

IESO Technical Panel Meeting

Minutes of Meeting

Date held: May 2, 2019	Time held: 9:00 am	Location held: IESO Office, Toronto
Invited/Attended	Sector Representation	Attended; Regrets
Robert Bieler	Consumer	Present
Ron Collins	Energy Related Businesses and Services	Regrets
Dave Forsyth	Consumer	Present
Sarah Griffiths	Other Market Participant	Present
Robert Lake	Residential Consumer	Present
Phil Lasek	Industrial Consumer	Present
Robert Reinmuller	Transmitter	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		
Tam Wagner	IESO	Present
Ioan Agavriloai	IESO	Present
Peter Giardetti	Resolute Forest Products	Present
Tony Ruberto	Resolute Forest Products	Present
George Vegh	McCarthy Tetreault	Present
Heloise ApesteGuy-Reux	McCarthy Tetreault	Present
Robert Doyle	IESO	Present
James Hunter	IESO	Present
Secretariat		
Reena Goyal	IESO	Present

May 2, 2019

Page 1

IESO Technical Panel

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

Jason Grbavac	IESO	Present
Prepared by: Mitchell Beer / Smarter Shift Inc.		

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Administration

Chair's Remarks:

The Chair welcomed participants to the special meeting, noting that inclement weather had affected some members' transportation to Toronto. He said Mr. Collins was stuck at the airport in Windsor, but had provided his vote and supporting rationale in advance.

The published agenda for the session called for follow-up discussion, answers to any questions from Panel members following the latest Q&A responses from the IESO and Resolute Forest Products, and a final phase where members were to vote on whether to recommend the proposed Market Rule amendment to the IESO Board and provide the rationales for their votes.

The Chair said George Vegh, McCarthy Tetreault, had requested an opportunity for opening remarks, and that the IESO would be accorded the same consideration if members granted the request. There were no objections to Resolute's request, and the agenda was approved as amended.

Agenda Item 2: Opening Remarks

George Vegh thanked Technical Panel members for their patience in considering Resolute's proposed Market Rule amendments and acknowledged that the proposal was different from any others the Panel had ever received, having been brought forward by a market participant rather than IESO staff. He said the system appeared not to have been designed for a situation in which a market participant brings forward a proposed rule that is opposed by staff, and suggested it had been difficult for the Secretariat to act as a neutral facilitator while simultaneously advocating for its own position. While it would be entirely appropriate for staff to take a different position on the merits of a proposal, he said the administrative role should not support that advocacy position.

Mr. Vegh expressed his view that the overlapping positions were reflected in the decision to refer the draft amendment to a working group before bringing it forward to the Technical Panel, and in the "editorializing" by staff that he said occurred after Resolute put forward its position. He also took issue with the IESO's suggestion that it was somehow inappropriate for the company to communicate directly with individual Panel members between meetings, even though nothing in the Market Rules explicitly prevents that communication. Mr. Vegh interpreted those staff actions as attempts to undermine the proposed Market Rule amendment.

Turning to the immediate decision on the day's agenda, Mr. Vegh referred to the Technical Panel's terms of reference, suggesting that the Panel fulfilled its mandate when it left the market rules for demand response essentially unchanged in the transition from the Capacity-Based Demand Response (CBDR) program to the Demand Response Auction (DRA). He said Panel members could uphold that interpretation of events by restoring the Market Rule to what he maintained was its original intention.

Mr. Vegh referred to the more than 100 pages of documentation Resolute had supplied in advance of the meeting, consisting largely of staff presentations and submissions to the Panel dating back to 2015. Many of those statements expressed the intention to transfer existing contracts to the new rules, and he said none of them indicated that the new rules would disqualify existing methods of achieving demand response. With Resolute's system in place since 2013, he said IESO staff had known about and facilitated the configuration. Given that the stated intent of the transition to DRA was to broaden the definition of demand response and simplify the registration process, Mr. Vegh said there were only two possible explanations for the staff position: that they had deliberately withheld information in 2015, an interpretation Mr. Vegh said he did not accept, or that they were seeking to justify a unilateral Market Rule amendment after the fact.

He added that a Panel vote to restore the Market Rule to what he said was its original intent would not prevent staff from bringing forward a proposed amendment for members to consider on its merits. But he cautioned that failing to approve the Resolute proposal would signal that staff have the discretion to implement design changes that have significant impacts on market participants, without regard for the terms of the rules or staff representations on those rules. Such an interpretation would mean increased regulatory risk for entities that operate in the market, and would outweigh any short-term cost reductions for customers.

Jessica Savage, IESO, said the IESO could not support the proposed Market Rule amendment, since it would have an adverse impact on the reliable, efficient operation of the IESO-controlled grid and introduce inconsistency in the manner in which market participants are treated. She expressed staff's concern that the proposal would require ratepayers to pay for a service they were not receiving.

She specified that the Panel's mandate was to determine whether or not to recommend the proposed amendment to the IESO based on its merits – not to determine whether historical actions were consistent or inconsistent with the Market Rules. The historical question was the subject of a separate dispute resolution process, she said, but the Panel's role was to make recommendations for the future.

Ms. Savage maintained there was sufficient information on the record to allow the Panel to make a decision on a go-forward basis.

Ms. Savage then turned to the Resolute response to the question posed by the Technical Panel April 16, and the four later follow-ups from Resolute's subsequent conversations with individual Panel members, of which she said the IESO had no knowledge until Resolute submitted its filing a few days before the meeting. Responding to Mr. Urukov's question about separate meter registration, Ms. Savage said the IESO did not accept Resolute's premise that there was no way to achieve the separation: there have been configurations with separate meters on load and generation resources, she stated, and there is no physical or technical barrier to a market participating registering and measuring their generation separately.

Responding to members' questions about the Technical Panel's mandate, she reiterated staff's position that any disagreements on historical matters were within the purview of the dispute resolution panel. In that light, she said the chronology of correspondence on Resolute's facility registration was irrelevant to the matter before the Panel – even if members had sympathy with Resolute's position, she said that must not be a factor for prospective rulemaking.

On the question of whether the Market Rule amendment specified that the baseline load for a connected resource must be measured at the IESO-controlled grid, she said that requirement should go without saying, since all market rules dealing with directly-connected resources focus on activity at the ICG, measured via the IESO revenue meter.

Ms. Savage disagreed with Mr. Vegh's characterizations of IESO staff conduct as not being open, honest, and transparent, particularly in light of the off-record conversations that Mr. Vegh sought to have with Panel members subsequent to the April 16 Panel meeting. When a member asked the Secretariat whether those communications were appropriate, Ms. Savage said staff responded that there were no rules to prevent them, so it was up to the individual member to decide. She recalled Mr. Vegh's January 2019 Freedom of Information request, which was brought to the Panel's attention on January 29, seeking all communications created or sent between IESO staff and the Technical Panel in respect of this Market Rule amendment, pursuant to his concern that staff had inappropriately injected themselves into the process.

She concluded that staff's opposition to the proposed Market Rule amendment did not make them bad actors, but simply meant they could not support a proposal that would adversely affect the reliable, efficient operation of the grid and introduce inconsistency in the market.

Agenda Item 3: Technical Questions and Answers for IESO and Resolute regarding MR-00437

Robert Lake identified himself as the Technical Panel member who had contacted the Secretariat after being invited to participate in an off-record conversation. As a past member of various municipal councils and boards, he said he'd been concerned that sharing information with some but not all participants in the process would put the group on an unequal footing. The Chair invited questions from Panel members.

Sushil Samant noted that the Market Rules contain a very strict definition of demand response capacity, spelling out that when a market participant reduces load, it can't subtract that from the capacity it injects into the grid. He asked Resolute whether its two proposed amendments contradicted that definition, and if so, how the conflict could be resolved. Mr. Vegh said there was only one proposed amendment on the table, recalling that after Panel members expressed concern about unintended consequences, Resolute revised and narrowed its draft to specify no adverse impact on previously-approved configurations. He said the amendment entailed no change in the definition of demand response, since "capacity" means the ability to reduce load and that's what Resolute had been doing under the Market Rules.

Mr. Samant asked whether the definition excluded injected capacity. Mr. Vegh said it had never been Resolute's practice to treat injected energy as meeting a demand response obligation, adding that the Thunder Bay facility's meter configuration was designed to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Samant asked whether the Panel was allowed to vote in a way that would invalidate the provisions of an existing Market Manual. The Chair clarified that if a Market Rule is amended in a way that conflicts with a Market Manual, the Manual is adjusted to match.

Mr. Forsyth asked whether the Panel should seek advice from counsel to reconcile the conflicting messages it was receiving from Resolute and staff. The Chair said he had heard no disagreement on whether the Panel could vote: his understanding of Ms. Savage's position was

that members should not consider historical issues that were subject to the dispute resolution process.

Ms. Griffiths said the process in response to the proposed Market Rule amendment had been inefficient, through nobody's fault. She suggested the Technical Panel schedule a debrief at a future meeting to look back on what was good, bad, and lacking in the process, to prepare for similarly contentious situations as the Market Renewal process unfolds. The Chair agreed, and Mr. Urukov supported the suggestion.

Mr. Bieler asked whether the IESO Board would become aware of the proposed amendment if the Technical Panel voted against recommending it for approval. The Chair said the proposal would go to the Board, whether or not Panel members decided to recommend it. Ms. Savage and the Chair added that every member's rationale for their vote would also be forwarded to the Board, pursuant to the Panel's regular practice.

Mr. Samant asked how the IESO measures demand response capacity at the IESO-controlled grid. James Hunter, IESO said the question was pertinent to Resolute's position that it was simply trying to clarify the existing Market Rule, and the IESO's position that the proposed amendment represented a change. He said it's legitimate to look at historical documents in an effort to determine their intent, but that staff would never have supported treating demand response in the way Resolute was proposing, and does not treat it that way now. When the IESO defines demand response capacity as a reduction in load, he said it's always been self-evident that that meant the load at the IESO-controlled grid—it's the definition that is most relevant to the system operator and the load that a demand response activation is intended to reduce.

Against that backdrop, Mr. Hunter said Resolute's scenario—that demand response referred to a load reduction at the facility level—was far afield from what demand response was ever intended to achieve or require. While it might be possible to stretch the rule to accommodate that activity, he said the IESO wouldn't support the resulting program because of the reliability and consistency issues it would face.

As the program stands, Mr. Hunter added, a resource is registered, it receives a capacity obligation, and the wholesale revenue meter is used to resolve the transaction. On that basis, the IESO's position is that Resolute's proposed Market Rule amendment would never have been accepted by the IESO and cannot be supported now.

Mr. Vegh replied that the configuration could not be that far afield, given that it had been in place since 2013. He contended that the IESO was aware of it, had actually designed it, and everyone understood that a demand response participant would be compensated for reducing load when it was called upon to do so. If the IESO had a different expectation, he said, it was never communicated in the hundreds of pages of technical detail on the subject. Mr. Hunter responded that the configuration was an Ontario Power Authority design, intended to support a contract-based procurement process, and the system went through a transitional phase for the express purpose of introducing a market-based program that treated participants consistently. He said it was unclear to him what purpose Resolute thought the transition was to serve, since the mechanism for activating capacity was the only significant difference between CBDR and DRA. If the intent had been to maintain the original methodology, he said, it was already

embodied in the previous set of rules—hence the IESO would never have initiated the transition to the Demand Response Auction.

Mr. Vegh replied that if that was the intent, he would have expected staff to say so, adding that there would be nothing inappropriate in running a program and learning by doing as long as the resulting rule changes were brought forward for open discussion. He repeated his contention that staff had initiated a unilateral change without bringing it to anyone’s attention, contrary to their authority under the rules.

Ioan Agavriiloai, IESO suggested the group move forward from discussing the history and how it should be interpreted. In reply to Mr. Samant, he said reliability, market efficiency, and transparency are fundamental tenets of the IESO’s mandate that staff would never violate. So the IESO would never accept an amendment that allowed any market participant to define the amount of service it provided to the grid based on its participation in a previous program. Mr. Vegh expressed concern that a market operator might sometimes use reliability as a trump card to silence discussion, and suggested staff should be obliged to explain the actual reliability or efficiency impacts of the proposed Market Rule amendment.

Heloise ApesteGuy-Reux, McCarthy Tetreault, said she found no reference in the Market Manuals of a connection at the IESO-controlled grid. Mr. Hunter referred her to definitions in Chapter 11 and elsewhere, but explained that the purpose of the Manuals is to apply technical direction to procedures and activities in accordance with the rules, not to interpret the policy decisions that inform the program. Responding to Mr. Vegh’s earlier point, he said the IESO would only spot an issue following an activation request, adding that any gap in reliability is inherently problematic, whether it occurs once or 100 times. He said Resolute’s proposed design raised reliability concerns precisely because an activation would not produce a full reduction of demand at the IESO-controlled grid.

Mr. Vegh said he would be happy to respond to Mr. Hunter’s point, but acknowledged the conversation was going in circles and said he believed Panel members understood the state of the debate. The Chair agreed that was a fair assessment.

Mr. Samant asked whether the definition of demand response capacity should be tightened up to specify load reductions at the IESO-controlled grid. Mr. Hunter said the issue had never arisen before, but agreed to take the question under advisement.

Agenda Item 4: Technical Panel Vote on MR-00437

The Chair invited Technical Panel members to vote on whether to recommend the proposed Market Rule amendment to the IESO Board, then provide the reasoning behind their votes. He reiterated that Mr. Collins had provided his vote and rationale in absentia.

Members voted as follows.

Mr. Reinmuller: No

Mr. Lake: No

Mr. Urukov: No

Mr. Samant: No

Mr. Bieler: No

May 2, 2019

Page 6

IESO Technical Panel

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

Ms. Savage: No
 Mr. Saunders: No
 Ms. Griffiths: Yes
 Mr. Forsyth: Yes
 Mr. Lasek: Yes
 Mr. Wu: Yes
 Mr. Collins, as reported by the Chair: No

Technical Panel Vote and Rationale on MR-00437

TP Member	Vote (In Favour)	Supportive Rationale
Robert Bieler	No	<p>Mr. Bieler thanked all participants for a lively deliberation, but indicated that he had put much of that discussion aside to look at the merits and implications of the proposed Market Rule amendment in its own right. He said he'd understood that Resolute's configuration could deliver a certain amount of capacity reduction at the IESO revenue meter, and that's what consumers and ratepayers should be paying for. With its own generation facility, Resolute would have the opportunity to sell power into the grid under other programs if it wished to do so, he said, but the objective and intent of the demand response program is to measure demand reductions at the IESO-controlled grid.</p> <p>While he agreed with Mr. Vegh that that expectation was not stated explicitly, Mr. Bieler said it was self-evident that that's what the IESO cares about and sees. On that basis, any past oversights or errors should not outweigh the spirit and intent of the way the program was designed to operate.</p>
Robert Reinmuller	No	<p>Mr. Reinmuller stated that, with all due sympathy to Resolute for the history leading up the proposed amendment, those matters did not reflect in his vote. He said the fundamental goal of managing the grid and controlling capacity and reliability dictated a clear, unambiguous, unique measurement point. Grid actions rely more and more on fast responses occurring in seconds or minutes, 365 days a year, he added, and grid automation requires clean data, based on clear measurements of load and generation. On that basis, he said he supported a unique measurement point that does not introduce any questions about the quantities required or received, and therefore opposed the proposed Market Rule amendment.</p>

TP Member	Vote (In Favour)	Supportive Rationale
David Forsyth	Yes	<p>Mr. Forsyth commended the IESO for strictly upholding and vigorously defending the Market Rules as staff interpret them, but said his vote turned on intent, not interpretation. As an active participant in the Demand Response Working Group during the evolution of the demand response program, Mr. Forsyth said he represented a large industrial user's interest by ensuring the rules and procedures were compatible with its operating characteristics and ability to participate after the transition was complete. He recalled a process that included many new and amended rules that would have material effects on DR participants, all of them debated and discussed at length. But he said he had no recollection and could find no record of discussions about existing DR metering configurations that would be disallowed under the Demand Response Auction.</p> <p>As a party to the CBDR contracts, Mr. Forsyth said the IESO would have had access to all the relevant details, including metering configurations. To its credit, since market opening, he said the IESO has always made him aware of any changes that might have a negative impact on his company's participation in markets or programs, and provided opportunities for input and comment. But in this case, neither Resolute nor the IESO indicated that any of that interaction had occurred. He said the proposed Market Rule amendment would prevent Resolute's continued participation with its pre-existing metering configuration.</p>
Joe Saunders	No	<p>After tracing the history of the proposed Market Rule amendment, Mr. Saunders said the overarching issue was that the IESO's demand response programs do transition over time, and facilitating participation does not mean the rules never change, or that a participant in a past program automatically qualifies for the current one. The Technical Panel gave careful consideration to the unintended consequences that could arise from the assumption of an automatic transition for Resolute or any other market participant, and Mr. Saunders cited the possibility of other market participants entering the program with similar meter configurations as problematic and potentially harmful. He cited other technical concerns that had arisen, as well, including the bi-directional flow of energy onto the IESO-controlled grid.</p> <p>Mr. Saunders said the IESO should give consideration to the way</p>

TP Member	Vote (In Favour)	Supportive Rationale
		<p>new programs are rolled out, particularly with market participants that are not primarily focused on energy, and should provide better support to help those clients understand the applicable programs and navigate the regulatory process. But in this instance, he said he could not support the Market Rule amendment.</p>
Julien Wu	Yes	<p>Mr. Wu said he had not been a part of the stakeholding process during the transition to the Demand Response Auction, so he couldn't weigh in on the past. He said he was inclined to accept the IESO's judgement and expertise if staff advised that a proposal was not satisfactory from a reliability and rate-payer benefit's perspective. He adds that the Technical Panel's mandate was to safeguard the rulemaking process, not to engage in dispute resolution. Yet he feels that the debate has been on a dispute regarding market process and outcome, and thus is outside the Technical Panel's mandate and expertise.</p> <p>But he explained that he had two reasons to vote in favour of the proposed amendment – so that it could be considered by the Board. First, given that the IESO designed and had complete oversight of the DR Auction process, and because the IESO approved auction participants' configurations in the qualifying process, the onus was on the IESO to assess the suitability of Resolute's meter configuration before allowing Resolute to participate in the auction. As a market participant, Resolute can only rely on the IESO's approval to make business and investment decisions. And fact of the matter was that the IESO approved Resolute's offer configuration in more than one auction. If Resolute's configuration was deemed unsatisfactory after the fact, he said, the IESO could have used rules, processes, and notification bulletins to correct the gap between the Market Rules and its original intent, and disqualify Resolute and other similar participants from future auctions. The failure to pursue those processes might have explained the lack of feedback from other DRA participants. Again, if Resolute's configuration was approved by the IESO and discovered to be problematic after the fact, the IESO has processes for changing and correcting market rules going forward. The subsequent disqualification of Resolute's already approved, offered and cleared capacity amounted to retroactive rulemaking. Mr. Wu said he couldn't support retroactive rulemaking as a market participant.</p>

TP Member	Vote (In Favour)	Supportive Rationale
		<p>He added that, from experience buying and selling capacity within his sector, most of the work and business decisions come at the qualification stage. So it would be troubling for a market participant to bid successfully, receive a capacity obligation, deliver the product, then be penalized because the qualification process it followed and relied on to make business decisions were inaccurate.</p> <p>Noting that this was the first time a market participant had ever brought forward a proposed Market Rule amendment, Mr. Wu said he hoped there would be lessons learned from the process.</p>
Phil Lasek	Yes	<p>Mr. Lasek agreed with the rationale noted by Mr. Forsyth and Ms. Griffiths. He also stated that legacy installations should be able to continue with their current meter installations.</p> <p>For plants to change to meet the new rules, existing electrical switchgear changes would be expensive and sometimes difficult. IESO should provide assistance in providing options to meet the intent of the DRA.</p>
Robert Lake	No	<p>Mr. Lake said he had hoped consideration of the proposed amendment would point toward an opportunity to bring more participants into the demand response market. He said that ultimately demand response is just one aspect of reliability. Mr. Lake noted that we use 3% or 5% voltage cuts, spinning reserve, imports, over and under voltage protections and incremental capacity. Demand response is a tool that must be available. He said he accepted the position of the staff, who manage the system every day, and have better knowledge than us, that the proposed amendment could have a negative impact on system reliability, efficiency, and cost.</p>
Ron Collins	No	<p>Mr. Collins said he saw no evidence that the IESO had explicitly accepted Resolute's metering configuration, and no evidence of an actual or implied warranty that participants in past demand response programs would automatically be accepted into a new program. He expressed concern that the proposed amendment would introduce the potential for market participants to use a combination of reductions at the IESO-controlled grid and behind-</p>

TP Member	Vote (In Favour)	Supportive Rationale
		<p>the-meter activities to satisfy their DR capacity obligation, therefore not realizing the expected DR capacity contribution being realized at the ICG as intended by the DR programs, while potentially introducing inconsistency in the treatment of participants in the IESO-administered markets.</p> <p>Mr. Collins expressed concern about the IESO's handling of the process. He said it is evident that the IESO delayed in providing the Technical Panel information when the issue first emerged. Further, the IESO did not provide responses to Resolute in a timely manner in all circumstances. Finally, the IESO appeared to be reluctant at times to disclose information throughout the process to all parties. I therefore would recommend the IESO undertake a review of the process in aim to improve the transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of the process.</p>
Sushil Samant	No	<p>Mr. Samant said he agreed with Mr. Urukov's comments, adding that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a market participant shouldn't expect to apply the rules from a past program after a new one is introduced, • the current program has no ambiguity in specifying load reductions at the IESO-controlled grid (<i>Demand Response Capacity</i> is a defined term), • he had based his vote on issues of fairness to ratepayers, grid reliability and unintended consequences, and stated that the events that occurred in the past are beyond the scope of the TP. "The past is the past". He finds it encouraging that RFP is pursuing another "process" with the IESO over their past interactions and hopes them success - because at the end of the day, "we're all loads. We all pay."
Vlad Urukov	No	<p>Mr. Urukov acknowledged that a transition from a program to a market-based solution could create tensions between new restrictions imposed by the market construct and the goal of retaining and expanding participation. Detailed stakeholdering should flesh out and resolve those issues. After reviewing the historical documentation, he said he concluded that the unique configuration of Resolute's Thunder Bay facility was not subject to specific, dedicated stakeholder review, and that based on their</p>

TP Member	Vote (In Favour)	Supportive Rationale
		<p>interpretation of information available at the time Resolute understood that the DR Auction would not introduce any changes that would apply to that facility – the unique configuration at the facility was only flagged during the failed activation in 2017.</p> <p>Mr. Urukov said his duty as a Technical Panel member was to evaluate the proposed Market Rule based on his understanding of its intent, as laid out in Chapter 17, 18.1.1 and Chapter 11 of the Market Rules, and Market Manual 12, Section 6.3.2, which he said contained no explicit language covering Resolute’s specific case. But he expressed concern about whether Resolute’s proposal to allow “any metering configuration that was approved under DR1, DR2, DR3 or CBDR”, absent additional limitations, may allow behaviour that is contrary to the intent of the demand response program. While Resolute’s utilization might not change, nothing would prevent some other market participant from applying the DR1, DR2, DR3 or CBDR enabled configuration in a different way and producing unintended consequences.</p> <p>Allowing for use of two channels of two meters where one meter is embedded, without additional details, is insufficient to prevent such unintended outcomes, Mr. Urukov concluded. He said the IESO should craft rules that contemplate all configurations and applications, even if they don’t exist at the time of crafting, and therefore he could not support the rule amendment as proposed.</p>
Sarah Griffiths	Yes	<p>Ms. Griffiths said the question to be settled was how the Resolute configuration failed to translate into the Demand Response Auction, especially when only three direct contact customers and three aggregators were involved in the transition. On that issue, she said she supported Mr. Forsyth’s comments on IESO’s intent, and agreed with his recollection of the DR transition process, in which she was also a participant. She noted that the IESO’s current capacity qualification process for the DRA was a best practice among electricity markets, and said it should remain in spite of the issue currently before the Panel.</p> <p>Ms. Griffiths supported the proposed Market Rule amendment, arguing that it would have limited impact on other resources and avert an approximately 50% de-rate of a market participant – an</p>

TP Member	Vote (In Favour)	Supportive Rationale
		<p>outcome that she said was not a business signal the IESO should want to send.</p> <p>She added that the IESO had an opportunity to put forward clear market rules on how resources would be measured in the change from the DRA to the TCA, and again during the development of the ICA, and had acknowledged the potential value in different metering configurations. How to create and gain access to that value should be a topic for discussion during upcoming consultations on competitive auction design, she said.</p>
Jessica Savage	No	Ms. Savage reiterated the IESO's position that the proposed amendment would have an adverse impact on the reliable, efficient operation of the IESO grid and introduce inconsistency in the treatment of participants in IESO-administered markets.

The Chair said lessons learned from the process would be an agenda topic at a future Technical Panel meeting.

The Chair said the deliberation on the proposed Market Rule amendment had been very challenging for all concerned, commended Panel members for their consideration of the topic, thanked Resolute for its participation in the process, and advised that the matter would be on the agenda for the June 12 Board meeting. Mr. Vegh thanked the Panel for its consideration and deliberations on the issue.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 AM.