ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

September 29, 2026

Report to the Minister

Gas-Electric Co-ordination Information Sharing

Ontario

Ontario Energy Board

Table of Contents

1. Executive summary 4
1.1 Purpose 4
1.2 Progress to date 4
1.3 Outcomes & next steps 5

2. Introduction 5

3. Progress 7
3.1 Context 7
3.2 Project and consultation launch 7
3.3 Discussion paper 8
3.3.1 Background 8
3.3.2 Objectives of co-ordinated planning 8
3.3.3 Background on energy planning and co-ordinated planning 8
3.3.4 Co-ordinated planning proposals 9
3.4 Forum meetings 9
3.5 Enhanced Indigenous engagement 9
3.6 Questionnaires 10

4. Modelling best practices and other forum feedback 11
4.1 Context 11
4.2 Modelling best practices 11
4.2.1 Background 11
4.2.2 Use of a broad set of forecasting inputs 11
4.2.3 Incorporate local and community planning information 12
4.2.4 Use of scenario-based planning to address uncertainty 13
4.3 Participant support for gas-electric co-ordination 13
4.4 Participant concerns 14
4.5 Participant recommendations for framework design 15

5. Outcomes and draft framework 15
5.1 Context 15
5.2 Project alignment: Linkages to other OEB initiatives 16
*5.3 **Objectives**: Goals and outcomes 17*
5.3.1 Background and forum input 17
5.3.2 Outcomes and approach 18
*5.4 **Geographic planning boundaries**: Regions within which co-ordination would occur 18*
5.4.1 Background and forum input 18
5.4.2 Outcomes and approach 20
*5.5 **Information type**: Gas and electricity planning information that should be shared 21*
5.5.1 Background and forum input 21
5.5.2 Outcomes and approach 21
*5.6 **Standardized templates**: File formats and procedures for information sharing 23*
5.6.1 Background and forum input 23
5.6.2 Outcomes and approach 23
*5.7 **Information sharing**: Approach and timing for transferring and accessing shared information 24*
5.7.1 Background and forum input 24
5.7.2 Outcomes and approach 25
*5.8 **Information discussion**: Ongoing gas-electric co-ordination meetings 26*

5.8.1 Background and forum input 26
5.8.2 Outcomes and approach 26
*5.9 **Information application**: How gas-electric co-ordination information sharing should impact planning 27*
5.9.1 Background and forum input 27
5.9.2 Outcomes and approach 28

6. Conclusion and next steps 28

7. Appendix 1: Detailed stakeholder and Indigenous participant feedback 29
7.1 Context 29
7.2 Current state, outcomes and objectives 30
7.3 Information scope and management 31
7.4 Information discussion and use of shared information 33
7.5 Other considerations 34

1. Executive summary

1.1 Purpose

The Ontario Energy Board (OEB) initiated a gas-electric co-ordination information sharing forum in January 2026 in response to the Minister of Energy and Mines' Directive to the OEB following the release of *Energy for Generations*, Ontario's Integrated Energy Plan (IEP). The forum is composed of the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO), electricity and natural gas transmitters and distributors, municipalities, Indigenous communities, transportation planners, urban planners and other relevant stakeholders.

The forum provided the OEB with advice on establishing a framework that facilitates the ongoing sharing of gas-electric planning information in support of co-ordinated and integrated energy planning. A draft framework is presented in section 5 of this report, on which the OEB will seek stakeholder feedback in fall 2026, before implementing a final framework in 2027. The forum will be convened by the OEB on an ongoing basis to monitor framework implementation, advise on framework refinements and establish the use of consistent planning assumptions and scenarios.

The implementation of this framework will support the objective of rightsizing Ontario's energy infrastructure by helping avoid overbuilding and underbuilding gas and electricity systems. In response to requirement #1 in the IEP Directive to the OEB, this document serves as a report to the Minister on the progress, modelling best practices and outcomes of the forum so far.

1.2 Progress to date

Progress to date includes the publication of an OEB discussion paper, two forum meetings, a dedicated workshop and meeting with Indigenous participants[1], and three opportunities for written feedback from forum participants.

Forum participants also shared gas and electricity modelling best practices. These best practices include using a broad set of forecasting inputs, some of which overlap between gas and electricity utilities. Participants emphasized the value of incorporating community-level information into forecasts to reflect local growth drivers. Additionally, they noted that scenario-based planning is an important tool for addressing uncertainty.

Forum participants generally supported the need for gas-electric co-ordination and agreed that it should build on existing planning processes rather than creating new ones. At the same time, participants raised concerns about administrative burden, confidentiality, data governance and limited comparability between gas and electricity forecasts.

[1] Indigenous participants include Indigenous communities, Nations and representative groups, including Political and Territorial Organizations.

1.3 Outcomes & next steps

As an outcome of the forum, the OEB developed a targeted and scalable draft framework for gas-electric co-ordination that responds to the opportunities and concerns raised by forum participants. Section 5 of this report provides a summary of the OEB's draft framework. The framework will support more transparent and comparable forecasting, systematic cross-sector co-ordination and dialogue, and better-informed applications to the OEB.

The approaches outlined in this report retain flexibility for the OEB to refine its draft framework in response to forum participant input, before it is implemented in 2027. Broad and ongoing participation by energy and energy-related planners will be critical to the framework's success. Therefore, the OEB will continue convening the ongoing forum in 2026 and beyond to inform the finalization of the framework, establish the use of consistent planning assumptions and scenarios, monitor implementation and make refinements, as appropriate. In doing so, the OEB will ensure that any incremental administrative burden provides proportionate value to ratepayers.

2. Introduction

In the IEP Implementation Directive to the OEB, the Minister outlined the OEB's role in implementing the Ontario government's Integrated Energy Plan, *Energy for Generations: Ontario's Integrated Plan to Power the Strongest Economy in the G7*. Section 1 of the IEP Directive requires the OEB to establish an ongoing forum to set expectations for gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing.

This forum was initiated in January 2026 for participants to provide advice on gas-electric co-ordination expectations. These expectations are summarized in the draft framework provided in section 5 of this report. Additionally, the Directive requires the OEB to report on the progress, outcomes and modelling best practices of the forum by September 30, 2026. This document responds to this reporting requirement.

Figure 1: Section 1 of the IEP Implementation Directive requiring the OEB to establish an information sharing forum

> *With respect to the Government of Ontario's objective of planning for growth and electrification, the OEB shall:*
>
> 1. *Take the following steps to establish an ongoing gas-electric coordination information sharing forum in support of integrated energy planning:*
>
>   *1.1. Set the framework for an ongoing forum to facilitate sharing of technical information and data and other coordination to support energy planning processes.*
>
>   - *Through this forum, the OEB shall set expectations for information sharing, including supporting information sharing in the short-term and establishing the use of consistent assumptions and scenarios in the medium-term.*

- *The OEB shall encourage and, where the OEB deems appropriate, require key energy planners and energy-related planners at the local, regional and bulk level to participate in the forum. Key energy planners and energy-related planners include the IESO, electricity and natural gas transmitters and distributors, municipalities, Indigenous communities, transportation planners and urban planners.*
- *For information shared by the forum, the OEB, in consultation with energy and energy related planners, shall establish a clear approach for transferring and accessing data. This could include general best practices for file formats; procedures; consideration of confidentiality, for example clarifying what information should be shared with which entities and whether information should be public or non-disclosure agreements are needed; and potentially working towards harmonization of software.*

1.2. Initiate the forum no later than January 31, 2026 and report back on the progress, outcomes and modelling best practices of the information sharing forum by September 30, 2026.

- *The subsequent frequency, format and parameters of meetings shall be set by the OEB given the diverse planning needs of the participants. Further expectations on reporting will be communicated through future Letters of Direction, as needed.*
- *For clarity, meetings of the forum or its subcommittees may satisfy other stakeholder engagement requirements, where the OEB deems appropriate.*

The OEB has completed or plans to undertake the following activities to meet Section 1 of the IEP Directive:

Table 1: Implementation of Section 1 of the IEP Directive

Select IEP Directive Requirements	OEB Actions
Initiate the gas-electric co-ordination information sharing forum by January 31, 2026.	The forum met on January 27 and April 7, 2026. Forum participants provided written input on February 16, April 20 and May 15, 2026. The next forum meeting will be convened in fall 2026.
Encourage or require the IESO, electricity and natural gas transmitters and distributors, municipalities, Indigenous communities, and transportation planners and urban planners to participate in the forum.	The OEB invited these organizations and associations that represent them to participate in the forum. Sections 3 and 5 of this report describe additional steps the OEB has taken or plans to take to require or encourage their participation.
Set the framework for an ongoing forum to facilitate sharing of technical information and data and other co-ordination to support energy planning processes.	The OEB issued options for a draft framework on December 17, 2025. Section 5 of this report describes how forum participant feedback informed updates to the draft framework. The OEB will continue seeking forum input in fall 2026.

Support gas-electric co-ordination information sharing in the short term.	The forum has supported the sharing of gas and electricity modelling best practices. Gas-electric co-ordination information sharing will continue to be supported by the implementation of the framework in 2027.
Establish the use of consistent assumptions and scenarios in the medium term.	The OEB will establish the use of consistent assumptions and scenarios in 2027.
The subsequent frequency, format and parameters of meetings shall be set by the OEB.	Ongoing forum meetings will be convened to monitor progress and refine the OEB's gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework, where appropriate.

3. Progress

3.1 Context

This section summarizes the progress that the Gas-Electric Co-ordination Information Sharing (EB-2025-0227) consultation has made to engage forum participants, consider their feedback and advance gas-electric co-ordination information sharing.

3.2 Project and consultation launch

The OEB launched a consultation on December 4, 2025, and consistent with the IEP Directive, invited a wide range of organizations to participate in the consultation forum, including:

- Electricity distributors and transmitters
- Natural gas distributors
- The IESO
- Municipalities
- Indigenous participants
- Transportation planners and urban planners
- Other relevant stakeholders

There are 444 municipalities, 133 First Nations, six historic Métis communities and approximately 100 municipal transit agencies in Ontario.[2] Therefore, the OEB invited the associations that represent these organizations to participate in the consultation. In

[2] Transportation planners and urban planners are represented by transit agencies and municipalities, respectively.

addition, the OEB worked with Ministry of Energy and Mines staff to identify organizations to invite.

The OEB also recognized that forum participants had varying degrees of energy planning expertise. In response, the OEB developed energy planning materials and presentations to support awareness and encourage participation.

3.3 Discussion paper

3.3.1 Background

The OEB issued a discussion paper on December 17, 2025, which described energy and co-ordinated planning in Ontario and provided proposals and options for gas-electric co-ordination information sharing. It also included specific questions for forum participants to provide feedback on.

3.3.2 Objectives of co-ordinated planning

The discussion paper outlined that gas-electric co-ordination information sharing could support the objective of avoiding overbuilding and underbuilding gas and electricity infrastructure. It could also improve visibility on the extent and nature of gas and electricity planning assumptions and scenarios. The discussion paper proposed that these outcomes could be achieved in the short term by strengthening the transparency and comparability of planning information, dialogue among planning entities and quality and comprehensiveness of evidence in applications to the OEB. Section 5.3 of this report provides an update on the objectives of this project.

3.3.3 Background on energy planning and co-ordinated planning

The discussion paper described energy planning processes in Ontario and how gas-electric co-ordination could support them. Today, electricity distributors, transmitters and natural gas distributors each develop discrete system plans to inform their investment proposals. These plans are filed as evidence to support utilities' applications to the OEB. The OEB considers these plans in its decision-making to better understand the rationale and assess the prudence, among other objectives, of utilities' proposed investments for energy infrastructure. In general, electricity and natural gas planning have primarily occurred in isolation in Ontario; however, the two sectors are becoming increasingly interconnected, resulting in the need for greater co-ordination and integration.

The discussion paper recognized that some gas-electric co-ordination has occurred in recent years, however, it has primarily been informal, ad hoc or limited in scope. Therefore, improved gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing is needed to optimize planning and help avoid underbuilding or overbuilding electricity and natural gas infrastructure. A lack of gas-electric co-ordination may also impede the province's efforts in meeting future energy needs and lead to higher energy prices and stranded

asset risks. For example, without co-ordination, there are higher risks that gas and electricity distributors will plan and build infrastructure to meet the same need.

3.3.4 Co-ordinated planning proposals

The discussion paper included a draft framework for gas-electric co-ordination information sharing for forum participants' written feedback. The draft framework included:

- **Outcomes and objectives** such as improving planning transparency, comparability and dialogue.
- **Information sharing** processes to facilitate the transfer and access of information.
- **Information types** that should be shared between participants.
- **Data comparability** needs that could be supported by consistent data units and formatting.
- **Information discussion** and co-ordination meetings between participants.
- **Information application** expectations related to how gas-electric co-ordination could inform energy plans submitted as evidence to the OEB.

Section 5 of this report summarizes the draft framework presented in the OEB's discussion paper in greater detail and describes how forum participant feedback informed updates to it.

3.4 Forum meetings

The OEB held gas-electric co-ordination information sharing forum meetings in January and April 2026. A January 27 kickoff forum meeting provided an overview of energy planning, the need for gas-electric co-ordination and the proposals provided in the discussion paper. It also provided forum participants with an opportunity to raise concerns and questions for discussion. The OEB also collected written feedback on the OEB's discussion paper.

The April 7 forum meeting discussed the written feedback and next steps. The meeting also included presentations from Anishinabek Nation, Enbridge Gas, the IESO, Hydro One and Hydro Ottawa. These organizations presented their modelling best practices, as well as knowledge and experience in energy planning. Forum meetings will continue to be scheduled on an ongoing basis to monitor progress, discuss updates and explore opportunities to strengthen gas-electric co-ordination information sharing.

3.5 Enhanced Indigenous engagement

The IEP Directive specifies that the OEB must encourage Indigenous communities to participate in the forum. The OEB met with select Indigenous participants in advance to

co-develop an engagement approach. Among other comments, Indigenous participants said they would like earlier engagement, have limited knowledge of energy planning processes and limited familiarity with the OEB. Therefore, the OEB took additional steps to encourage participation. Specifically, the OEB invited Indigenous participants to attend:

- An energy planning workshop on January 21, 2026, to provide forum participants with an overview of the OEB, energy planning in Ontario and the gas-electric co-ordination information sharing project.
- Indigenous pre-engagement meetings ahead of each broader co-ordination forum meeting. These meetings provided an opportunity for the OEB to consider feedback and questions from Indigenous participants in advance of the co-ordination forum meetings and incorporate this feedback into the larger engagement approach. The OEB will continue convening Indigenous pre-engagement meetings ahead of future forum meetings.

The OEB's enhanced Indigenous engagement approach was well-received by Indigenous participants. As a result of this effort, the OEB strengthened its relationships, supported active Indigenous participation and was invited to present at an energy planning forum convened by Anishinabek Nation.

3.6 Questionnaires

The OEB issued questionnaires on April 9 and April 27, 2026, to solicit additional feedback from forum participants on the types of information that could be shared as part of the future gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework. This process was intended to narrow the more than 150 suggested information types received from forum participants.

The first questionnaire asked forum participants to comment on the OEB's initial screening of 30 information types. For each information type, the OEB identified potential sources, formats and screening outcomes and provided an opportunity for forum participants to share their views and concerns. The OEB considered the responses it received and reduced the types of information that could be shared from 30 to 20.

The second questionnaire sought more detailed input on a shorter list of 20 information types, which was developed after considering responses to the first questionnaire. It asked forum participants to provide feedback on how each information type is currently used, the specific data points or documents that could be shared, the potential planning impact of sharing the information, confidentiality or implementation challenges, and other relevant considerations.

4. Modelling best practices and other forum feedback

4.1 Context

This section summarizes the gas and electricity modelling best practices that were shared between forum participants, including best practices related to forecasting inputs, planning assumptions and information sharing. It also provides an overview of key feedback from forum participants that informed the OEB's draft gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework. A more detailed summary of feedback is provided in section 7 (Appendix 1) of this report.

4.2 Modelling best practices

4.2.1 Background

Engagement through the forum highlighted several modelling best practices related to gas-electric co-ordination. While consistent application of these practices by gas and electricity planners can improve forecast quality, forum participants noted barriers in gas-electric co-ordination. These include inconsistencies in how planning information is shared, interpreted and incorporated into gas and electricity planning processes. Feedback emphasized the need for a common set of information to be shared, standardized templates for information sharing and formal opportunities for discussion among planning entities. This feedback and key modelling best practices identified through the forum are summarized below.

4.2.2 Use of a broad set of forecasting inputs

Gas and electricity planning entities highlighted that forecasting relies on a wide range of inputs. While forecasting methodologies and sources of data vary across organizations, there is significant overlap between the types of inputs considered in electricity and gas planning as many common factors can influence both gas and electricity demand. Today, both gas and electricity planners regularly incorporate inputs related to weather assumptions, historical consumption data, customer connection forecasts, population growth, housing, macroeconomic indicators and fuel-switching assumptions when developing their demand forecasts.

Participants also noted that some forecasting inputs have greater relevance to one sector than the other. For example, electric vehicle (EV) adoption is an important input for electricity planning because it can influence electricity demand but generally has little impact on offsetting natural gas demand. Forum discussions highlighted that forecasting best practices require gas and electricity planning entities to consider a broad range of both common and sector-specific inputs. However, sharing inputs with material cross-sector impacts generally provides the greatest value in supporting gas-electric co-ordination. This informed the OEB's approach to focus the framework on sharing information types with material cross-sector impacts, as discussed in section 5.5 of this report.

4.2.3 Incorporate local and community planning information

Forum feedback also highlighted the importance of local and community-level planning information for effective forecasting, particularly to ensure region-specific growth drivers and priorities are reflected in demand forecasts and infrastructure. Local planning information can provide earlier visibility into emerging energy needs as compared to only relying on historical consumption trends, allowing planners to better account for future growth and changing energy-use patterns in forecasting. Consistent incorporation of local planning information ensures both sectors are informed by a common understanding of community growth, development priorities and evolving energy-use trends. This requires engagement not only among electricity and natural gas utilities and the IESO, but also with municipalities, Indigenous participants, transportation planners and urban planners (hereafter referred to as “non-utility planners” or “non-utilities”).

Participants indicated that natural gas and electricity planners already consider inputs related to housing, economic growth drivers, land-use planning and policy priorities to provide insights into future energy needs at the local and community level. This information is particularly valuable in high-growth and high-change areas where development and infrastructure expansion can materially influence both gas and electricity demand forecasts.

Such information is shared through a variety of existing processes, including direct engagement with non-utility planners and through the electricity regional planning process. Information is commonly shared through Municipal Energy Plans (MEPs), Community Energy Plans (CEPs), climate action plans, land use and economic development plans, growth plans and transit planning initiatives. Forum participants also said that information on energy policy priorities and Indigenous traditional knowledge could help ensure forecasts reflect community needs and priorities. Existing tools support the incorporation of local planning information into energy planning processes. These include mechanisms within the electricity regional planning process designed to facilitate municipal participation[3], the IESO’s Indigenous Energy Support Program[4] and Ontario’s Municipal Energy Plan Program.[5]

Participants also noted that energy planning practices, capacity and the availability of information vary considerably across municipalities, Indigenous participants and other

[3] The Municipal Information Document was developed by the Regional Planning Process Advisory Group (RPPAG) to enhance co-ordination between municipalities and entities in the electricity sector. A municipal input template is used for data sharing during the transmitter-led Needs Assessment phase of the regional planning process. Hydro One is the lead transmitter in 20 of 21 regions.
[4] The Indigenous Energy Support Program is an IESO program that promotes broad equitable participation in Ontario’s energy sector for First Nations and Métis communities and organizations by supporting capacity building, economic development and energy resiliency and monitoring activities. This includes funding provided for the development or updating of CEPs.
[5] Ontario’s Municipal Energy Plan Program provides funding for municipalities to develop a plan that helps their communities improve energy efficiency, reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, study the impact of future growth on energy needs and foster renewable energy production and economic development. The program is open to all Ontario municipalities and provides funding to either create a new or update an existing MEP or CEP.

non-utility planning entities. Even when information is available, the forecasts of utilities and non-utilities often have different objectives and methodologies. Participants indicated that more consistent information sharing approaches, including standardized information requests, earlier engagement and clearer guidance on planning information needs, could improve the availability and comparability of local planning information. This feedback informed the inclusion of standardized information-sharing templates as a key part of the draft gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework, as discussed further in section 5.6 of this report.

4.2.4 Use of scenario-based planning to address uncertainty

Forum discussions also highlighted that scenario-based planning is an important forecasting tool because key demand drivers, such as weather, growth and fuel-switching, are inherently uncertain. By assessing multiple scenarios, planning entities can better understand and prepare for a range of potential outcomes, while assessing the sensitivity of forecast results to changes in key assumptions.

Scenario-based planning is already incorporated into planning processes in Ontario. The IESO's 2026 Annual Planning Outlook, which supports bulk electricity planning, included a reference, high-demand and low-demand scenario, where each scenario had distinct assumptions associated with various factors such as population levels, economic trends, climate, building electrification policies and the hydrogen economy.[6]

The Load Forecast Guideline for Ontario developed by the Regional Planning Process Advisory Group (RPPAG) to align electricity distributor load forecasts also recommends a sensitivity analysis to capture uncertainty in the regional planning demand forecast and variability in demand drivers related to distributed generation and electrification.[7] Recent changes to regulatory filing requirements also require electricity and natural gas distributors to consider multiple demand scenarios in their distribution-level load forecasts, moving towards a more consistent approach across the energy sector.

Participants noted, however, that the methodologies and assumptions used to develop scenarios can vary across organizations. Greater visibility into different forecasting assumptions can help validate key technical assumptions, identify potential cross-sector impacts and improve the alignment of planning decisions across both sectors. This informed the OEB's proposed approach to require discussions between gas and electricity utilities and the IESO on data similarities, inconsistencies and other co-ordination matters related to shared planning information, as described in section 5.8 of this report.

4.3 Participant support for gas-electric co-ordination

Feedback from the forum generally supported the need for a gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework, acknowledging that although gas-electric co-ordination

[6] The IESO's *2026 Annual Planning Outlook Report*.
[7] Regional Planning Process Advisory Group (RPPAG) *Load Forecast Guideline for Ontario*.

is increasing in Ontario, it remains informal and project-specific. Participants agreed that growth and changes in energy use trends are creating more complex infrastructure planning considerations and increasing the interdependence between the gas and electricity sectors. While views differed on implementation details, participants broadly agreed that improved co-ordination could support timely, cost-effective infrastructure investments that benefit ratepayers by avoiding overbuilding and underbuilding in gas and electricity systems.

Participants emphasized that gas-electric co-ordination should be practical and focused on improving transparency, comparability and co-ordination among planning entities. While there was general support for greater information sharing, participants consistently said co-ordination should build on existing planning processes, rather than create entirely new processes and reports.

Participants also highlighted the importance of strengthened two-way information sharing between utilities and non-utility planning entities. This recognizes that local planning information can support improved utility forecasts and infrastructure planning, while utility forecasts can support local energy planning, land-use planning and economic development activities.

4.4 Participant concerns

While participants generally supported improved gas-electric co-ordination, some also identified several implementation challenges and concerns that should be considered in the design of the framework.

A recurring theme was that gas and electricity planning processes use different planning frequencies, methodologies, assumptions, geographical boundaries and planning horizons. Planning data is also often presented in different formats, units and granularity. While these differences do not prevent co-ordination, participants cautioned that they may limit the usefulness of direct comparisons without appropriate context and standardization.

Participants also raised concerns about Indigenous data sovereignty, confidentiality, data governance and the protection of commercially sensitive planning information, especially in the context of a public data repository.

Finally, participants raised concerns about administrative burden and resource demands associated with new reporting and information sharing requirements. Enbridge Gas and Hydro One may face a uniquely pronounced co-ordination burden given their large distribution territories overlapping with many of Ontario’s nearly 60 electricity distributors. Utilities generally emphasized the need to maintain a flexible and targeted approach to gas-electric co-ordination that remains proportionate to the expected benefits. Some non-utilities preferred a broader scope that involved further co-ordination with entities outside of the gas and electricity sector, with some suggesting the inclusion of oil and district energy.

4.5 Participant recommendations for framework design

Participants identified several design considerations that informed the OEB's approach to a gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework.

First, participants consistently emphasized the value of focusing on sharing a limited set of planning information with material cross-sector impacts rather than attempting to share all available planning data.

Second, the importance of standardization was highlighted, with many noting the need for common definitions, templates and reporting approaches to improve transparency and comparability.

Third, participants generally suggested that existing planning forums, cycles and documents be leveraged to facilitate information sharing and discussion as a way to reduce duplication and manage burden.

Fourth, co-ordination between gas and electricity planners already exists but is limited and informal. Existing co-ordination practices should be leveraged, where possible.

Finally, participants emphasized that any framework should be scalable and flexible, recognizing differences in regional needs and organizational capacity, while remaining adaptable to respond to changing energy trends and planning needs.

Together, these modelling best practices, areas of support, concerns and recommendations provided the foundation for the OEB's revised views on a draft gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing framework, summarized in the following section.

5. Outcomes and draft framework

5.1 Context

The OEB will continue to convene the gas-electric co-ordination information sharing forum in 2026 and beyond. As described in earlier sections of this report, the forum will provide an ongoing venue to monitor progress, advise on refinements to the framework and inform the establishment of consistent planning assumptions and scenarios. Broad participation by gas and electricity utilities, the IESO, and non-utilities such as municipalities, Indigenous participants and transit agencies will be important to this work.

The OEB's draft framework, which sets out specific activities that would support gas-electric co-ordination information sharing, is summarized in sections 5.1 – 5.9, below. The draft framework has the following outcomes:

- Ensuring co-ordination occurs in regions where it is expected to provide the greatest benefits.
- Sharing information that is most useful to both gas and electricity forecasting.

- Establishing procedures to ensure data standardization.
- Ensuring regular dialogue between gas and electricity utilities and the IESO.
- Setting clear expectations for how gas-electric co-ordination would inform infrastructure proposals and other proposals (e.g., non-wires solutions) to the OEB.

When implemented, the framework would support the following co-ordination and information sharing activities by gas and electricity utilities, the IESO, and non-utility planners. These activities will support the objective of avoiding overbuilding and underbuilding gas and electricity infrastructure (see section 5.3).

Table 2: Gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing activities supported by the draft framework

Activities	Utilities and IESO	Municipalities, Indigenous participants and transit agencies
Participate in ongoing forum meetings convened by the OEB	Encouraged	Encouraged
Share information using standardized templates	New requirement	Encouraged
Co-ordinate through Technical Working Group meetings	New requirement	Not applicable
Co-ordinate through localized utility-to-utility meetings	Encouraged	Not applicable
Participate in existing planning and engagement processes	Existing activity	Existing activity
Consider co-ordination and information sharing in planning	New requirement	Encouraged

The high-level approaches outlined in this report reflect the OEB's current views. These approaches and technical details will be further refined through forum input in fall 2026.

5.2 **Project alignment:** Linkages to other OEB initiatives

The OEB is concurrently implementing other initiatives related to energy planning in response to other IEP Directive requirements. These initiatives are being advanced in an aligned manner as per the approach outlined in the OEB's discussion paper.

- **Section 2 of the Directive** requires that additional scenarios and assumptions be incorporated into utilities' forecasting. Where relevant, gas-electric information sharing would involve these scenarios and assumptions (see section 5.5).

- **Section 3 of the Directive** requires gas distributors to participate in electricity planning. Gas-electric co-ordination would ensure gas and electricity distributors and the IESO share planning information with each other and have regular co-ordination meetings to support existing planning processes (see section 5.8).
- **Section 4.2 of the Directive** requires electricity distributors to provide their latest forecasts and other information as part of electricity regional planning. Since this project and gas-electric co-ordination require information sharing, where this information overlaps, the OEB would ensure aligned templates, data granularity and presentation of information such that the same dataset can be used for both initiatives (see section 5.6).[8]

The IESO is also implementing initiatives with potential linkages to gas-electric co-ordination as part of the IEP Directive to the IESO, such as initiatives related to enhancing electricity regional planning processes, regional Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and engagement with gas distributors in electricity planning processes. The OEB and IESO are collaborating, where appropriate, to ensure alignment and avoid duplication.

5.3 **Objectives:** Goals and outcomes

5.3.1 Background and forum input

The IEP provides a range of benefits that would be achieved by integrated planning, for which gas-electric co-ordination information sharing is a key pillar. The OEB's December 2025 discussion paper concluded that optimizing the energy system by avoiding overbuilding and underbuilding gas and electricity infrastructure is the most relevant integrated planning outcome that can be achieved by the OEB's gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework. This is appropriate given the OEB's role in reviewing and approving infrastructure proposals.

The OEB and forum participants contemplated other objectives. These included gas-electric co-ordination supporting emissions reductions or Indigenous land claims. While these are important, they are not within the mandate of the OEB. Objectives such as ensuring responsiveness to growth, the timely development of projects that meet an identified need, cost-effective fuel switching, system reliability and consumer choice were also considered. The OEB agrees with these objectives but believes that they ultimately serve the objective of ensuring that energy infrastructure is neither overbuilt nor underbuilt, and therefore they have not been added as stand-alone objectives for the framework.

[8] Electricity regional planning will also involve electricity utilities sharing other electricity-specific information outside the scope of gas-electric co-ordination. The templates proposed in section 5.6 of this report may include additional tabs for the sharing of electricity-specific information between electricity utilities.

5.3.2 Outcomes and approach

Table 3 describes how the OEB's approach for gas-electric co-ordination will support the objective of avoiding overbuilding and underbuilding gas and electricity infrastructure.

Table 3: Approach for achieving project objective

Objective supported by:	OEB's approach:
Improving forecasting transparency and comparability	Standardizing the geographic planning boundaries (s. 5.4) and scope (s. 5.5) of information sharing, supported by standardized templates (s. 5.6) and greater access to information (s. 5.7), will make key forecasting inputs and outputs more comparable and visible. This will help utilities, the IESO, OEB staff and others identify, address and/or explain differences in forecasting, where appropriate.
Strengthening co-ordination, responsiveness, and dialogue	Regular information sharing and gas-electric co-ordination meetings (s. 5.8) will improve the responsiveness of planning for growth. These meetings provide a structured opportunity to compare forecasts, share modelling best practices and discuss how changes in planning assumptions may affect infrastructure needs in both sectors.
Supporting better-informed applications and regulatory review	Utilities will be required to demonstrate how they considered gas-electric co-ordination in their applications to the OEB (s. 5.9). This will support better co-ordinated infrastructure proposals, ensure co-ordination is visible in the evidentiary record and support more informed interventions. It will also inform the OEB and its participants in the adjudication process, such as in their consideration of cross-sector impacts and risks in Ontario's energy sector.

The OEB will use regulatory instruments, where appropriate, to provide certainty, structure and consistency to gas-electric co-ordination information sharing. Over time, gas-electric co-ordination will also reveal the similarities and differences between gas and electricity planning assumptions and scenarios. That understanding can inform the OEB's approach to implementing the IEP Directive requirement to establish consistent planning assumptions and scenarios in the medium term.

5.4 **Geographic planning boundaries:** Regions within which co-ordination would occur

5.4.1 Background and forum input

The IEP Directive requires the OEB to clarify what information should be shared. For information sharing to be useful, it should be based on aligned geographic planning

boundaries and involve organizations that plan within common planning boundaries[9]. For example, energy assumptions for one planning region may not be informative or comparable to a different region. The challenge, however, is that gas and electricity planning boundaries do not align and achieving full alignment is highly complex and effort intensive.

The OEB explored a range of options for geographic planning boundaries, summarized in Table 4 below, within which gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing could occur. While co-ordination is technically feasible at multiple geographical levels, increasing geographic granularity can increase the relevance and usefulness of planning information to local gas-electric infrastructure decisions, but it also introduces greater complexity and administrative burden.

Table 4: Options for geographic planning boundaries considered for gas-electric co-ordination

Geographic planning boundary option	Benefit	Limitation
Existing provincial or bulk level (1 region)	Lowest burden and complexity	Limited impact on local infrastructure decisions
Existing gas operation region boundaries (up to nine regions)	Aligns with gas planning practices and moderate impact on infrastructure decisions	Requires some electricity local distribution companies and the IESO to align their data with gas boundaries
Existing electricity regional boundaries (21 regions)	Aligns with electricity planning practices and moderate impact on infrastructure decisions	Requires gas distributors (primarily Enbridge Gas) and some electricity distributors to align their data with electricity regions
Existing electricity distribution boundaries (nearly 60 regions)	Highest impact on local infrastructure decisions	Highly burdensome for Enbridge Gas to align data and co-ordinate with nearly 60 electricity distributors

The OEB's discussion paper proposed that the geographic planning basis for sharing data should be at the distribution or regional level using the existing 21 electricity regional planning boundaries, which are primarily defined by electricity infrastructure. Under these approaches, Enbridge Gas would need to segment its existing assumptions and forecasts to be geographically comparable to electricity distribution or regional-level boundaries. If a regional approach is chosen for gas-electric co-ordination information sharing, a small number of electricity distributors, whose service territories

[9] Geographic planning boundaries refer to the planning boundaries used by energy planners. Utilities typically define these boundaries by the location of energy infrastructure.

span more than one region, would also need to segment their assumptions and forecasts to align with the regional boundaries.

Forum participants supported leveraging existing planning processes and geographically relevant data. They also recommended a targeted approach focused on regions where cross-sector co-ordination would provide the greatest value. However, no consensus emerged on a geographic standard. Many said that provincial-level co-ordination is insufficient as it is not granular enough to benefit local forecasting and infrastructure decisions. Participants also cited challenges related to the high effort and complexity of aligning gas data to electricity planning boundaries.

5.4.2 Outcomes and approach

The IEP says that "building the energy infrastructure necessary to power Ontario's future is a complex undertaking that requires the highest level of planning, co-ordination and integration." It also states the need to support gas-electric co-ordination across local, regional and bulk system levels, with an emphasis on the regional level. To be consistent with this vision while supporting value for effort, the OEB will advance a targeted approach that is also scalable towards higher degrees of co-ordination and integration.

The OEB's current view is to use Ontario's existing 21 electricity planning regions as the common geographic planning reference point for the framework, while requiring gas-electric co-ordination in an initial subset of five of the 21 regions where the value of co-ordination is expected to be greatest. For clarity, gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing, for which potential expectations are outlined in this report, would only begin in the initial subset of regions. The OEB's rationale is as follows:

- **Value**: Co-ordination will be the most valuable in regions experiencing high growth or change that have overlapping gas and electricity systems.
- **Scalability and continuous improvement**: Starting with an initial subset of regions focuses effort on where value is greatest, while allowing lessons learned from early implementation to inform refinements to co-ordination processes and to support future expansion to cover additional regions as greater system integration is needed.
- **Effort**: Planning integration will require a common geographic reference point. Overall burden is limited by beginning co-ordination in an initial subset of regions and leveraging the existing 21 electricity regional planning boundaries already used by most utilities.

- **Complementarity**: Regional co-ordination will complement existing bilateral co-ordination between gas and electricity utilities at the local level.[10] Bulk-level co-ordination between Enbridge Gas and the IESO already occurs and will continue.

The OEB will continue to seek forum participants' advice on identifying the specific geographical planning boundaries within which gas-electric co-ordination would be required, determining the extent to which Enbridge Gas should align its forecasting data with electricity planning boundaries and clarifying how co-ordination at the local, regional and bulk levels would work together. Insights from implementation of the framework will also be presented at the OEB's broader ongoing forum meetings and will inform the OEB's decision on expanding co-ordination to additional regions over time.

5.5 **Information type**: Gas and electricity planning information that should be shared

5.5.1 Background and forum input

The OEB is required to clarify the types of information that should be shared as part of gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing. Forum participants provided over 150 suggestions of specific data points. Utilities expressed diverging views, but mostly preferred greater flexibility and a narrower scope, citing concerns about relevance and effort. Non-utility planners generally preferred a broader scope, capturing data points related to Indigenous engagement, environmental stewardship and oil and district energy.

Since it is not practical to adopt all the suggestions received, the OEB is prioritizing information that would:

- **Provide a practical starting point** for the first gas-electric co-ordination framework in Ontario.
- **Have a meaningful impact** on the gas and electricity forecasts that underpin gas and electricity infrastructure needs and proposals.

5.5.2 Outcomes and approach

The OEB has determined that gas-electric co-ordination information sharing could involve sharing of the following 11 information types, with additional discussion with forum participants needed to verify use cases and determine information granularity.

[10] Regional co-ordination will also help utilities identify and pursue opportunities for more detailed, localized or project-specific co-ordination. Local-level co-ordination often involves granular information that requires non-disclosure agreements, making it less suitable for public access, whereas information sharing at the regional level provides greater opportunities for transparency (see section 5.7).

Table 5: Types of information that could be shared

Types of information	Examples of granularity (to be determined)
1) Historic demand	Historic consumption by customer type
2) Forecast demand	Consumption scenarios (Low/Reference/High) by customer type
3) Forecast customer connections	Projected new connections by customer type
4) Heating split assumptions	Penetration of gas/electricity for heating technologies in new connections
5) Heat pump assumptions	Efficiency and adoption rate of heat pumps in new and existing connections
6) Weather assumptions	Extreme weather and Heating Degree Days/Cooling Degree Days forecasts and normalization methods
7) Economic growth assumptions	Rate of GDP change and other economic changes
8) Population assumptions	Population growth rate. Some utilities have indicated that housing assumptions provide a proxy for population.
9) Housing assumptions	New housing types and sizes
10) Fuel switching and electrification assumptions	Where pertinent, share fuel switching rates and scenarios
11) Other sector trends and public policy assumptions	Key assumptions related to sector and public policy trends and risks not already captured by 1-10, above

Items one to three will reveal demand and electrification trends and impacts. Items four to 10 are forecasting inputs that can be cross-checked between gas and electricity planning entities in the same region. Item 11 will provide broader context for forecast scenarios, supporting more consistent and comprehensive scenario modelling.

The selected information types also align with recent OEB filing requirements introduced in response to section 2 of the IEP Directive, which require electricity and natural gas distributors to incorporate certain assumptions and scenarios into their forecasting. Several of the proposed information types, including forecast demand and items six to 11, overlap with those requirements. Further phases of gas-electric co-ordination will include additional information types, as needed.

5.6 **Standardized templates:** File formats and procedures for information sharing

5.6.1 Background and forum input

The IEP Directive requires the OEB to establish a clear approach for transferring and accessing data as part of the framework, including general best practices for file formats and procedures. Some forum participants advised that information shared between planning entities may be difficult to consider in their forecasting unless it is presented in a standardized format and at a sufficient level of granularity. Therefore, forum participants generally agreed with the need for the OEB to facilitate consistency in file formats, units and data granularity through standardized information sharing templates.

5.6.2 Outcomes and approach

Within the initial subset of regions, the 11 information types will be shared through standardized Excel templates to support consistent, comparable and usable information sharing. The template will align shared data on characteristics such as units, granularity, time frame, segmentation, conversion methods and interpretation. It will also provide those completing it with the option to provide commentary on data sources, methodologies and other matters.

The OEB will establish the template's parameters, while asking forum participants, as the planning experts and future users, to lead its development.[11] Where appropriate, the template will align with the templates used for other, existing data-sharing requirements so that the same dataset can support multiple initiatives.

The OEB will also work with the forum to develop standardized Excel templates for non-utility planners to directly share their information with utilities. For municipalities, the OEB will build on the 2022 Municipal Information Document developed by the RPPAG, which identifies municipal planning information that can support electricity forecasting. As part of the gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework, the OEB will encourage these organizations to voluntarily share relevant planning information with utilities using the standardized templates.

The potential benefits of non-utility participation are numerous and there may be opportunities to incent participation to facilitate those benefits. For example, information from these organizations will provide utilities with earlier visibility into emerging energy needs, planned developments and local priorities. This will support more informed forecasting and infrastructure planning by utilities and the IESO.

Information sharing templates will evolve over time, as needed. A simplified example of a template for sharing housing and building data is below:

[11] Information sharing templates will be subject to OEB approval before being finalized.

Table 6: Example information sharing template

Building load:	Geographic region	Total units	Average size (m^2)	% Electrified	Forecast # units		
					2027	2028	2029
Residential							
Commercial							
Industrial							
Commentary (optional)							

The OEB notes that voluntary participation in the forum from some non-utilities has been limited. Additionally, energy planning practices, organizational capacity and the availability of planning information vary considerably among non-utility planning entities. These factors may limit the ability of some non-utility organizations to participate regularly in information sharing, including by completing and sharing the standardized templates.

The OEB also has few tools to require these organizations to participate in gas-electric co-ordination information sharing activities, as these entities fall outside the OEB's jurisdiction under the *OEB Act, 1998,* and are not subject to OEB regulatory instruments.

The OEB is therefore taking additional steps to encourage their participation. The OEB's approach to enhanced Indigenous engagement was described in section 3.5 of this report. The OEB is also working with the Ministry of Energy and Mines to explore potential solutions to incent and reduce barriers to non-utility participation. The OEB will continue monitoring participation and refining its approach.

5.7 **Information sharing**: Approach and timing for transferring and accessing shared information

5.7.1 Background and forum input

The IEP Directive requires the OEB's gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework to include an approach for transferring and accessing information, including procedures, confidentiality considerations and whether information should be made public.

The OEB's discussion paper described two possible approaches for sharing planning information: a centralized data repository and direct information sharing between participants. A data repository would provide a common location for storing and accessing completed templates, while direct sharing would allow participants to exchange information with the relevant planning entities through email.

Forum participant feedback on these options was mixed. Non-utility planners generally supported a repository because it could improve ongoing transparency and access to planning information. However, the OEB received limited feedback on how non-utility

planners would use information shared by utilities and the IESO if it were made publicly accessible. Utilities generally preferred direct information sharing, citing concerns about complexity, burden and confidentiality. Some utilities expressed that it would be useful to share certain forecasting assumptions with each other, especially in areas where gas and electricity infrastructure overlap. Some participants recommended a hybrid approach that would involve certain information being made public, while other information would be directly shared among planning entities.

5.7.2 Outcomes and approach

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. Additional forum input is needed to assess the merits of facilitating public access to the shared templates.

The OEB notes that information sharing requires significant effort, and the benefits must be proportionate to the associated costs to ratepayers and burden on participants. The OEB has verified the benefits of direct information sharing involving gas and electricity utilities and the IESO. The OEB will consult with forum participants this fall to better understand the potential uses and impacts of publicly shared information, as well as how information shared by utilities and the IESO would be used by non-utility planners. This input will inform decisions about which entities should receive information and whether information should be publicly accessible.

In terms of the timing and frequency of information sharing, within the initial subset of regions, participants would share their completed templates on a regular basis. A regular schedule will enhance the responsiveness of planning to growth, ensure that co-ordinated information is consistently current across utilities' planning and respond to forum participant feedback that information sharing should occur sufficiently in advance of infrastructure decisions.

The OEB has determined that information sharing at regular intervals will meaningfully support utility and IESO forecasting, the monitoring of growth and load changes and the development of utilities' infrastructure proposals and other proposals to the OEB. Utilities and non-utilities would share their completed templates:

- At the beginning of active electricity regional planning to inform the Integrated Regional Resource Plan (IRRP) process.
- Before the Annual Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings during non-active planning, to support the monitoring for major load or forecasting changes.

The timing of co-ordination meetings between gas and electricity utilities and the IESO (see section 5.8) will also align with these intervals above.

The IESO would share completed templates based on IRRP results when those results become available. The IESO does not produce independent regional forecasts. Rather,

it is involved in the development of each region's IRRP, which includes a compilation of electricity utilities' forecasts for that region.

Participants will be responsible for the accuracy and completeness of their own information. The OEB will work with forum participants to explore any measures needed to ensure that confidential and sensitive information is appropriately protected.

5.8 **Information discussion**: Ongoing gas-electric co-ordination meetings

5.8.1 Background and forum input

The IEP Directive says the forum should support information sharing in the short term and that the OEB will set the frequency, format and parameters of forum meetings. The OEB had proposed that, to avoid duplication, gas and electricity utilities and the IESO co-ordinate through existing or planned meeting forums. The OEB further proposed that existing stakeholder consultation meetings convened by the IESO and utilities be leveraged to facilitate dialogue with non-utility planners.

The OEB considered the alternative of not requiring systematic gas-electric co-ordination meetings, but determined that information sharing without accompanying discussion does not provide a sufficient level of co-ordination and integration. The alternative of establishing a new forum for these discussions was also considered, such as natural gas distributors (primarily Enbridge Gas) having co-ordination meetings with each of Ontario's nearly 60 electricity distributors. Forum participants generally agreed that these alternatives are not practical and instead supported leveraging existing processes.

5.8.2 Outcomes and approach

Gas and electricity utilities and the IESO will have regular, ongoing gas-electric co-ordination meetings with each other. The existing regional TWG[12] meetings can be used for this purpose, in response to forum advice about aligning with existing processes and avoiding creating duplicative meeting forums. Under this approach, in the initial subset of regions, the relevant TWG would meet with the natural gas distributor operating in the region to discuss energy forecasts, infrastructure and other co-ordination matters.

Completed templates can be shared in advance of these meetings to allow participants to review the information and support meaningful discussion about forecast assumptions and outcomes. Non-utility planners will also be encouraged to share their completed templates ahead of these meetings so that their information can also inform utility forecasting and discussions.

[12] Each of Ontario's 21 electricity planning regions has a TWG, consisting of the electricity utilities and the IESO operating in that region. Active electricity regional planning is typically triggered every three to five years, during which the TWG meets regularly to help identify regional needs and solutions to meet those needs. In non-active planning years, the TWG meets annually to monitor load change and determine whether active planning should be triggered.

Forum participants indicated that some localized gas-electric co-ordination meetings are needed and already occurring. The OEB will encourage utilities to continue identifying and pursuing opportunities for localized co-ordination involving utility-to-utility meetings and information exchange. Regional TWG meetings can help identify these opportunities and, where appropriate, provide a forum for discussing the outcomes of localized co-ordination.

Municipalities, Indigenous participants and transit agencies will not participate in these regional TWG or localized utility-to-utility meetings due to their technical nature and the sensitivity of information discussed (e.g., timing and location of infrastructure and load). However, non-utility planners will be encouraged to participate in gas-electric co-ordination information sharing by sharing completed templates, participating in the OEB-led co-ordination forum meetings and participating in other engagement processes such as the IESO-led regional planning meetings. This approach will help address emergent energy system needs in a more timely manner than that provided through current planning processes. Opportunities for non-utility participation in gas-electric co-ordination are summarized in Table 2 (see section 5.1).

5.9 **Information application**: How gas-electric co-ordination information sharing should impact planning

5.9.1 Background and forum input

According to the IEP Directive, gas-electric co-ordination information sharing must support energy planning processes. The OEB's discussion paper proposed two options for how gas-electric co-ordination could inform gas and electricity infrastructure proposals to the OEB.

1. Existing planning documents submitted by utilities to the OEB could be updated to include a new section demonstrating how shared information and co-ordination discussions were considered.
2. Shared planning information and co-ordination outcomes could be summarized in a stand-alone Regional Gas-Electric Co-ordination Report and filed as evidence in relevant applications to the OEB. Gas and electricity utilities and the IESO would collaborate on developing this report.

Under either option, the objective would be to make the use of shared information and co-ordination outcomes visible in the evidentiary record, including similarities and differences between utilities' planning assumptions and the reasons for those differences.

Forum participants generally supported using existing documents and processes to demonstrate how gas-electric co-ordination was considered, particularly as a way to avoid creating duplicative processes or reports. Some participants saw value in a stand-alone Regional Gas-Electric Co-ordination Report because it could centralize planning

information and explanations across utilities in a region, improving comparability and ease of review. However, participants also raised concerns about the additional burden of preparing such a new report.

5.9.2 Outcomes and approach

The OEB will require utilities to demonstrate that they have considered gas-electric co-ordination in their rate applications and facility applications to the OEB.[13] This will include describing co-ordination outcomes and impacts as well as the similarities and reasons for differences between the utility's planning assumptions and those of other relevant planners in the same region.

Utilities will remain accountable for their own planning and investment proposals. The OEB's goal is to ensure that co-ordination is considered and demonstrated, without prescribing specific planning assumptions, scenarios or investment outcomes. Where relevant, it will be expected that OEB staff and other parties engaged in the OEB's adjudication process will consider gas-electric co-ordination outcomes when developing their strategies for testing proposals, including their submissions in rate and facility proceedings.

Additionally, gas-electric co-ordination may inform planning by non-utility planners. For example, it may help these non-utility planners better understand the anticipated energy needs and developments affecting their communities. It will also inform their participation in regional planning processes and in rate and facility application proceedings before the OEB.

6. Conclusion and next steps

The OEB will continue working with forum participants to finalize the gas-electric co-ordination information sharing framework. Planned activities include:

- Continue convening the forum in fall 2026 to seek further input on the framework.
- Continue working with forum participants to identify an initial subset of priority regions for gas-electric co-ordination.
- Establish subgroups within the forum to develop standardized information sharing Excel templates.
- Continue working with Ministry of Energy and Mines' staff on encouraging participation from municipalities, Indigenous participants and transit agencies.
- Issue and implement the final framework in 2027.
- Continue convening the forum in 2027 to establish the use of consistent planning assumptions and scenarios.

[13] For example, a new section could potentially be included in electricity distribution system plans, gas utility system plans and electricity IRRPs describing how gas-electric co-ordination was considered.

- Set the frequency, format and parameters of ongoing forum meetings, as appropriate, to monitor implementation and refine the framework. This may include revising the types of information to be shared, enhancing the scope of co-ordination and assessing whether co-ordination should be expanded to additional regions.

Gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing will support better-informed gas-electric infrastructure planning and regulatory review, towards the overall objective of optimizing energy infrastructure by avoiding overbuilding or underbuilding gas and electricity infrastructure. The OEB's framework will achieve this by making forecasting more transparent and comparable, ensuring systematic gas-electric co-ordination meetings to discuss planning assumptions and cross-sector impacts and requiring utilities to demonstrate that gas-electric co-ordination was considered in their applications to the OEB. Over time, the experience gained through this framework will also help the OEB establish the use of consistent planning assumptions and scenarios in the medium term.

7. Appendix 1: Detailed stakeholder and Indigenous participant feedback

7.1 Context

As noted in section 3, forum participants were invited to provide feedback at various stages of the consultation process.

- **December 17, 2025**: The OEB issued a discussion paper on Gas-Electric Co-ordination and Information Sharing and invited feedback on the design of an information sharing framework through 10 questions covering outcomes and objectives, scope and process. The OEB received 25 written submissions.
- **April 9, 2026, and April 27, 2026**: The OEB issued two questionnaires to further refine the types of information that should be shared to support gas-electric co-ordination and information sharing. The OEB received 11 written responses to Questionnaire #1 and 12 written responses to Questionnaire #2.

Forum participants also shared feedback through forum discussions, during which OEB staff presented initial thinking and proposals for a gas-electric co-ordination framework. In addition, on April 7, 2026, the OEB hosted a forum meeting where the Anishinabek Nation, two electricity utilities, one natural gas utility and the IESO delivered presentations detailing their current planning, forecasting and co-ordination practices.

These discussions and presentations provided valuable insights into modelling best practices and opportunities for gas-electric co-ordination. A high-level summary of the key takeaways from these engagements was provided in section 4. A detailed summary

of consistent themes and feedback received throughout the consultation process is outlined below.

7.2 Current state, outcomes and objectives

Forum participants provided the following feedback on the current state and potential outcomes and objectives of gas-electric co-ordination:

- **Gas-electric co-ordination is increasing, but uneven**: Participants generally agreed that gas and electricity planning still largely occurs in silos, but co-ordination is increasing in some planning processes, particularly for high-growth areas. For example, gas distributors have provided input into the electricity regional planning process, and gas and electricity distributors have also directly co-ordinated planning efforts in areas of high growth. Some participants indicated that current co-ordination remains project-specific, informal, lacks transparency and is insufficient to meet the demands of the energy transition. Others suggested that existing planning transparency and co-ordination is sufficient.
- **A systemic co-ordination barrier is lack of alignment in methodologies and standards, rather than data availability:** A main limitation identified was the lack of standardized definitions, templates and shared assumptions for key planning inputs. Asymmetrical information sharing between the electricity and gas sectors, along with misaligned planning cycles, geographical boundaries and methodologies, limits data comparability and hinders identification of synergies. In addition, a lack of cross-sector understanding of gas and electricity planning processes limits co-ordination across sectors.
- **Information sharing and co-ordination should be targeted, pragmatic and build on what already works:** Most comments cautioned against full integration of planning processes or the creation of overly complex new processes. Instead, they supported formalizing and scaling proven co-ordination approaches, focusing on high-quality information exchange where there are demonstrable cross-sector and consumer benefits.
- **Objectives should emphasize maintaining affordability, reliability and supporting cost-effective infrastructure deployment, without prescribing outcomes:** There was strong support for objectives aimed at timely, cost-effective infrastructure investments and improved transparency. Most comments emphasized that a co-ordination framework should be data-driven, technology-neutral, preserve customer choice and enable flexible solutions, rather than favouring one fuel over another. Many also said the objectives of improved transparency and strengthened evidence in applications should translate into measurable improvements in regulatory efficiency. Indigenous participants said Indigenous rights-based and environmental stewardship objectives should be

meaningfully reflected in this work. Some participants also cautioned that incorporating too many objectives could create confusion and make the project less effective.

- **Inclusive planning and broader system alignment are essential to success:** Effective co-ordination must extend beyond utilities to include and integrate Indigenous rights-holders, municipalities, transit agencies and system-critical providers like suppliers, generators and distributed energy resource (DER) providers into the planning process. Some stakeholders also recommended recurring stakeholder gatherings to facilitate information exchange and improve alignment across utility and non-utility planning processes.

7.3 Information scope and management

Forum participants provided the following feedback about gas-electric information sharing, including how such information should be managed:

- **Direct bilateral/multilateral information sharing was preferred**: Utilities generally preferred direct information sharing among planning entities over a centralized data repository, particularly where information is time-sensitive, commercially sensitive or requires context to safeguard against misinterpretation or misuse. Views on a central data repository were mixed due to concerns about data security, timeliness, confidentiality and burden, though some non-utilities supported a public data repository for transferring and accessing data due to its transparency benefits. A hybrid approach, combining direct sharing of more granular and sensitive information with a centralized provincial-level data repository, was suggested by some participants. Questionnaire responses also noted that much of the information identified as relevant to gas-electric co-ordination is filed publicly through existing regulatory proceedings, planning processes and reporting requirements, questioning the incremental value of creating a new public repository.
- **Information sharing should focus first on developing a prioritized set of cross-sector, clearly defined planning inputs**: Participants generally supported focusing on a limited set of cross-sector information with material impacts on project objectives, supported by clear definitions, units, reporting timelines and geographic scope. Participants identified Table 5 of the OEB discussion paper as a strong starting point, but proposed approximately 150 additional data points. Some comments also suggested prioritizing “factual” inputs (e.g., customer count and weather) over “assumption-based” inputs (e.g., rate of electrification) and focusing on leading indicators of future demand rather than historic trends.

  - Questionnaire responses indicated that not all planning inputs provide equal value for gas-electric co-ordination. Participants identified customer connections, weather, population growth, fuel-switching, economic development and policy assumptions as having the greatest cross-sector relevance, while EV adoption, natural gas vehicle adoption and DERs were generally viewed as more sector-specific.
  - Questionnaire responses also highlighted that gas and electricity planning entities already rely on many of the same planning inputs, although data sources, methodologies and time horizons may vary. Participants noted that these inputs are sourced through public sources, direct engagement with municipalities, Indigenous participants and other planning entities and utility-specific analysis, but are often developed and reviewed through sector-specific processes that can limit visibility across sectors.
  - Forum feedback further suggested that information needs vary across the different stages of the planning process. Inputs such as weather, customer connections and population growth were viewed as particularly relevant for forecasting. By contrast, information related to system constraints, project costs and non-wires/pipe alternatives was viewed as more relevant to infrastructure options analysis. As a result, some participants suggested that these information types may be better suited for future phases of the gas-electric co-ordination framework.

- **Geographic scope should be flexible and purpose-driven**: There was no agreement on any of the geographic standards proposed. While some supported alignment with existing electricity regional planning boundaries for consistency, many cautioned against converting gas data into electricity boundaries due to technical challenges and a risk of misinterpretation. Participants also noted that different geographic levels serve different planning purposes.
- **Data comparability requires standardization**: Participants emphasized that comparability through simple conversions can obscure real system differences. Core enablers of comparability include a shared data dictionary/taxonomy, aligned time frames, standardized formats and transparent modelling methods that are understood by both sectors. Some participants also suggested comparability should extend beyond energy to broader system impacts (e.g., greenhouse gas emissions, ecological and land-use effects).

7.4 Information discussion and use of shared information

Forum participants provided the following feedback about how shared information should be discussed between organizations and used by utilities to inform their applications to the OEB:

- **Gas-electric co-ordination planning information should be discussed through existing planning forums**: Participants strongly cautioned against creating new standing meetings and emphasized leveraging existing bulk, regional and utility planning forums for discussions, as well as existing direct municipal and community engagement activities.
- **Information sharing and discussions should inform planning and regulatory review, not drive towards identical scenarios**: Discussions should focus on identifying planning inconsistencies, risks, sensitivities and best practices to improve alignment across gas and electricity planning while preserving utility discretion and professional judgment to consider local needs and uncertainty.
- **Discussions should enable earlier engagement, be inclusive and capacity-supported**: Forum participants emphasized that discussions should enable early and iterative engagement before infrastructure decisions are made, with participation from a wide range of forum participants and Indigenous participants as co-planning partners. The need for capacity funding to help support Indigenous participation was raised, along with the importance of recognizing Indigenous governance processes.
- **Use existing planning documents to demonstrate shared information and discussions were incorporated**: There was some support for creating a new stand-alone Regional Gas-Electric Co-ordination Report to summarize gas-electric co-ordination outcomes, but most participants viewed it as burdensome and duplicative. Instead, requiring utilities to document how shared information and discussions were considered within existing planning documents was favoured.
- **Timing of information sharing and discussions should align with existing planning cycles and material changes**: Many participants supported information sharing aligned with existing planning cycles. Some participants suggested that previously shared information only be updated when material changes occur and others suggested more frequent information sharing in high-growth areas. Most participants agreed that information should be shared sufficiently in advance of key planning milestones to allow for meaningful review and discussion. With respect to forecast horizons, participants preferred aligning

with existing planning and rebasing practices, with many calling for 20-plus year outlooks.

- **Roles and responsibilities should be clear and proportionate**: There was general support for the roles outlined in the OEB's discussion paper. Views differed on whether broader non-utility participation should be voluntary or mandatory.

7.5 Other considerations

Forum participants provided the following general feedback:

- **Gas-electric information sharing and co-ordination must recognize First Nations not merely as "stakeholders" but as rights-holders with constitutionally protected Aboriginal and treaty rights**: Indigenous participants emphasized that energy planning decisions engage directly with rights to lands, waters and resources on traditional territories and must be aligned with the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, including the principle of free, prior and informed consent.
- **Indigenous planning information can strengthen forecasting and planning**: Forum presentations identified several unique planning inputs from Indigenous participants that are not consistently reflected in current utility forecasting processes. Beyond CEPs, these include land-use and economic development plans, growth plans, traditional knowledge, cumulative environmental effects data and potential renewable and storage capacity information.
- **Indigenous data sovereignty and governance must be respected:** Indigenous participants also emphasized the importance of appropriate data governance, including respect for First Nations' Ownership, Control, Access and Possession (OCAP) principles.
- **Effective gas-electric co-ordination will be resource-intensive:** Many submissions noted that gas-electric information sharing and co-ordination will require more resources from both utilities and non-utility planners. Some non-utility planners said that ongoing funding is needed to support their participation.
- **Establishing the use of consistent assumptions and scenarios in the medium term has value where appropriate:** Submissions suggested focusing on where and when consistency is appropriate, while recognizing that regional differences, different planning time frames, sector-specific risks, innovation and inherent uncertainty must be considered in planning decisions as well.
- **Gas-electric co-ordination should be aligned with parallel OEB initiatives**: Some forum participants highlighted the importance of drawing linkages between

this work and other related OEB and IEP initiatives, particularly those affecting system planning, to avoid duplication and siloed implementation.

- **The framework should remain flexible to accommodate emerging fuels:** Some submissions identified hydrogen and renewable natural gas as fuels that could affect future gas-electric system interactions and, therefore, should be within the scope of this framework.