

Minutes of the IESO Technical Panel Meeting

Meeting date: June 10, 2025
Meeting time: 9:00 a.m. – 9:38 a.m.
Meeting location: Virtual

Chair/Sponsor: Michael Lyle

Scribe: Trisha Hickson, IESO

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

Invitees	Representing	Attendance Status Attended, Regrets
Jason Chee-Aloy	Renewable Generators	Attended
Rob Coulbeck	Importers/Exporters	Attended
Dave Forsyth	Market Participant Consumers	Attended
Jennifer Jayapalan	Energy Storage	Attended
Forrest Pengra	Residential Consumers	Attended
Robert Reinmuller	Transmitters	Regrets
Joe Saunders	Distributors	Attended
Vlad Urukov	Market Participant Generators	Attended
Michael Pohlod	Demand Response	Attended
Lukas Deeg	Generators	Attended
Matthew China	Energy Related Businesses and Service	Regrets
David Short	IESO	Attended
Michael Lyle	Chair	Attended
Secretariat		

Invitees	Representing	Attendance Status Attended, Regrets
Trisha Hickson	IESO	Attended

IESO Presenters/Attendees

Presenters:

Laura Zubych
Paula Lukan
Adam Cumming

Attendees:

Amy Eakins
Marko Cirovic
Sehrish Syed
Claudia Dessanti

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Administration

Trisha Hickson, IESO, welcomed everyone joining the meeting.

The meeting agenda was approved on a motion by Vlad Urukov.

The May 13, meeting minutes were approved on a motion by Joe Saunders.

Introductory Remarks from the Chair:

Michael Lyle, Chair welcomed everyone and noted there was no updates for the Technical Panel at this time.

Agenda Item 2: Engagement Update

Trisha Hickson, IESO provided an update on the prospective schedule which is posted on the Technical Panel webpage. Ms. Hickson identified upcoming sessions as part of the IESO June Engagement Days and encouraged panel members and observers to attend. In addition, Ms. Hickson provided an update on the Market Power Mitigation Working Group regarding the recent meetings which are posted on the MPM Working Group webpage.

Agenda Item 3: Capacity Auction Enhancements

Adam Cumming, IESO provided an overview of the Capacity Auction Enhancements for Technical Panel education. The enhancements include amendments focused on more flexible transfers, increasing the buy-out charge, eliminating forfeiture rules, and changes to the capacity test requirements.

The presentation with complete details of the changes is posted on the Technical Panel webpage.

Adam Cumming, IESO presented the final draft language of the market rules and addressed questions submitted by TP member, Vlad Urukov, OPG.

- Mr. Urukov, OPG asked will the participant also forfeit their capacity auction deposit and how is the deposit adjusted in relation to the buyout charge?

Mr. Cumming noted that if the deposit is not used during registration, it will typically be rolled forward. If a buyout occurs, and the charge exceeds the deposit, the participant pays the difference. If the amount is less than the deposit, the unused portion may be refunded.

- Mr. Urukov asked if treatment of the deposit is clearly stated in the market rules.

Laura Zubycck, IESO confirmed that the treatment of the deposit is handled under the capacity obligation which is stated in the Market Rules and Market Manual 12.

- Mr. Urukov inquired if the act of reducing the obligation, rather than formally revoking it, yields equivalent treatment?

Mr. Cumming confirmed they are treated the same. If a market participant does not register, the buy-out charge is applied and reduces their obligation to zero, therefore the obligation is effectively revoked.

- Mr. Urukov raised a comment regarding the new language used in the amendment 19.9.6 compared to 19.9B.7, noting that the structure of the language in 19.9B.7 should be revised to further align with the rest of the section.

Mr. Cumming acknowledged Mr. Urukov's proposed amendment. It was noted that generator-backed imports represent a slight outlier within the testing framework due to the additional requirement of coordinating both local jurisdictional scheduling and the scheduling of the corresponding import. In contrast, system-backed imports are intended to stylistically align as closely as possible with other resource types (e.g. capacity generation resources, dispatchable load resources).

- Mr. Urukov asked about amendment 19.9.9, what the implications would be if a resource is deemed to have delivered 0 megawatts. Would this be considered equivalent to failing the capacity test?

Mr. Cumming noted that receiving a failed result is preferable to submitting no data at all. Without any data, there is no way to confirm whether the test was performed, resulting in zeromegawatts.

- Mr. Urukov followed up by asking if that assignment would lead to a charge in 4.13.5?

Ms. Zubyck noted that delivering a zero megawatt result will trigger a pass/failure result of the test which then the capacity charge will be applied. Noting that it is a straight one-month payment that does not factor the actual delivery into the charge, only the fact it was a failure.

- Mr. Urukov asked if there are any chances to resubmit or ask for an extension if the deadline to submit has passed.

Ms. Zubyck noted the testing week is given to all capacity auction participants, there is one week to complete the test, and then one week to submit the data. In the case of system-backed imports, the process simply involves notifying us via email of the specific day and hours during which the test was completed. If we do not receive that by the deadline, the test is deemed to have not been completed.

- Mr. Urukov referencing amendment of Chapter 0.9, 4.13.9, asked how would the buy-out charge be calculated to achieve the percentage value increase?

Ms. Zubyck presented an example from the design document posted on the engagement website to demonstrate how the change of the equation can be implemented. It is noted that the adjustment is achieved by removing the buy-out charge being equal to one third of the availability payment to it being equal to around fifty percent of availability payment.

- Jennifer Jayapalan, Workbench thanked everyone for the clarification on all amendments and inquired as to when an update will be available on the tie-break methodology enhancement which was put on hold earlier this year.

Ms. Zubyck noted that based on significant stakeholder feedback the team reprioritized the tie-break methodology for 2025 and will discuss next steps during the upcoming June engagement.

- Micheal Pohlod, Voltus asked if different measures will be looked at in attempt to tackle some of the reasons that are leading to stakeholders buying out? Mr. Pohlod acknowledges the summer HVAC DR program that will be coming out, however highlights that in the capacity auction the deadline for capacity transfers remains ahead of the start of the capacity year. It was noted that being able to transfer within the season might also help improve liquidity and prevent buyouts going forward.

Ms. Zubyck noted that in-period transfers remain an ongoing conversation and could resume in the fall regarding future enhancements.

On a motion moved by Joe Saunders, members unanimously voted to post the proposed market rule amendments for broader stakeholder input.

Agenda Item 4: Terms of Reference - Administrative Updates

Paula Lukan, IESO presented amendments to the ToR as discussed with members and posted recently for broader stakeholder input. The amendments include those of an administrative nature concerning grammar and the change of name of *Stakeholder Advisory Committee* to *Strategic Advisory Committee*. Additional amendments include changing the frequency of the joint TP/Board meeting from two meetings per year to one meeting per year. The impetus for this change was to allow for a more focused strategic discussion as the IESO and TP members felt that with post MRP launch there is no longer a need to meet as often. The last amendment included aligning the ToR and Chapter 3, section 4 of market rules which will be discussed in the July TP meeting.

Stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback until May 29, 2025. The IESO did not receive any feedback from the broader stakeholder community. One item brought forward by a TP member suggested changes to provide greater clarity in section 9 of the ToR to define “minor changes” to the ToR and aligning the language describing “minor changes” with that for “minor amendments” of the market rules, as defined in Market Rules Ch. 11.

On a motion moved by Michael Pohlod, members unanimously voted to recommend the proposed amendments to the ToR for IESO Board approval.

Other Business

Mr. Urukov asked the if the IESO is considering having a broader working group dedicated to dealing with issues around MRP. Mr. Urukov noted that with the Market Power Mitigation (MPM) working group in place to address unintended outcomes of MPM, acknowledging that there have not been any market-significant problems reported, there may be smaller items that need to be addressed which would be outside the scope of the MPM Working Group.

Mike Lyle, IESO thanked Mr. Urukov for the comment and noted that the IESO will consider this request and will provide an update to the broader community in the future.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:38 a.m.

The next regular TP meeting will be held on July 15, 2025

Action Item Summary

Date	Action	Status	Comments
No actions identified.			

DRAFT