

IESO Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes
February 10, 2016
St. Andrew's Club & Conference Centre, Toronto

Advisory Committee Members:

Mr. Brian Bentz – Chair (representing Distributors and Transmitters)
Mr. Steve Baker (representing Related Businesses/Services)
Mr. John Beaucage (representing Ontario Communities) (via teleconference)
Ms. Darlene Bradley (representing Distributors and Transmitters) (via teleconference)
Mr. Jack Burkom (representing Related Businesses/Services)
Mr. David Butters (representing Generators)
Mr. Jared Donald (representing Generators)
Ms. Julie Girvan (representing Consumers)
Ms. Valerie Helbronner (representing Generators)
Mr. Geoff Lupton (representing Ontario Communities)
Mr. Rob Mace (representing Distributors and Transmitters)
Mr. James Scongack (representing Generators)
Mr. Mark Schembri (representing Consumers)
Mr. Paul Shervill (representing Related Businesses/Services)
Mr. Adam White (representing Consumers)
Mr. Terry Young (representing IESO)

Absent:

Ms. Ersilia Serafini (representing Ontario Communities)
Mr. Todd Wilcox (representing Distributors and Transmitters)

Presenters:

Ms. Alexandra Campbell
Ms. Barbara Ellard
Ms. Evelyn Lundhild
Ms. Nancy Marconi

IESO Board Members:

Mr. Tim O'Neill, Chair
Ms. Cynthia Chaplin
Mr. Murray Elston
Mr. Ronald Jamieson (via teleconference)
Ms. Margaret Kelch
Mr. Bruce Lourie
Ms. Deborah Whale

Agenda Item No 1:
Welcome – Brian Bentz

Mr. Bentz welcomed all to the meeting, noting that more than 100 people were in attendance, including 30 on the phone. He introduced the IESO Board members and encouraged Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members to provide comments on the information and input items.

Agenda Item No 2:
IESO Business Update – Terry Young

Mr. Young referred to a series of memoranda that were provided with the meeting materials, including the Conservation First Framework, Regional Planning Engagement, and Resource Procurement. A calendar of engagement initiatives was also provided in the materials and Mr. Young provided verbal updates on the following stakeholder engagement initiatives underway:

1. Gas-Electric Coordination Enhancements

The IESO acknowledges that the current market rules place sufficient obligation on market participants to communicate any fuel limitations.

2. Capacity Exports

The IESO is recommencing discussions with stakeholders to investigate the potential to allow Ontario generators to export their capacity to other jurisdictions.

3. Real-Time Generation Cost Guarantee Program

The IESO is continuing to work with stakeholders to develop a new cost-recovery framework.

4. Foundation Project

The Ontario Energy Board (OEB) has issued decisions regarding the smart metering entity license and the next rate application associated with it.

5. Cap and Trade

The IESO continues to provide advice and analysis to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, which is expected to release a draft regulation for stakeholder comment in late February 2016.

6. Net Metering Policy

The IESO is providing technical analysis to the Ministry of Energy as it explores this initiative.

7. Demand Response Auction and Working Group

The first demand response auction in December was a success. Almost 400 megawatts were secured for the summer and more than 400 megawatts for the winter at clearing prices lower than at other auctions. The IESO will continue to refine and incorporate key learnings into future auctions.

Comments

Mr. David Butters asked for clarification on how regional planning works within the long-term energy plan. He asked whether it is a bottom-up or a top-down process. He said generators need to know how their interests are being represented. He also supported the outcome on gas-electric coordination enhancements. With respect to cap and trade, generators are concerned about the timeline. For example, if the government goes forward with regulations regarding upstream suppliers, there must still be a regulatory process, as yet unwritten and unannounced, to figure out how carbon costs will flow through. There is also a question as to how these will be dealt with contractually. He suggested that the IESO meet with affected generators at the next planning meeting or after the draft regulation is released, as meeting the 2017 deadline will be a tall order.

Mr. Michael Lyle, VP, Planning, Law and Aboriginal Relations said that with respect to regional planning, the IESO would like to see more community input. Discussions around 'wires' solutions tend to dominate due to economics and time horizons. Long-term planning discussions with local advisory committees have begun.

Mr. Bentz said integrative solutions will require getting a better handle on demand as soon as possible. It would be a shame to default to transmission line wires and miss out on innovative solutions.

Ms. Valerie Helbronner underscored Mr. Butters' point that the generator community will have concerns if the long term energy plan gets ahead of regional planning.

Mr. Steve Baker asked specifically how the IESO is working with the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change on cap and trade and what it will mean in terms of demand and impact on infrastructure. Ms. JoAnne Butler replied that the IESO has been working more so with the Ministry of Energy, as well as with Environment and Climate

Change Canada, to discuss impacts of policies on price, how imports are treated, how CHP is treated, etc. and where the proceeds of the Cap and Trade program should go.

Mr. Jared Donald said that from a timing and leadership design interface perspective, the net metering consultation process should not be only about microFIT. Mr. Young replied that it is a government-led initiative, and he invited Mr. Donald to discuss his concerns outside of the meeting.

Mr. Lupton said it is important to keep an eye on prospects for economic development at the level of regional planning.

With respect to the LTEP versus regional planning issue, Mr. White asked what the IESO is doing to foster leadership in regional planning. The alternative to long-term energy planning is to hand leadership over at the regional level to empower people locally. With respect to energy managers under the conservation update, uptake is not happening fast enough. Large industrial consumers like this program. With respect to multi-site energy management, there are only 10 full-time equivalents assigned but more are needed to engage an industrial supply chain. Mr. Young replied that energy managers are the treasures of the conservation initiative, and the IESO is focused on having businesses work directly with them. The industrial accelerator program is being looked at to improve uptake, and more funding is available.

Mr. White suggested removing some of the restrictions in the criteria to facilitate uptake. The LDCs find themselves in a gatekeeper role, and the list should be expanded to include where the low-hanging fruit will be. Mr. Bentz acknowledged Mr. White's point.

Mr. White added that an energy management training program is needed for college graduates, because students do not receive that training.

Mr. Mark Schembri said consumers are happy with the energy management program and that Loblaw Properties Limited has applied for a multi-site customer energy manager role. He asked if the No. 4 category will replace the No. 2 category [outlined in Conservation update memorandum], or if they will run independently.

Mr. Young said he does not see one category replacing the other; nor does he see them all run independently. Gaps will be identified and integration addressed during the next five years. Mr. Schembri thanked the IESO for recognizing the multiple LDC requirement.

Ms. Helbronner noted that Aboriginal engagement must factor into regional and long-term energy planning. She requested a specific update at the next SAC meeting on how these will work together.

Mr. Beaucage suggested creating a separate line item at the next meeting to begin the discussion on Aboriginal engagement. Mr. Lyle responded that there are First Nation and Métis stand-alone advisory committees in the northwest, which will be represented on the general advisory committee, and that all advisory committees will have an Aboriginal representative. He noted that the government is responsible for the long-term energy plan and the development of overall engagement.

Ms. Julie Girvan asked about the goals and outcome of the Foundation Project. Mr. Young said that the OEB had renewed the SME licence until December 31, 2016 but was requiring the IESO to collect additional information from LDC smart meters by January 1, 2017. The IESO will take to the OEB with respect to license renewal and rate application for the next round of the Smart Metering Entity. Mr. Doug Thomas said the IESO has reached out to the OEB, the Ministry, and the Electricity Distributors Association regarding what the initiative will look like. It is also reaching out to a smart metering steering committee. Both technical changes and policy decisions are being addressed.

Ms. Girvan asked how the data from the Foundation Program will be used. Mr. Thomas said the OEB is interested in time-of-use and other pricing studies. There are also conservation and regional planning benefits.

Mr. Paul Shervill said the first effort on the demand response auction was commendable, but there were some weaknesses to identify post auction. He encouraged the IESO to build flexibility into future auctions.

Mr. Jack Burkom referred to the export portion of the IESO usage fees that are under review. He said that in the past the IESO held the position that costs for domestic customers only should not be applied to export transactions. However, a new report by Elenchus Research Associates says such costs should be applied to exports in order to reduce administrative complexity. Mr. Burkom asked whether the IESO will hold its former position or look to the recommendation in the Elenchus report.

Mr. Young said this will be addressed in Agenda Item No. 3.

Agenda Item No 3:
IESO Business Plan Update – Nancy Marconi

Ms. Marconi provided an overview of the IESO Business Plan submission. She noted that on January 19, 2016, the IESO filed with the OEB its first revenue requirement submission for the merged entity, which is based on the business plan for 2016 to 2018. The IESO's 2016–18 business plan, which was approved by the Minister of Energy in December, includes a net revenue requirement of \$181.1 million, compared to \$190.2 million in 2014. This reflects merger savings of more than \$5 million.

The IESO is seeking approval for a usage fee of \$1.13 per megawatt-hour, effective January 1, 2016. This fee represents a 9% reduction compared to the combined current IESO usage fee of \$0.803 per megawatt-hour and the current Ontario Power Authority (OPA) usage fee of \$0.439 per megawatt-hour. The current fees were made interim as of January 1. The fee includes a reduction to 724 full-time equivalents in 2016 compared to 730 in 2015 and 765 in 2014, illustrating the organization's focus on achieving efficiencies.

The IESO is proposing to charge one fee to all customers including embedded generation and export volumes, rather than the two fees currently charged. She added that the IESO takes the position that charging customers on a gross load basis is fair and reasonable.

The IESO proposal to charge one fee to all customers is supported by a report by Elenchus Research Associates, which was hired by the IESO to do a cost allocation and rate design study.

With respect to the merger costs, the IESO and OPA incurred \$10.9 million in costs in 2014 to enable the merger to take place: \$5.3 million was incurred by the IESO, \$5.6 million by the OPA. Compensation and benefits made up the bulk of the costs, which were due to staff reductions of 35 people and totalled \$7.8 million.

The IESO proposes to fund the OPA's 2014 merger costs of \$5.3 million through registration fees collected from OPA procurements as well as through an operating surplus. It also proposes to fund the IESO's merger costs through accumulated operating surplus at the end of 2014.

The IESO has proposed to file updated, audited financial information on March 31. A written hearing has been requested by the IESO.

Comments

Mr. Butters said it is frustrating to see the IESO change its position in relation to fees associated with exports. He stated that the Elenchus report acknowledges that charging one fee is inequitable, but within the range of reasonable. Further, generators will be looking to contest it. Ms. Marconi reiterated that the IESO takes the view that charging one fee is equitable and that it simplifies administration.

Mr. John Todd, Elenchus, responded that cost allocation rate design depends on judgment. The question is whether the differences are large enough to require different rates. The OEB has adopted a revenue contribution range of 80 per cent to 120 per cent for most distribution classes, and this is the primary reference point used in the report to determine the reasonableness of one fee.

Mr. Burkom said the Elenchus report acknowledges tens of millions of dollars of costs that should not apply to exports but that will be applied based on customer classes that are not relevant to an export transaction. He noted that the logic in the report is straightforward but not particularly thorough with respect to the nature of customer class.

Mr. Todd asked if there was an implication that the Elenchus report is incomplete. Mr. Burkom declined comment.

Mr. Butters said generators fought the imposition of OPA fees on exports in 2011. The OPA had not consulted affected stakeholders at the time, and sufficient consultation about gross versus net has still not taken place.

Mr. Butters also asked if there is an anticipated percentage increase in the amount of fees collected from exports. Ms. Marconi replied that a \$3-million increase for exporters is forecast in 2016. Mr. Butters replied that \$3 million is considerable.

Mr. Lyle acknowledged that the IESO was unable to engage in as broad a stakeholder process as it would have liked prior to its revenue requirement case filing, which related to challenges in developing its first business plan. However, he noted that there was some SAC discussion about the IESO's intention to charge a single fee.

Mr. Schembri asked if the IESO is on track to meet synergy savings from the merger, excluding the one-time merger costs. Ms. Marconi said yes.

Ms. Girvan asked what the proposal is to recover amounts from January 1 until there is a decision by the OEB. Ms. Marconi said it is expected that rate differences will be returned (or charged) to the appropriate customer classes.

Mr. White said arguments about net versus gross and cost allocation in setting rates have been going on for years in every transmission rate case. AMPCO does not like to see departures from a pro-efficiency stance. The problem with a single fee is that it makes the fee optically better by growing the denominator of the equation. The solution is to bring some economic efficiency to this and to move away from socialized costs.

Mr. Butters said retroactivity must be looked at to see whether it is fair and reasonable. Ms. Marconi replied that it will be an OEB decision.

Mr. Burkom said cost shifting exists in a less transparent fashion when costs on exports are driven up. Customers pay the costs. Ms. Marconi noted that the overall revenue requirement has decreased since 2014, so it is not just a difference in the denominator.

Mr. White said the big efficiencies will be in the market and if the IESO has shaved off \$10 million, then it has less resources to fund innovation. He said that he doesn't see this as a win.

Mr. Bentz said there is benefit in driving costs down and maintaining the same service level while driving innovation. He noted that there are two elements to synergies: reduction to existing budgets, and avoided costs on future budgets. He asked if there is a breakdown for these two elements related to the \$5 million in savings. Ms. Kim Marshall replied that the \$5 million in savings was delivered in 2015 and the IESO is now going through synergistic cost savings within its 2017–19 plan.

Agenda Item No 4:
Technical Panel Terms of Reference – Alexandra Campbell

Ms. Campbell said the Technical Panel was developed prior to the current stakeholder engagement processes. It is proposing terms of reference that clarify its role with respect to market rule changes and technical issues to differentiate it from the SAC and other stakeholders.

The Technical Panel is the only engagement initiative referenced in the Governance and Structure By-Laws, making it a bit of an anomaly. More detail in the terms of reference has therefore been proposed.

In terms of membership, it is being proposed that the Technical Panel move toward something similar to the SAC.

Ms. Campbell noted that generally, members of the Technical Panel understand the direction of the current draft although some are less comfortable with it than others. In an effort to add more clarity in some of the noted constituencies, the IESO will be looking at a way to be clear about the important role of consumers in representation in the proposed Terms of Reference.

In general, more is staying the same with the Technical Panel than is changing.

Comments

Mr. Lupton suggested including the word “commercial” to amendment 4.1.2 with respect to customer representation to make it more inclusive. Ms. Campbell replied that this can be done; however, the Terms of Reference are not intended to note specific representation for every consumer group.

Mr. Butters said he doubts that the Technical Panel members are “at peace” and noted discontent in the proposal from the generator community. The Technical Panel process was put into the By-Laws to assure market participants that their interests would be

protected and asked that By-Law changes not proceed until representation issues are sorted out. Symmetry between the SAC and the Technical Panel is not required. He noted that at the last Technical Panel meeting, neither of the two generator representatives could be present, and one was not allowed to participate by phone.

Mr. Mace said there is general agreement that Technical Panel effectiveness is critical. He asked whether the IESO has a concrete plan for a formal re-evaluation process. Ms. Campbell replied that this will be done.

Mr. Young noted that some Technical Panel members are very supportive of the changes. Mr. Butters replied that generators are arguably the most important constituency within the Technical Panel and deserve more credence. Ms. Campbell said the IESO is committed to greater visibility around activities and meetings and will offer the opportunity for members to join by phone.

Mr. Butters asked if reference to Technical Panel will be removed from the By-Laws. Ms. Campbell said that it is the intention to address the function of the of the Technical Panel in the By-Law but remove the details of the process - more detail will be available for comment.

Mr. Shervill said he is supportive of the changes with respect to market participation but is disturbed by the comment that much is staying the same within the Technical Panel's terms of reference. In particular, it seems that the Terms of Reference do not provide certainly for the service providers who are working in the Demand Response field, so this input is currently not being received. The IESO should try to better reflect the new participants on the Technical Panel, and not delay.

A comment from the floor supported Mr. Butters' comments.

A comment from the floor, supported Mr. Shervill's and Mr. Butters' comments. The Technical Panel should break away from the old-school structure to include the demand response community and new participants like storage. There is a good opportunity to expand membership.

Mr. White supported the comments from the floor and recommended more openness.

Mr. Bentz said that the industry is on the cusp of a paradigm shift in how energy is managed and noted that stakeholdering should change to reflect new participants and new opportunities.

Mr. Lupton said it is important to remember the end-use customers who pay the bills. They need to understand the processes that will affect them.

Ms. Campbell agreed the feedback would be considered before proceeding with any changes.

Agenda Item No 5:
Market Development Initiative – Barbara Ellard

Ms. Ellard said a stakeholder engagement initiative will soon be launched to include market participants and interested parties regarding how to evolve the market, the priorities, and the timelines.

Discussions with key stakeholders began last fall and will continue. It is important to be mindful of changes already happening in the market and to align them with clear objectives in order to develop a work plan that works for everyone.

Ms. Ellard said that the IESO recognizes that a majority of Ontario's generation and some of the load side is contracted, and there is interest in ensuring that the value of these contracts is preserved. There is also an emphasis on providing practical solutions to known problems. There are three key stakeholders: external, governmental, and internal. Going forward, there must also be discussion around governance as the market evolves.

The IESO has looked at market evolution for a long time and is trying to pick up on good work that has already been done. Out-of-market payments and inefficiencies within the market are limitations coming to the forefront. Many changes are coming, including demand response, new participants, storage, distributed energies, SmartGrid, utilities of the future, and Google moving into the space.

She noted that there has been a lot of Band-Aid solutions in the past, some blunt, intrusive, and administratively burdensome for the IESO and for market participants, and there is an opportunity here to fix the foundation to ensure the industry is ready for change.

Potential design changes include two-schedule pricing, day-ahead market, real-time unit commitment, intertie scheduling, capacity, growing the DR capacity auction and portfolio, and trading capacity with neighbours.

Replacing the two-schedule system is the key that will enable other market development work.

Comments

Mr. Butters said as long as the focus is on improved efficiency and not diminution of revenues, then things will be moving in the right direction. Timelines are important.

Contracts should align. Generators are looking for neutrality. It will be important to focus on current assets in addition to what is coming.

Mr. Baker suggested the IESO provide principles and priorities at the front end with respect to prioritizing what needs to be addressed and when. The contracts that are coming up for expiry now and in the near future will be sure to drive some of the priority in this planning. Ms. Ellard replied that the IESO and stakeholders will be clear about objectives, principles, priorities, and where the capacity auction fits in. There has been a suggestion about creating a working group to come back to the stakeholders with a greater focus on the discussion.

Mr. Burkom said the farther away one gets from using market signals, the higher the cost. He echoed Mr. Butters' comment regarding the need to view markets in a neutral fashion noting that on one hand a NUG contract was retired, laying off 15 people go because capacity was worth zero yet on the other hand, a DR auction takes place where capacity clears at levels where the plant could have continued to operate. There is cause for concern that pet projects are targeted through a market evolution.. He noted he is cautiously supportive [of the market development initiative] based on past experience.

Mr. Shervill said his constituents are supportive of moving ahead with the market development initiative. He recommended a road map to show market interdependencies because some things, by definition, will have to be put on or off the table.

Mr. Bentz asked how the IESO will deal with congestion and generator dispatch when the two-schedule system is removed. Ms. Ellard replied that the IESO is looking at different design options around the two schedules and what is being done in other jurisdictions.

Mr. White noted that the action plan, timelines, and targets are lacking and a cost-benefit analysis needs to be done. He added that nothing is happening and [consumers] do not feel empowered. He would like to see real leadership on this. Ms. Ellard replied that the present goal is to set those timelines and targets.

Mr. Butters also called for a cost-benefit analysis. Also, governance is integral to market confidence and must be addressed.

Mr. Lupton said he has heard from mayors on the energy task force about the cross-subsidization of off-peak power to jurisdictions across the border. This has contributed to loss of economic development for some segments. The mayors would appreciate discussion about this in future.

Ms. Girvan agreed with Mr. Butters' and Mr. White's recommendations to do a cost-benefit analysis to improve the bottom line for Ontario consumers.

Mr. Beaucage echoed the need to improve the cost for consumers. A statement of principle would help to provide clarity as to where the market development initiative is heading. People want to know why their hydro rates are so high and they need to know there is a plan.

A comment from the floor asked if anyone is weighing in on cap and trade with respect to the market development initiative. Ms. Ellard replied that it is one of many external elements being discussed with government.

A comment from the floor noted that a good place to begin would be to dust off the old road map from the electricity market forum. Cap and trade should be overlaid on it.

Agenda Item No 6:
peaksaverPLUS – Evelyn Lundhild

Ms. Lundhild said that in March 2015 a Minister's direction sought to evolve all demand response programs to play a greater role in the IESO-administrated market as a capacity resource.

A transition plan is being developed for *peaksaverPLUS*, and the objective is to establish the next steps for this residential demand response program. From a consumer's perspective, it is a "set and forget" program. Events are managed by an aggregation service. Approximately 300,000 participants are enrolled with a mixture of programmable thermostats and load control switches.

Evaluation results for 2014 indicate a 113-megawatt demand reduction capacity based on ex-ante impacts. Ms. Lundhild noted that it was a cool summer, so the resource wasn't activated. The IESO ran some test events, and were getting about a half a kilowatt per home of demand response and has not been able to get a measurable energy savings number from the in-home display that is being offered to the consumer along with a load control device, and that is a concern. The program has high brand awareness.

In terms of incentives, the IESO is committed to paying up to \$415 per participant through the LDCs for devices and installation. About half of that cost is for the in-home display, and this is an ongoing concern.

In technology, smart thermostats have advanced beyond what is now being offered. The program uses the pager network to activate the devices, providing a one-way signal to the device. There is no way to know whether a device is still in service.

In the short term, the proposal is to move to a maintenance mode and to continue to be able to activate the resource when required. LDCs would cease enrolling new customers in the program. Potential technology enhancements will be explored while barriers to participation by residential load in the DR auction process are addressed.

There has been significant investment in these devices, but new enrolments are slowing. As the IESO moves to a new funding framework with LDCs, the role of LDCs must be considered, as well as the role of smart thermostat providers.

Comments

Mr. Lupton said that moving toward a market-based structure removes incentives for LDCs. Consumer trust is an issue; there is a threat of creating a door-knocker syndrome as new players enter the market. Ms. Lundhild replied that research has shown that a significant proportion of homeowners do not want government controlling their thermostats.

Mr. Bentz said the current product is outdated and hitting saturation. Residential demand response must be approached in a more holistic way because technology is changing. Community microgrids involving battery, electric vehicle, and solar, and the intelligence to integrate and aggregate them, are required. There are 23 regional plans in the province looking at integrated systems, and the LDCs should be involved. There should be some choice for the consumer. With respect to stranded assets, about \$175,000 in devices is in his utility's warehouse.

Mr. Baker recommended not limiting the long-term energy plan to electricity. A smart thermostat controls not only electricity but natural gas, too. There is an opportunity to allow consumers to manage their overall energy costs in a holistic approach.

Mr. Schembri asked whether it is the intent to reduce the role of the LDCs. Ms. Lundhild said the options are being looked at.

Mr. Schembri asked how M&V would work for residential consumers. Ms. Lundhild acknowledged M&V as a barrier that must be worked out.

Mr. White said that if the program doesn't work then it should be written off. Even with one-way communication there are lots of way to control the customer's load-off during high-price periods. There were several thousand-dollar hours last year where *peaksaver* was not dispatched, which could have saved customers a lot of money. This also happened when the market was restructured in 1998, and it seems to be happening again. Ms. Lundhill replied that the intent of maintenance mode is to continue to pay the LDCs to use the load control devices, as well as the aggregation service. Mr. White

replied that they should not be paid if they do not activate; they should only be paid out of load control savings.

Ms. Girvan said LDCs should offer customers alternative energy options that are efficient. As well, there is an opportunity for collaboration with gas utilities on energy retrofits for residential customers.

Mr. Donald said it is important to ensure that the rules are clear with respect to developing microgrids so that the private sector will invest and bring value to consumers.

Mr. Shervill said the IESO is on the right track, but energy must be a controllable resource both ways. The players who deliver and use energy must be compensated appropriately.

Mr. Mace said the real opportunities for residential customers are around smarter systems. Price signals are key.

A comment from the floor noted that the province recently increased funding for residential retrofits and asked how this aligns. Ms. Lundhild said the IESO is in discussion with the government regarding the opportunity for the LDCs to participate.

A comment from the phone noted that the communication failure rate in the original *peaksaver*PLUS program was 1% but was reported in 2009 to be 3%. The Nexant study in 2014 found that only one LDC was doing better than 9%. He asked what the overall failure rate was in 2014, and what was the driver. Ms. Lundhild said she did not know the rate, but the declining performance appears to be due to not being able to verify whether the homeowner has removed the device or the device has failed.

The commenter also said the original project design expected a saving per participant of 1.1 kilowatts. A recent study found it to be 0.29 kilowatt per participant. He asked what portion of that difference was caused by communication failure. Ms. Lundhild said this is unknown. Mr. Adams asked whether there is a process in place to follow up on these details. Ms. Lundhild said the Nexant evaluation report is on the IESO website. Investigating individual situations would not be cost-effective, so a statistically valid sample size is used.

A comment from the floor noted that at the start of the Feed in Tariff Program, LDCs were allowed to participate in the private market, and the private market tolerated that.

Agenda Item No 7:
Other Business

The next meeting will take place on March 23, 2016. The SAC will bring their priorities for the 2017–19 planning process.

Agenda Item No 8:
Adjourn

Mr. Bentz thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.