation by the Board for a presentation in May/June timeframes? The Group needs a starting point – what has worked and not worked. What has been done in the 21 regions? Is the Board looking for a State of the Union kind of report or something else?
 - OEB staff suggests that the purpose for this is to, as stated in the scope of work (ToR) that the Group review from time to time how the process is working. After 3 years, what works and what does the industry think needs to be changed?
 - Group agreed that a “lessons learned” presentations needs to be delivered by each representative groups (i.e. transmitter, LDC, generator) at the next meeting. Based on the findings from this presentation will help the

Group decide on next steps, which include presenting its findings to the Board.

2. RPPAG Review (Efficacy)

The discussion expanded to what other elements / information needed to report on the RIP process.

- Need to Survey OEB case managers and panel for feedback
- Need to Survey RIP participates and interest group constituents; and indigenous groups.

Group agreed the planned outcome from the review is to deliver a “Letter or Summary Report” to the Board (June 2017) to include: experience of Hydro One, IESO and LDCs; as well as identified issues and proposed recommendations.

Action Items:

1. A member to send a list all LDCs who received a Status Letter
2. A Member to include an Appendix on Local Planning in the PPWG Report
3. Members to contact constituents (complete survey/provide feedback)
4. Members to provide list of questions for the OEB panel/case managers. OEB staff to support the Group with the survey.
5. Group to review LTEP

3. Next Meeting

The next two meetings has been tentatively requested to be in May 2017, with and June, 2017. OEB staff is to send proposed dates.