Feedback Form

Local Achievable Potential Study Webinar – August 21, 2025

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Richard Carlson

Title: Director, Energy

Organization: Pollution Probe

Email: [redacted]

Date: September 11, 2025

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on this engagement webpage unless otherwise requested by the sender.

Following the Toronto Local Achievable Potential Study (L-APS) webinar held on August 21, 2025, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback on the draft findings. A copy of the presentations as well as a recording of the session can be accessed from the engagement web page.

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca by September 11, 2025.

Topic	Feedback
What feedback do you have on the L-APS draft findings?	There is insufficient information available in the draft to have any material feedback. That is a barrier to ensuring that the results are useful. As such, detailed feedback may only be possible after the results have been released.

Topic	Feedback
Is there additional information that should be considered before L-APS findings are finalized?	Include wording at the beginning of the report to note the scope (including definition of DER used), what was excluded and the reasons for that, and a general note that the results are based on the inputs and assumptions used in the report and are subject to change as the energy transition changes continues to rapidly advance DER opportunities and solutions.
Are there specific modelling methodology or assumption topics that you would like to see discussed in the final public report?	Clarity on the assumptions. There is no information on what the assumptions are, and why they were chosen. There appears to be a hard cap on some technologies, but that is not clarified or even expressed in the draft. Again, without more information on the methodology it is impossible to provide useful feedback.
How can the IESO best communicate with communities and stakeholders on actioning the additional electricity demand-side management opportunities identified in the study?	More information is required before commenting on this. It is also unclear how this information compares to the THESL's DSP it prepared for the OEB, or how this information will be used in the IRP.

General Comments/Feedback

The results were only presented at the very high level and without accompanying methodology, and without clarity on the limitations, artificial or not, that were placed on the study (such as a hard cap on DERs based on a percentage of grid capacity). As the presentation made it impossible to understand the results, or even to know the exact numbers and the reasons for the results, it is impossible to provide feedback on decisions made, and feedback can only be made at the high level. The results as made, however, were not useful for the reasons made above. If the IESO is unable to provide greater granularity and methodological analysis, then a scenario-based approach with a sensitivity analysis with large error bars would be more useful than what was presented. In addition, the limitations of the findings, the technology chosen and the technology not chosen, need to be made clear upfront. This is a fast-moving sector, and without sensitivity analysis and clarity that new business models may change the results completely, and a willingness to recognize the humility that the results are only based on best available assumptions and technology at the time, then the results will hinder development.

In addition, THESL recently prepared a DSP for the OEB and has plans for expanded DERs/DSM. Given that they know grid limitations likely better than the modeller, the results from the modelling should be compared to THESL's DSP, and the differences explained. In addition, the City of Toronto has clear targets, and it appears that they were ignored in the modelling.