

IESO Technical Panel Meeting

Minutes of Meeting

Date held: February 6, 2019		Time held: 9:30am	Location held: Telephone
Invited/Attended	Sector Representation		Attended; Regrets
Robert Bieler	Consumer		Present
David Brown	Ontario Energy Board		Present
Ron Collins	Energy Related Businesses and Services		Present
David Dent	Other Market Participant		Present
Sarah Griffiths	Other Market Participant		Present
Robert Lake	Residential Consumer		Present
Phil Lasek	Industrial Consumer		Present
Dave Forsyth	Consumer		Present
Sushil Samant	Generator		Present
Joe Saunders	Distributor		Present
Jessica Savage	IESO		Present
Vlad Urukov	Generator		Present
Julien Wu	Wholesaler		Present
Michael Lyle	Chair		Present
Observers / Presenters			
Jo Chung	IESO		Present
Josh Duru	IESO		Present
Secretariat			
Reena Goyal	IESO		Present
Jason Grbavac	IESO		Present
Prepared by: Kathy Pearsall / Smarter Shift Inc.			

February 6, 2019

Page 1

IESO Technical Panel

Please report any suggested comments/edits by email to engagement@ieso.ca.

Welcome and Introductions

Agenda:

The meeting agenda was approved with no comments, questions, or additions.

Chair's Remarks:

An in-camera meeting was held on January 31, 2019. Discussion from that meeting has been summarized in a memo circulated by Jessica Savage, IESO, to TP members.

The Chair informed the Panel that the purpose of today's meeting was to discuss whether Ms. Savage's memo appropriately reflected the discussion that took place on January 31, and to vote on next steps to proceed with Market Rule Amendment Submission MR-0437-Q00.

Agenda Item 1: Market Rule Amendment Submission (MR-0437-Q00: Demand Response – Registration and Metering Requirement)

The Chair asked the Panel to comment on whether Ms. Savage's memo encapsulates the January 31 in-camera meeting.

Comments:

Ms. Griffiths supported the memo, stating that the in-camera meeting provided the Panel with an opportunity to understand the market rules and terms of reference, and helped to get everyone on the same page. In future, it may be possible to discuss matters of governance in a public forum.

Mr. Saunders supported the memo, adding that the in-camera meeting helped him to understand the amendment submission, which in turn will help him to understand the overall impacts of the market rule.

Mr. Collins supported the memo, stating that future in-camera meetings may be required when questions arise that are confidential or sensitive in nature. The Panel will try to make things transparent while ensuring the committee is as effective as possible.

Mr. Dent supported the memo and the in-camera session as a helpful administrative discussion to help move this issue forward, noting that this was the first time in a number of years that a market rule amendment submission had come from a market participant.

The Chair asked if the Panel would like to bring a motion for a vote. All agreed.

The Chair said three elements would be considered in the motion. Two participants suggested separate votes to reflect each element. The Chair responded that a separate vote would be held for each of the following elements:

- 1) The amendment submission warrants consideration;
- 2) The matter should be assigned a high priority; and,

February 6, 2019

Page 2

IESO Technical Panel

Please report any suggested comments/edits by email to engagement@ieso.ca.

3) The Panel will seek broad stakeholder input over a two-week period, and seek Demand Response Working Group (DRWG) perspectives at the February 12 DRWG meeting. Resolute will be invited to participate and present at the DRWG meeting.

Element 1:

Mr. Saunders moved to vote that the amendment submission warrants consideration.

Mr. Bieler voted in favour, stating that it was important to understand Resolute's position.

Mr. Collins voted in favour, noting that the submission identified ambiguity or confusion within the market rules that could cause interpretation confusion and lead to poor coordination or implementation, or to future disputes. He said the amendment must satisfy the market principle of efficiency with respect to the dispatch of resources and the determination of market prices.

Mr. Dent voted in favour, adding that it was necessary to fully explore the merits of the amendment submission.

Mr. Forsyth voted in favour, stating that it was important to avoid ambiguity and confusion.

Ms. Griffiths voted in favour, agreeing with the previous comments and memo by Ms. Savage, with nothing further to add.

Mr. Lake voted in favour, noting that the submission could provide for additional resources for Demand Response (DR). The DRWG needs to look at this closely and draw on outside expertise.

Mr. Lasek voted in favour, noting that, as an industrial customer installing a 10 MW storage facility, clear goals and criteria are required, especially in light of the definition change that occurred in the merging of the OPA into the IESO.

Mr. Samant voted in favour, stating that there was an impact on the market principle of efficiency. He said further discussion would provide a gateway to the next phase, which will be hearing from stakeholders.

Mr. Saunders voted in favour in order to address the ambiguity and confusion within the market rules. He said there was a need to understand the impacts on all participants.

Ms. Savage voted in favour because Resolute was claiming there was ambiguity within the market rules.

Mr. Urukov voted in favour on the basis of ambiguity and confusion on the part of Resolute. He said he would like to understand Resolute's assertion that the 2016 and 2017 auctions were treated differently from subsequent auctions.

Mr. Wu voted in favour agreeing with the previous comments by Panel members, with nothing further to add.

The Technical Panel unanimously adopted the motion that the amendment submission warrants consideration.

February 6, 2019

Page 3

IESO Technical Panel

Please report any suggested comments/edits by email to engagement@ieso.ca.

Element 2:

Mr. Forsyth moved to vote on giving the matter high-priority status, allowing it to be addressed sufficiently in advance of the next DR auction in December 2019.

Mr. Bieler voted in favour of high-priority status on the basis that a significant amount of time had passed since the submission arrived in November. He said the matter should be expedited, particularly in light of Resolute's participation in the next DR auction.

Mr. Collins voted in favour of high-priority status, stating that clarification of market rules would remove ambiguity and ensure consistent treatment of market participants.

Mr. Dent voted in favour of high-priority status, stating that it was desirable to have as many participants as possible in the DR auction.

Mr. Forsyth voted in favour of high-priority status in order to allow Resolute to move forward.

Ms. Griffiths voted in favour of high-priority status in order to allow Resolute to prepare for the auction.

Mr. Lake voted in favour of high-priority status, stating that the more participants that compete, the better for the consumer. He said there were practical matters, such as control and metering systems, that would need to be in place prior to the December auction.

Mr. Lasek voted in favour of high-priority status with nothing further to add.

Mr. Samant voted in favour of high-priority status, stating that increased competition would drive down prices, and that this was long overdue.

Mr. Saunders voted in favour of high-priority status with nothing further to add.

Ms. Savage voted in favour of high-priority status so that the matter could be addressed sufficiently in advance of the December auction.

Mr. Urukov voted in favour of high-priority status with nothing further to add.

Mr. Wu in voted in favour of high-priority status with nothing further to add.

The Technical Panel unanimously adopted the motion that the amendment consideration be given high-priority status.

Element 3:

Mr. Bieler moved to vote that the Panel seek a broad range of stakeholder input over a two-week period ending February 21, and that the amendment submission be referred for discussion at the February 12 DRWG meeting.

Mr. Bieler voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input, stating that there could be implications for other participants and stakeholders with respect to the clarity the amendment was proposing. He said stakeholder and DRWG input would be needed because there may be impacts on a participant's ability to participate in the DR auction.

Mr. Collins voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input because broader circumstances require broader input on issues that the Panel may not be aware of.

February 6, 2019

Mr. Dent voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input.

Mr. Forsyth voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input because Resolute needs an opportunity to present its position at the DRWG meeting.

Ms. Griffiths voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input with nothing further to add.

Mr. Lake voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input because he expected there would be diverse views on this matter. What the Panel does should augment what the DRWG has already done.

Mr. Lasek voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input, stating that if there was a change in interpretation during the merger from OPA to IESO, there could be implications in other areas. The Panel needs to understand there is a set of procedures, and the working group of the day would need to be able to intervene and insist on proper protocol to prevent the system from being short-circuited.

Mr. Samant voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input, stating that it would be interesting to hear what the stakeholders and their competitors had to say, particularly on lowering prices through competition.

Mr. Saunders voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input, stating that he wanted to gain a better understanding of the impacts on all market participants.

Ms. Savage voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input with nothing further to add.

Mr. Urukov voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input, stating that the DRWG meeting was an appropriate forum to provide a technical perspective.

Mr. Wu voted in favour of seeking broad stakeholder input with nothing further to add.

The Technical Panel unanimously adopted the motion to seek broad stakeholder input on the amendment submission.

In conclusion, the Panel unanimously agreed that the amendment submission warranted consideration as a high priority item, and that the Panel would seek broad stakeholder input by inviting written submissions for a two-week period ending February 21. The matter will be referred for discussion at the February 12, 2019 DWRG meeting, where Resolute will be invited to make a presentation.

Further Business:

Mr. Collins asked if there would be an opportunity for IESO staff to identify the financial impact to end users or ratepayers of the amendment decisions, stating that what is fair to the market but unfair to ratepayers must be weighed. He said there may be some urgency in starting this process.

Ms. Savage said the Panel should explore financial impacts with the DRWG, as well, so that it is not up to the IESO alone to come up with an assessment.

With no other business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 10:06 AM.

February 6, 2019

Page 5

IESO Technical Panel

Please report any suggested comments/edits by email to engagement@ieso.ca.

Action Item Summary			
Date	Action	Status	Comments
Jan. 29, 2019	In camera meeting to discuss the process for the market rule amendment proposed by Resolute.	Closed	See Technical Panel memo – Feb 5, 2019
Feb. 6, 2019	The Panel will seek broad stakeholder input on the amendment submission over a two-week period ending February 21. The matter will be referred for discussion at the February 12 meeting of the DRWG.	Open	

February 6, 2019

Page 6

IESO Technical Panel

Please report any suggested comments/edits by email to engagement@ieso.ca.

