Minutes of the IESO Technical Panel Meeting

Meeting date: 17/May/2022
Meeting time: 10:00 a.m.
Meeting location: IESO Office, Toronto and MS Team

Chair/Sponsor: Michael Lyle
Scribe: Luisa Da Rocha, IESO

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

Invitees	**Representing**	**Attendance Status Attended, Regrets**
David Brown	Ontario Energy Board (Observer)	Attended
Jason Chee-Aloy	Renewable Generators	Attended
Ron Collins	Energy Related Businesses & Services	Attended
Rob Coulbeck	Importers/Exporters	Attended
Emma Coyle	Market Participant Generators	Attended
Dave Forsyth	Market Participant Consumers	Attended
Sarah Griffiths	Demand Response	Attended
Jennifer Jayapalan	Energy Storage	Attended
Indra Maharjan	Market Participant Consumers	Attended
Nick Papanicolaou	Market Participant Consumers	Attended
Forrest Pengra	Residential Consumers	Attended
Robert Reinmuller	Transmitters	Regrets
Joe Saunders	Distributors	Attended
Vlad Urukov	Market Participant Generators	Attended
David Short	IESO	Attended
Michael Lyle	Chair	Attended

Invitees	Representing	Attendance Status Attended, Regrets
Secretariat		
Agatha Pyrka	IESO	Attended
IESO Presenters		
Vipul Agrawal Muhammad Bilal Phil Bosco Abbas Zaidi Adam Cumming Robert Doyle		

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Administration

Agatha Pyrka, IESO, welcomed everyone joining the meeting both in-person and via MS Teams.

The Chair welcomed participants to the meeting and noted that a revised agenda was posted the day prior to change Item 3 from a 'vote to recommend to the IESO Board' to a 'discussion' item. The Chair noted that Panel members were also advised of the change from a 'discussion' to a 'vote to post for broader stakeholder comment' until May 31.

David Forsyth asked whether the new stakeholder engagement summary memo included for item 3 would be included for all items moving forward. As this hasn't been included in the Technical Panel package previously, Mr. Forsyth also inquired as to whether the IESO is seeking feedback on the engagement memo itself as he sees it as a version of the feedback. The Chair indicated that the memo brings the IESO perspective on the feedback and comments are welcomed, noting that this will be discussed further during Item 3.

The meeting agenda, as amended, was approved on a motion by Joe Saunders.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved on a motion by Forrest Pengra.

Agenda Item 2: Engagement Update

Ms. Pyrka drew participants' attention to the Prospective Technical Panel Schedule and recapped the upcoming items on the calendar leading up to the June Board meeting, including an education item for the Market Renewal Project Calculation Engine batch.

Ms. Pyrka indicated that the broader engagement documents will be posted in the next few days and will be sent to the Technical Panel members.

Agenda Item 3: Enhancements to the 2022 Capacity Auction

Adam Cumming, IESO, recapped that materials were posted for stakeholder comment and feedback was received from the AEMA and others, followed by additional discussions with those who submitted feedback. As a result, slight changes were made to the proposed amendment related to the standby availability charge whereby the charge will decrease from the original 10 times to a 5 times charge, will only be applicable during peak months and will be capped at 25 applications during peak months. The rationale for this change is that it models the amount from the de-rate penalty against a dispatchable load in an equitable fashion, therefore the dollar amount for a similarly performing dispatchable load versus the dollar amount for an HDR resource would be approximately the same, assuming the demand response resource receive 25 standby notices during the given obligation period.

Mr. Cumming, indicated that the missing italization noted by Vlad Urukov in advance of the meeting would be reflected in the final version. In response to the question submitted by Mr. Urukov in advance of the meeting on why transfers have not been included in the true-up payments, Mr. Cumming indicated it is because all transfers must take place prior to the start of the obligation period. It was further explained that only buy-outs can take place during the obligation period, resulting in the reference to changing obligations due to buy-outs, not transfers.

Chuck Farmer, IESO, reviewed the drivers and needs being seen on the system, indicating that it is important that the auction rule changes be given adequate time for consideration by the Panel before it votes. The first driver is the urgency of need on the system and the role of the Capacity Auction as a significant contributor to meeting that need. Urgent needs are being seen in 2025-2026 to meet reliability requirements as outlined in the Annual Planning Outlook and the Annual Acquisition Report. To address this, it is important to have as many Ontario-based resources available as possible through this period, and then in the longer term, to begin to transition the system with new resources that can be relied upon to meet significantly growing demand. This is all occuring during a particularly busy procurement period in what will be the front end of an extended period of investment as the system is renewed and prepared for an energy transition. It was noted that the Resource Adequacy Framework is vital in this process since it is a framework that can be run on an ongoing basis that enhances competition among resources and delivers the best outcomes for customers.

Mr. Farmer, shared that the second driver of moving forward with the enhancements is to establish the Capacity Auction as a viable way to contribute to meeting these needs. The validity of some Capacity Auction resources, particularly around demand response, have been called into question by the Market Surveillance Panel (MSP) which has led to concerns at the IESO Board, with some operational results in the past supporting these concerns. It was noted that it is important that these resources be positioned to be competitive and on a level playing field with other resources to be able to contribute to meeting system needs. The intent of the rules being brought forward is to create this level playing field and create a situation where there is indifference to the types of resources that are competing to provide capacity and participate in the market. Mr. Farmer, acknowledged that there have been missteps along the way and breakdowns in communications with stakeholders, but noted that discussions continued, the community has made proposals and everyone has agreed on the spirit of what is trying to be achieved. While there is still some diasgreement, the result is a Capacity Auction framework that can continue to evolve to ensure that all resources are considered in a fair way.

Joe Saunders asked whether the (upcoming provincial) election brings any risks to the framework and whether the IESO communicates with all parties as part of this process. Mr. Farmer, noted that while political risk cannot be discounted, there is a role for government in decision making and providing direction. More specific to the Resource Adequacy framework, it has been well received by government, and much of it is subject to receiving authority from government. With respect to communicating with the parties, Mr. Farmer, indicated that communication is primarily undertaken with the government and inquiries are responded to. The IESO's advice is ready with regards to directives, and the IESO is working on a number of report backs as outlined in the letters that have been received from the government.

Sarah Griffiths noted that the changes referenced in the new set of rules posted for this meeting on the change from the 10 times penalty to the new 5 times plus a 2 times penalty, are not listed in the market rules, noting that the changes were listed in the original set from November, and then removed for the April 19 Technical Panel meeting and are no longer included. It was further noted that the mapping from the market rules to the market manuals on this item is unclear and the question posed as to what will be included in the market rules versus the market manuals. Ms. Griffiths indicated that there is still no transparency on the penalty, and expressed concern for the future since market manuals do not have the same review process as market rules, siting the potential ability to change a penalty without going through the Technical Panel or a full engagement process. Ms. Griffith noted that the additional time to review is appreciated since no one has had the ability to comment on this publicly and asked for clarification on where the items are in the market manuals. Vipul Agrawal, IESO, noted that the items are located in Market Manual 5.5 where the charges are described in section 1.6.26.3. Two new charge types are included, an augmented availability charge type and a stand-by availability charge type with the 10 and 5 factors listed. Ms. Griffith indicated she was looking for an explanation to be included and suggested that this be made clearer in the final rules, especially since there is heightened sensitivity on this charge. Mr. Agrawal, indicated that rationales are not typically included in the market rules or market manuals as this information is included in the stakeholder documents, but noted that this will be taken back for discussion. Mr. Cumming, IESO, added that the 10 times penalty was removed because of the confusion expressed by stakeholders, and it was instead implemented as two distinct new charge types. This information will be added to the Settlements Market Manual 5.5. and the exact formulas will be available in Charge Types and Equations document. Ms. Griffiths noted this discussion as an example of the benefit of having additional time to review and provide comments on this issue.

Ms. Griffiths shared the frustration that has been felt throughout the consultation, which has also been raised by the AEMA and other members, that there is a compounding impact of all the changes that have been proposed in the market rule amendments that impact the HDR resources, and potentially DR resources, differently than other resources. These include: the move from a 20% to 10% threshold; continuation of an in-day adjustment, which is only known after the fact; introduction of a 10 times penalty with no transparency as to why it is 10 times; the 5 times penalty with 2 times penalty factor with no outage management process; the inclusion of a performance adjustment factor; and the continued misalignment between the Capacity Auction and energy market, noting that this makes sense when there are two separate markets, however the separation no longer exists when capacity is being measured on participation in the energy market. It was also noted that as the new procurement mechanisms move forward, it is not clear how they will be paid as there seems to be the potential for it to be blended between capacity and energy revenues.

Ms. Griffiths shared that their analysts are having difficulty determining the impact of these rule changes as they prepare for the December 2022 Capacity Auction. This was further explained through the following scenario - the threshold is now 90% that is against the ICAP, not the bid, so the resource will now need to perform to the ICAP. However there is no outage management process, so if there is one HDR resource, since only one resource is allowed in a zone, and one large resource that has to go down, there is now a resource that is almost hitting ICAP, but could face an in-day adjustment that is unknown. This creates a choice of bidding in what they have or pulling the resource, creating the question of whether they put in and face a penalty, or whether they don't provide the MWs that are needed and then face the Market Assessment and Compliance Division (MACD) threat. This is the predicament in deciding what to do for December 2022, which is leading up to a time when MWs are needed. Ms. Griffiths noted that HDR resources have attended each meeting and asked about performance adjustment factors and the Market Surveillance Panel (MSP) issues. With respect to the timeline that references the changes made as a result of feedback, pointing to the November 21 comment, it was asked what comments were provided by stakeholders that led to this change, because there is a lack of understanding of where this came from.

Ms. Griffiths reiterated that her main message is the compounding impact of these changes to the resource, the inability to map out the resource, and the fact that it still doesn't feel like the rules are meeting the right intent, especially when resources are threatened with MACD - indicate that the IESO is incenting the wrong behavior. Ms. Griffiths shared that this is not how a real stakeholder governance process should work. It was also noted that the MSP has not engaged with any HDR resource, despite being formally asked to do so and as has been done in every other market, and that if changes are being made because of MSP reports, and the IESO Board is basing their questions on MSP reports, that there is a problem in not discussing this with the affected parties. Ms. Griffiths recognized that this is not a Technical Panel issue, but rather a broader governance issue.

Mr. Urukov asked about the outages and emergency conditions on page 2 of the IESO response document where one of the concerns of generators is that they can be on an IESO approved outage and still be subject to the augmented availability charge. It was asked whether it was correct that the reason this was not addressed is because of the treatment of resources that are not eligible for outage approval and it was also asked how this issue could be considered for future Capacity Auction enhancements. Mr. Agrawal, IESO, confirmed that Mr. Urukov's understanding is correct. Due to implementation challenges, and to ensure fairness across all resource types, the IESO needs to ensure that all resources in a future auction obligation period can submit outages to the IESO so that they can be granted the exemptions during those conditions. This will be prioritized in the workplan once there is IESO staff capacity to address the implementation challenges.

Jason Chee-Aloy followed up on his question from the April 19 Technical Panel meeting on whether generators are charged for not being available during aplanned outage in other markets, where the response from the IESO was that it is the same as in the Ontario market. His research found that they are not charged, such as in the New York ICAP market. Mr. Agrawal, indicated that availability is based on an average over 6 months and that a true-up mechanism was developed in Ontario that takes into account planned outages and achieves the same outcome. Mr. Chee-Aloy indicated he would have a further look at the two.

Emma Coyle asked about the IESO's process for amending the performance factors in the market manual, and how market participants would know if there is a change to the market manual that impacted the quantum of the penalty. James Hunter, IESO, indicated that there would be a stakeholder engagement on changes proposed to the market manual. Ms. Coyle asked whether it would go to the Board to which Mr. Hunter, indicated it would not. Mr. Cumming, IESO, further shared that there is a baseline process for any amendments to market manuals which includes posting for engagement on the changes before they go into effect. The Chair added that this would not be brought to the Board for formal approval, but would be brought to the Board's attention if there was a signficiant issue to stakeholders.

David Short asked if certain portions of the market rules and market manuals are frozen for the Capacity Auction. Mr. Hunter, IESO, indicated that yes, rules are frozen at certain points in time. For example, once the pre-auction period commences, the market rules and market manuals relevant to that auction are frozen for the duration of that auction, however this does not stop the discussions about changes for future auctions.

David Forsyth supported Ms. Griffiths remarks and shared his perspective that the stakeholder engagement for the Capacity Auction has been clumsy, and instead of just being enhancements to the auction, it ended up being wholesale changes to the participation model for HDR, but was not treated as such. For example, the $100 threshold price per standby was agreed upon a few years ago and it was never discussed that it would be a trigger for a penalty, but now it is a big part of the participation model. Mr. Forsyth suggested that the IESO review the model as a whole. Mike Risavy, IESO, noted that the broader HDR participation model touches on different parts of the organization, and it is something the organization as a whole needs to take back. In terms of the trigger for the standby notices, the HDR community provided feedback on this and was one of the driving forces behind having the cap on the number of times that the standby availability charge would be applied.

Ms. Griffith indicated that since there is recognition that the participation model touches on so much, she asked whether the controversial elements could be pulled out so that the Technical Panel could spend the next year working on the December 2023 auction to develop the right participation model for the IESO, market participants, rate payers, the MSP and the Board. Ms. Griffiths noted that there are good elements in the package, including increased competition from generator backed imports, that should not be held up because of a misalignment of the participation model. Mr. Risavy, indicated that reviewing every aspect of the participation model would take much longer than the noted time horizon. Ms. Griffiths indicated that the approach of "we will get to it" is short-sighted and does not help the resources that will need to bid into the December 2022 Auction with a flawed participation model and bandaid solutions. The basis of the Market Renewal Project was to move away from the bandaid solutions, however this new mechanism is adding more administrative burden. Ms. Griffiths acknowledged that the review would be a signifcant amount of work, but it matters for how the resources will bid in and how many MWs will bid in across Ontario.

Nick Papanicolaou shared that the penalties may act as a disincentive for historically good performers. As the rules are currently written, companies may not accept this risk and may choose to not participate because of the testing periods that come at a significant cost to the organization. Mr. Papanicolaou further indicated that it is not clear that there will be more participation as a result of moving this risk away from the IESO and that the risk balance needs to be more understood on how it is shared.

On a motion by Sarah Griffiths, the Technical Panel voted to re-post the market rule amendments for further stakeholder comment until May 31. The Chair noted that Robert Reinmuller had departed the meeting, but voted by proxy.

Agenda Item 4: Replacement of the IESO Settlement System

Robert Doyle, IESO, recapped that since the last Technical Panel meeting, the IESO continued to receive feedback on the importance of the implementation of the Replacement Settlement System. In addition to feedback from Ontario Power Generation, minor clericall feedback was received from Technical Panel member Vlad Urukov. Changes were made to sections:

- Section 2.5.1B
- Section 6.3.6, Part b,

- Section 6.8.3
- Section 6.10.2
- Section 6.10.2.1
- Section 6.10.2.2, subsection a) and c)
- Section 6.10.2.3, subsection d) and e)
- Section 6.10.4
- Section 6.10.4.1, subsection b)
- Section 6.12.1
- Definition of final recalculated settlement statement

Mr. Urukov shared how the significance of these changes will be felt by market participants when they review the timeline. Following the November 1 implementation date, market participants will receive their first statement on November 16, followed by the final on November 30 and the invoice on December 14, which will all be followed by year end. From an implementation perspective, there is an ongoing concern with the ability to deal with IT changes, especially for year end, as this does not provide a large margin of error. Mr. Urukov further noted that the settlement process is the beginning of a complex financial reporting process, which places a lot of importance on getting it right fom the start. It was emphasized that the market rules need to be clearly conveyed to participants who will need to clearly understand the new settlement process so that they can then work with their vendor to build a settlement solution. For medium to complex participants, understanding the level of precision and accuracy needed is pivitol. Mr. Urukov perceives that there is still an ongoing lack of clarity by market participants and they continue to be surprised once they are presented with the details. While the flow chart provided by the IESO is helpful, additional detail is needed.

Mr. Urukov emphasized that the exact date must be known for the issuance of the standard RCSS (recalculated settlement statement). For example, for an invoice dated January 16, it was asked what the date would be once the month is added. Mr. Abbas Zaidi, IESO, indicated that one month would be the next invoice date, which is 10 business days after the subsequent month. Mr. Urukov asked for confirmation that it would not be February 16, but rather the date in February that is the invoicing date for that month. Mr. Zaidi, confirmed that this was correct. Mr. Uukov stated that the language does not provide sufficient clarity.

Mr. Urukov said that the June 2021 Settlement Disagreements and Resettlements design document v.2.0 contains a table that is more helpful than the flow chart, however the data is no longer accurate. Mr. Zaidi, indicated that this is correct, that some changes have been made since publishing the document including a change from the 25 month period for the RCSS final which has since been updated to 23 months because the limitation period needed to be inclusive of the 24 months from the first invoice. Mr. Zaidi, indicated that the market rules include an updated version of the information in the document.

Mr. Urukov, referenced an email sent earlier to the IESO and worked through a real-life example of a change on the final recalculated settlement statement. In this example, for the month of January 2023, the invoice would be sent on February 14, 2023 and the final recalculated settlement statement (RCSS7) would be issued on the date invoices are issued for December 2024, which was indicated as January 15, 2025 by Mr. Zaidi. Mr. Urukov said that participants would then have 20 days to submit a notice of dispute but sought confirmation on the exact date given the language in Market Rules section 2.5.1B. referencing timing between the earlier of scenarios (a) and (b). Mr. Zaidi, clarified that (a) refers to a scenario where a participant is expecting something but doesn’t receive it, whereas (b) refers to a scenario where a participant receives something but disagrees. Mr.

Urukov indicated that in both scenarios, the date would be February 14, which is the invoice date for the month of January. Mr. Zaidi, confirmed that the dates are the same and further explained that the IESO does not foresee scenario (b) happening before scenario (a) but wants to ensure there is clarity as to the start date of the limitation period. The language used in the draft rules aligns with the language in the legislation relating to the limitation period, which is necessary to ensure the same limitation period applies in both contexts. Further to this, Mr. Urukov asked why the language in Market Rules section 2.7.27A is different for an invoice date and an obligation to invoice rather that to settle. Mr. Zaidi, noted that the first instance refers to something that was invoiced, whereas the second refers to something that should have been. Mr. Urukov questioned why the same language would not be used, but noted that having confirmed the definition, he is more comfortable that it will not truncate the notice of dispute.

Mr. Urukov shared his understanding that this change was introduced so as to not confuse dates on the same statement, but rather separate them into the recalculated settlement statements. Despite this, Mr. Urukov asked whether there will continue to be instances where the IESO will still rely on the preliminary settlement statement. Mr. Zaidi indicated that will be the case up to October 31, 2022, however, for statements from November 1, 2022 onwards, it will be settled on the date for that new statement, further explaining that for enforcement actions that may occur outside the 2 year obligation period, there will be no option but to put this on a subsequent statement. In response to the question as to whether the ad hoc recalculated statement could be used for this, Mr. Zaidi replied that no, they could not be used because the ad hoc are still within the 2 year limitation period and once the IESO issues the final RCSS, that trade date is considered complete. Mr. Urukov noted that this is unfortunate because a small amount of statements will still require this process, and asked if a longer ad hoc period could be used. Mr. Zaidi noted that one of the objectives of this change is to have a final statement for a trade date and this suggestion would return the process to the current situation where there is no real limitation period. Mr. Urukov suggested that the use of the preliminary settlement statement for the statements that will still require the system to deal with a multiple trade date statement takes away the benefit of RSS so that they don’t have different trade dates on the same statement. This was noted as an unfortunate outcome and it was asked whether sufficent thought was given to this. Mr. Zaidi noted that this will be a rare occurence, but it is one of the trade offs with the implementation.

Mr. Urukov asked if the ad hoc statements can be issued on any calendar day. Mr. Zaidi noted that an ad hoc statement for a given trading day may be issued on any business day up to the issuance of the Final RCSS for the trading day in question. Ad hoc statements will appear exactly like an RCSS statement, and it is anticipated that it will be used to (a) ensure participants do not have to wait an unreasonable amount of time to resettle a trading day and (b) ensure that multiple trading days impacted by the same event can be resettled at the same time. Mr. Urukov indicated that systems will need to be more flexible, noting this as another unhelpful complexity that takes away from notion that this was a simplification exercise.

Mr. Urukov noted that the current invoices are very clear, but they willl now be augmented with any RCSS issued since the previous invoice. Mr. Zaidi confirmed that this is correct and noted that the IESO will be publishing a revised calendar to help with this, including ad hoc statements. Mr. Urukov noted that this will become a more complicated exercise for the market participant to trace the original source of the RCSS to see what has changed. Mr. Zaidi noted that the RCSS will be published monthly, and on any given invoice, the RCSS will be defined. Mr. Urukov noted that these can all be for a multitude of trade dates and therefore there will not be an easy way to see incremental changes and they will need to be traced back to trade date months prior. Mr. Zaidi noted that the form of the RCSS statements will be similar to the final that shows the preliminary and the adjustments, it will show all amounts from prior statements plus any new adjustments. Mr. Urukov noted that the invoicing creates a layer of complexity. Mr. Zaidi agreed that it is potentially adding to the volume of statements but provides participants with an easier way to track adjustments for a trading day, which is an improvement from the current process where statements for a particular trading day may include settlement amounts for multiple trading days.

Mr. Urukov summarized that these answers are coming late in the process and there is not a lot of time between the vote and when it will be implemented in November which is a concern, one that will be shared by everyone who needs to reconcile. It was suggested that the stakeholders did not have the correct level of details to be able to fully assess the impact and therefore offer recommendations for improvement. Mr. Urukov concluded by sharing his unease with the package since it lacks a complete and comprehensive close out with participants in a way that they truly understand the changes and such that they can work with their vendor to discuss any issues.

Mr. Doyle, IESO, thanked Mr. Urukov for his comments and indicated that as we move into the implementation phase, the points that have been raised will be emphasized so that participants understand what this will entail.

Ms. Coyle echoed Mr. Urukov's comments with respect to the need for clarity on stakeholder engagement and asked for confirmation on the implementation date. Mr. Doyle confirmed the date as November 1, 2022. With regards to year end considerations, Ms. Coyle requested that the IESO continue to consider stakeholder feedback during the implementation process to ensure it makes sense or whether it needs to be moved for the purpose of effective implementation.

On a motion by David Short, the Technical Panel voted to recommend the package of market rule amendments to the IESO Board of Directors. As part of the recorded vote shown below, members were instructed that they could provide their rationale in writing following the meeting.

In favour: Mr. Collins, Mr. Coulbeck, Ms. Coyle, Mr. Chee-Aloy, Mr. Forsyth, Ms. Griffiths, Ms. Jayapalan, Mr. Papanicolaou, Mr. Pengra, Mr. Reinmuller (via proxy), Mr. Saunders, Mr. Short

Against: None

Abstained: Mr. Urukov

Absent: Mr. Maharjan (unable to vote due to connection issues)[1]

Agenda Item 5: Improving Awareness of System Operating Conditions

Adam Cumming, IESO, recapped that this item was posted for stakeholder comment and none was received. At the last meeting, Mr. Urukov and Mr. Reinmuller requested supplemental information on descriptions for extreme hot and cold weather. Additions have been made to Market Manual 7, System Operations, defining extreme hot weather as weather in southern Ontario that is forecast above/ equal to 35C or a humidex above/ equal to 40C, defining extreme cold weather as weather in southern Ontario that is forecast below/ equal to -20C or a wind chill below/ equal to -30C, and weather in northern Ontario that is forecast below/ equal to -30C or a wind chill below/ equal to -40C. Additional cross reference has been made to the conservative operating state within Market Manual 7 System Operations Part 7.3 Outage Management. It was noted that no changes have been made to market rules since the last meeting.

---

[1] Mr. Maharjan subsequently voted in favour.

On a motion by David Forsyth, the Technical Panel voted to recommend the package of market rule amendments to the IESO Board of Directors.

Other Business

Paul Lukkonen asked for an update to the April Technical Panel in-camera session that resulted from the March Technical Panel meeting where there were a number of abstentions in provisioanlly recommending the Market Power Mitigation (MPM) batch of market rule amendments in relation to the Market Renewal Program (MRP) to the IESO Board of Directors. The Chair noted that the in-camera discussion was focused on the process going forward and process improvements, it was not a substantive discussion on the MPM batch of market rule amendments. It was further noted that as MRP moves forward, discussions on the implementation of the process improvements will continue.

The meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m. The next meeting will be held on June 14.

Action Item Summary

Date	Action	Status	Comments
February 15, 2022	Technical Panel members asked for a MACD review of if the MR-00468 proposed market rule amendments met the intent of the design.	Closed	A letter from the Technical Panel Chair is posted to the Technical Panel webpage.
March 23, 2021	In relation to MR-0448-R00 market rule amendments, the IESO will periodically review the availability of error and omissions insurance for negligence.	Open	Update provided during November 2021 TP meeting.