

IESO Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Minutes of Meeting
July 12, 2006
9:00 am

Advisory Committee Members in Attendance:

Mr. Brian Bentz (representing Distributors)
Mr. Bruce Boland, Chair (representing Generators)
Mr. Mr. Bruce Campbell (representing IESO)
Mr. Chuck Stradling (representing Commercial Consumers)
Mr. Daniel Whyte (representing Generators)
Ms. Julie Girvan (representing Residential Consumers)
Mr. Matthew Picardi (representing Marketers/Brokers)
Mr. Mike Humphries (representing Embedded Industrial Consumers)
Mr. Paul McMillan (representing Marketers/Brokers)

Mr. Yuri Tsimberg (for Mr. Steve Dorey)
Mr. Mike Kuriychuk (for Mr. John LeMay)

Advisory Committee members Absent:

Mr. Bruce Lourie (representing Environmental)
Mr. Don Thorne (representing Distributors)
Mr. John LeMay (representing Wholesale Consumer Market Participants)
Mr. Steve Dorey (representing Transmitters)

Presenters:

Mr. Harry Chandler (IESO)
Mr. Peter Sergejewich (IESO)

Introduction – Bruce Boland

Mr. Boland, Mr. Dorey and Mr. Humphries attended the Board meeting on behalf of the Committee. They conveyed two messages to the Board regarding the vision: there is a need to drill down and not spend all of our time at a high level; and in drilling down we will focus on 5 or 6 major themes. In relation to market evolution the Board asked the Committee to consider what the benefits to consumers are. The Board also sought input on how do you measure transparency, efficiency and equity, and what is the definition of a good business case. In relation to Government policy there was a discussion regarding whether you follow or lead.

IESO Senior Management Update – Bruce Campbell

Briefing notes were provided in advance of the meeting, the floor was open for questions on the notes provided.

Day-Ahead Commitment Process

There was discussion around the low 2.85% participation rate and whether it would undermine the reliability benefits of the program. It was noted that it was very early in the program, and the weather had been moderate with lower prices and imports. Mr. Carey suggested that in these conditions there are low day ahead prices and any imports would come in at the higher HOEP price. The IESO has been making enquiries of traders but no conclusions have been drawn at this time.

Electric Reliability Organization

Following up on an email circulated to Committee members on July 11, 2006 Mr. Barry Green highlighted OPG's concerns regarding ERO developments. In particular OPG is concerned about the lack of an Ontario remand capability analogous to that held by FERC. He suggested that NERC standards would take effect in Ontario while they continued to be under review by other regulators who could remand the standard back. He proposed that this could be addressed in the interim, pending legislative change granting the OEB remand authority, through a market rule revision requiring NERC standards to be approved by market rules which would then be subject to review and remand by the OEB.

Mr. Campbell responded by noting that standards will only come into effect on an "effective date" which would allow for the remand process in other jurisdictions to run. This would prevent the immediate adoption of a NERC standard which was subject to ongoing review and potential remand. Ontario will be advised of any remand of a proposed standard through the rules of procedure proposed by NERC. The IESO was in strong support of the OEB being granted remand authority, however, until that was done the OEB had made it clear that it would not undertake a review of standards under the guise of reviewing market rules as proposed by OPG. Mr. Campbell suggested that it would be useful for the Committee to speak with a unanimous voice in recommending to the Government that the OEB be granted remand authority.

Mr. Boland took comfort from Mr. Campbell's comments regarding standards not taking effect in Ontario until the effective date which would follow regulatory review. Mr. Boland suggested that members consider this and come back to the issue at a later date.

Motion

Be it resolved that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee recommend to the IESO Board and senior management the Committee's strong support for legislative amendments to the *Ontario Energy Board Act*, and other legislation as necessary, such that the Ontario Energy Board be given the remand authority to deal with NERC reliability standards. This resolution was unanimously approved.

There was further discussion regarding the need for clear guidelines with appropriate standing confirming how the NERC functional responsibilities would be mapped to Ontario market participants. The IESO indicated that they will encourage the active and ongoing participation

of Ontario market participants in the NERC standards development process. Hydro One was concerned about the approval of standard in the interim period between now and the granting of remand authority to the OEB. Mr. Campbell said that it has been recognized in discussions with NERC and FERC that there needs to be a co-ordinated mechanism to ensure consistency of standards which may have a potential deficiency. It is anticipated that the NERC process would be used to make any changes that are required to address ambiguities, a lack of clarity for enforcement, or fill in the blank regional standards. It was agreed that interested parties would have further discussion on this issue off line during the lunch break.

Natural Gas/Electricity Interface (NGEIR)

The IESO confirmed that the DACP program will be subject to a full review in the fall.

12X Ramp Rate

As this issue moves forward all of the participants acknowledge the need to provide, to the extent possible, empirical evidence and modelling of price impacts.

Stakeholder Engagement

Mr. Boland noted that there was value in group stakeholder sessions which were open and transparent. The IESO confirmed that various 1 on 1 meetings with market participants are not a substitute for the group sessions with stakeholders. Stakeholding on particular issues is conducted pursuant to the stakeholder engagement plan developed for each initiative; the IESO encourages comments on draft stakeholder plans which are posted for comment. Mr. Alpajaro, Bruce Power, spoke in favour of the continuation of the Market Price Working Group as a very useful working level group session for all stakeholders, allowing discussions of linkages between different issues which may not fit into a specific initiative.

Vision

Mr. Boland suggested that based on the last discussion the Committee appeared to be coming towards a common view. He summarized various points from the minutes of the last meeting and undertook to prepare a draft document reflecting this general consensus for further discussion at the next meeting. In particular he noted that no one was suggesting a return to the old Ontario Hydro model. People want to move towards a competitive regime in a pragmatic manner supported by a good business case. Mr. Chuddy asked if there is a process for the IESO, OPA and OEB to establish a joint group to co-ordinate the incremental steps being taken towards a joint vision. Mr. Goulding confirmed that a group has been established, BOAC, to incorporate OPA, OEB and IESO. In addition there are on going meetings between these organizations at different levels including their board members, executives, management, and staff. These meetings take place against a background of a hybrid market, legislative change, regulations and directives. Work between the organizations is directed to avoiding the need for as many directives, regulations and legislative change in future.

Mr. Bentz said that there is an opportunity to move the market towards competition and the most practical way of doing that is looking at such initiatives as a day-ahead market, LMP and LSEs. By moving on these issues it is hoped that there will be a consensus amongst the key groups – the OEB, OPA and IESO – allowing us to move the market forward. If you make progress on the specifics then there will be an opportunity for the grand vision to unveil itself.

Evolution of the Vision for the Ontario Electricity Market

Exploration of Themes

Mr. Boland as chair had established teams of committee members to undertake more detailed work on specific themes relating to the general issue of market evolution. Team members were asked to provide an overview of their initial work and to highlight what they have identified as issues and opportunities.

Day-Ahead Market – Matthew Picardi, Daniel Whyte

Mr. Picardi said that he had several conversations with Mr. Whyte regarding the day-ahead market. Mr. Picardi said that to accurately assess the options, issues, opportunities and benefits it is necessary to look at both the existing current situation (where we are today), and where we think we may be (where we are going). Without looking forward to some degree you would not be able to accurately assess the value it provides. In relation to the day-ahead market it would provide a certain value today and even more value in a more competitive market with greater load participation. Similarly in looking forward there may be a market with a reliability component which makes the day-ahead market not necessarily voluntary, but with an element of mandatory bidding. One must consider the government's statements in support of a day-ahead market while recognizing that we continue to need to make a case in favour of it.

Mr. Whyte said that there were two themes in relation to the day-ahead market:

1. the benefit to all market participants, including generators, of having the optionality of another market; and
2. in order to support market evolution one must set up systems that will allow for the evolution of the market. At this point the day-ahead market serves evolutionary purposes.

Mr. Humphries said that it is one thing to talk about a concept and another to identify the impact (who benefits and when). To win support for a proposal requires an assessment of the impact.

Mr. Kuriyuchuk said that previously AMPCO had opposed the day-ahead market not because they opposed markets but because there was no business case. Benefits and costs to customers must be clearly delineated. Mr. Picardi said you need to consider what type of long term view one should take to assess the benefits, particularly when you are in a market that is developing resources through contract that some day you will want in the market instead of under contract. Mr. Bentz said do not forget the history associated with prior work on the day-ahead market. It

would be useful for the IESO to sponsor a refresher workshop on the day-ahead market. Mr. Picardi said that as a starting point for his work there is a lot of good information on the IESO website. Further lessons can be learned from the development of day-ahead markets in other jurisdictions and from consideration of legislative change in Ontario.

Linkages were also identified between the development of a day-ahead market and load serving entities, and LMP.

Demand Response – Chuck Stradling, Julie Girvan, Bruce Lourie

Mr. Stradling said that they had not had an opportunity to spend much time on this theme. Mr. Stradling provided a copy of his rough notes on the issue. Current pricing does not facilitate demand response. RPP without time of use rates provides no incentive for demand response and the hourly Ontario energy price does not provide enough certainty to attract large users. Different sectors have different characteristics and needs. The next logical steps include smart meter implementation which is well underway and which will be a basic platform for time based pricing for small consumers; time of use RPP; critical peak pricing; and then a day-ahead market to better facilitate demand response and larger consumers.

Mr. Boland noted that there has been significant experience elsewhere with demand response which can be reviewed for best practices. Ms. Girvan enquired about what role the IESO should play in demand response. Mr. Kuriychuk commented on AMPCO's work with the OPA on a pilot programme which could eventually be integrated into an IESO economic demand response programme. Though the benefits of the programme are inadequate it is enough to get started and gain experience.

In response to a comment regarding the use of demand response for operating reserve, Mr. Paul Murphy noted that the IESO has more load participating in operating reserve than anywhere else in North America.

Locational Marginal Pricing – Mike Humphries

Mr. Humphries commented that it would be useful to update the prior work on LMP as much of it is dated from 2003. At this stage of his review he had more questions than answers. The first question is what is going to drive LMP? Is it driven by a need to make the system more efficient, a market view, or is it driven by the political desire to provide relief for certain areas of the province? Politics is a significant concern particularly because of the potential for rapid shifts in the pricing in specific areas, for example the northwest, as a result of changes in generation. Consideration also needs to be given to the Ontario transmission system. Is it intended to be a system without constraints, or do we live with the constraints we have and use LMP to highlight the need for change. Who pays for addressing constraints? Does LMP work in such a large province with generation distributed the way it is?

Mr. Kuriychuk said that AMPCO understands that the Government is planning to make a pronouncement on LMP in the next couple of months. AMPCO has no official policy on LMP other than that the Government should not deal with it on an ad hoc basis but study it correctly with input from groups such as the IESO and OPA. Mr. Picardi commented on the need to think about how to deal with transition mechanisms to introduce LMP such as load zones and nodal pricing for generators to address unique local issues.

Committee members commented on the level of chatter about this issue by Government officials. Mr. Goulding said that rather than be reactive it would be appropriate for the Committee to recommend a broadly stakeholdered study of the various options for LMP going forward. This would put the issue on the table and may avoid taking a reactive step to something which would not support evolution.

Motion

Be it resolved that the Stakeholder Advisory Committee recommend to the IESO Board and senior management that the IESO proactively study through an open stakeholdering process the potential introduction of LMP (Local Market Pricing) in Ontario as a priority for development of the Ontario electricity market. This resolution was unanimously approved.

Load Serving Entities – Brian Bentz and Don Thorne

Mr. Bentz said that there is divergence of opinion amongst distributors regarding load serving entities (LSE's) and that the views that he was expressing were his and not necessarily those of his constituency. [divergence is over the appetite among LDCs for LSEs, to perform it as default supply basis and a minority does not believe they need LSEs] Competitive and efficient markets are dependent upon load and generators making informed decisions. Only the largest consumers today have the ability to manage their own energy needs through understanding of their load shape, developing strategies to minimize their energy costs through initiatives such as forward contracts, hedging, demand response, altering consumption or even self generation. Smaller load lacks this ability. Retailers, marketers and aggregators fill this gap by offering fixed price alternatives to the current RPP.

Approximately 8,000 MW have not signed with retailers, marketers or aggregators, remaining instead with default supply where they receive the benefit of regulated and OPA contract pricing. They are not active in the marketplace and are subject to significant price volatility as evidenced by the 16% increase in the RPP commodity price last April. Should this group be represented so that it is more than just a passive price taker. LSE's can fill this function as a load aggregator procuring supply for customers who choose not to sign with a specific retailer nor to passively accept the spot market price.

Power is purchased at a set price for a set period of time. It is a transparent price to consumers and for retailers to beat. Price and volume risk is borne by the LSE. Benefits include representation of a large unrepresented group of consumers in the wholesale market which

balances some generator market power. It strongly supports the resource adequacy reliability priority. It provides alignment with the adjacent wholesale electricity markets who have successfully implemented LSEs. Supports the development of forward energy contract markets and price discovery while enhancing market liquidity. Minimises price volatility, improves price transparency and predictability, and ultimately reduces political risk by shifting risk to the private sector. Longer term, eliminates the carrying cost of the OPA managed RPP variance account and the price volatility created by RPP price true-ups.

Recommend staged implementation for customer segments with the greatest potential benefit e.g. RPP customers. Staged implementation to ensure market power influences do not produce anomalous results if too large a proportion of load is purchased or renewed at a single point in time. It should be bought in strips to avoid gaming. Issues associated with implementation include creditworthiness of LSE proponents; the value proposition of LSE model versus RPP model; program costs and required business processes; LDC sector risk appetite and expertise to be an LSE; availability of forward supply; risk management and mitigation; and the timing of implementation. Other jurisdictions should be looked at.

In summary LSEs have the potential to provide significant benefits in the development of the Ontario electricity market and should be given serious consideration in any model brought forward to move towards a more competitive market.

The Hydro One representative suggested consistency of definitions between Ontario and, for example, NERC was important. Mr. Boland asked about the timelines for transitioning from the longer term contracts being entered into by the OPA to build new generation (25 years) vs. the shorter term contracts favoured by LSEs (1 to 3 years). Mr. Bentz noted that it is recognized that there is a gap between the wholesale and retail markets – evidenced by attempts to fix it through smart meters & demand response – and that LSEs can also address that issue by getting consumer interests better representation in clearing the market and incenting supply. Mr. Picardi noted that the risks to be assumed by LSEs can be priced and passed on to the different entities that help the LSEs serve their load. Ms. Girvan commented on the regulatory issues which will be raised by LDCs taking on the role of LSEs. In some ways it is similar to LMP and serves as a way of breaking the market into different prices. There will need to be significant regulatory mechanisms to ensure supply and reserve adequacy.

Mr. Whyte enquired about the IESO's view of LSEs. Mr. Campbell said that the OPA has specific responsibility for moving forward on LSEs and that the IESO is very supportive of getting load more actively engaged in the market. For example a day-ahead market offers greater benefit with load participation. Mr. Whyte questioned if this was the right forum to discuss LSEs. Mr. Campbell said that it made sense to take advantage of the IESO stakeholder process and to stay coordinated with the OPA, who often attended these sessions, in terms of discussions on market evolution.

Evolving the Market – Linkages – Bruce Boland and Steve Dorey

Mr. Boland said that they commenced their work by looking at the evolution of both the environment and market over the last 8 years. They did this by itemizing changes from 1998 to 2003 as set out in by the Electricity Conservation & Supply Task Force, and then updating that list. After identifying what has changed the next step would be to make recommendations and observations.

Changes from 1998 to 2003

- Investors' loss of confidence in Ontario market
- The loss of credit-worthy electricity traders in the wake of the Enron debacle
- Natural gas price increases and volatility
- Delays and cost increases in Pickering A restart
- Recognition that unmitigated spot price for small customers is politically unacceptable
- Government commitment to coal phase-out by 2007
- Commitment to renewable and DSM targets, plus Kyoto compliance
- Government commitment to ongoing public ownership
- US government commitment to supporting new nuclear, clean coal, hydrogen, renewables and conservation

Changes in Environment from December 2003 – July 2006

- Hybrid market recommendations were adopted; we have an OPA Supply Mix IPSP
- Increased recognition of transmission constraints and infrastructure needs
- Renewables and conservation – increased commitment beyond Task Force
- New nuclear
- Growing concern in U.S. over retail benefits of competition and overall cost increases
- Growing recognition of NIMBY (generation/transmission)
- Role of natural gas “peaking and intermediate” to “peaking” and “gap filling/special applications”

Mr. Kuriychuk added that there is also a sense of disillusionment among industrial consumers in the evolved markets as a result of significant price increases. Industrial consumers consider there to be little incentive for new entrants, generator behaviour to keep prices up, and a search for alternatives including deregulation or reregulation in a limited context. Mr. Picardi disagreed with these comments and said that the issue in PJM, for example, was driven by capacity market design. He also noted that they had enjoyed the benefit of low prices for a long period of time. He cautioned about undertaking an analysis which is based on the assumption that gas prices will continue to stay high given that gas prices have and will continue to fluctuate. Mr. Whyte added that with fuel costs being the largest component of energy prices, fuel price increases will result in energy price increases in both regulated and deregulated markets.

Mr. Boland said that there is disillusionment out there but the question is whether it should be attributed to markets or to other factors. Mr. Picardi said that this is a difficult issue to debate since how can you compare a market to a regulated state where energy prices were going up in any event because of input price increases. Mr. Humphries noted that the disillusionment may have as much to do with how a market selects generation mix vs. selection of generation mix in a regulated market.

Defining a Business Case – Paul McMillan

As a starting point Mr. McMillan observed that the challenge was to add or replace generation capacity in the context of what has traditionally been low cost supply. The problem is that the world has changed and you cannot build new capacity for \$42/MWH. We need to move forward from the hybrid situation; the question is whether it is a phase in, or incremental development towards the end goal. Price is a significant concern. Consumers see prices as too high but we need to get them to participate in the market. Customers want price certainty and need the ability to deal with price excursions.

Macro elements for a business case include understanding what it is you are trying to do, define the parameters, establish parameters you are going to measure against, and communicate it clearly to the investment community. You will need adequate transition mechanisms to respect contractual commitments especially in the hybrid market. You need to consider the future and the significant infrastructure changes that will occur.

Objectives are to build new capacity, ensure reliability, ensure that it is affordable, increase liquidity and counterparty participation. These objectives may change depending upon the time frame used. Mr. McMillan discussed the need for market liquidity through price discovery and risk management.

Measurement is fundamental to a business case. You must measure the costs and benefits (often harder to measure the benefits), including ancillary effects and costs. It is easy to underestimate the impact on, for example, back office and settlement costs. Under-estimating implementation costs can lead to a tendency to build a solution instead of going for pragmatic usable solutions that already exist. Ultimately you need to break it into discrete parts, establish phases with objective and priorities which you can turn around and measure to see if you are successful. At the end of the day you want an informed decision process. It is important to remember that you will never make the right, perfect decision but you will have succeeded if it is an informed one.

Mike Kuriychuk said that the electricity sector exists for the benefit of consumers and not as an end in itself. Ideology is not a compelling argument, for example market incentives do not lead to new capacity. In developing a business plan avoid mantras. It is not enough to say it is a reliability issue, prove it. Benefits may be harder to quantify but that does not mean that you should not try to quantify them, or put them in a qualitative range. Industrials are turned off by a one sided business case. Try to keep it balanced.

Mr. Boland noted that Mr. Lourie, who was not present, has commented on the need for environmental issues to be addressed in a business plan. What is a benefit may vary with your perspective; for example a new job can be viewed as an additional expense or a political benefit. Mr. Whyte said that producing electricity is a business like any other manufacturing process; they too can deploy their resources in other jurisdictions.

Other Comments

Mr. Bob Hunt said that most demand response programs are at a pilot stage. In other jurisdictions the most successful projects appear to target peak demand under critical peak pricing; this is not the case in Ontario. Demand response can become part of the supply mix to the extent that it is dependable and measurable and under IESO control. Demand response seems to have one of the lower costs attributed to it with respect to replacing generation resources and can contribute to price stability for industry.

Market Surveillance Panel – Findings & Recommendations – Harry Chandler

Mr. Chandler provided a presentation summarizing the findings and recommendations of the Market Surveillance Panel as set out in its Monitoring Report on the IESO-Administered Electricity Markets. Mr. Boland asked if the panel would agree that if constrained off payments are eliminated then the resources that are constrained off would also be excluded from the price setting schedule? Mr. Chandler said that the panel does not propose market design but brings forth evidence and analysis on issues. The current problem is the Hourly Ontario Electricity Price does not reflect the real cost of the resource needed. In discussion on the implications of the inability to use the phase shifters on the Michigan interties, Hydro One advised that progress has been made but they are unable to give a sense of the timing.

Mr. Boland commented that it might be useful for the IESO to respond to the recommendations that are made in the MSP report and track progress against the recommendations. Monitoring and demonstrating progress would keep the issues raised alive between the reports and put pressure on to make progress.

Mr. Hunt said that the accuracy of the 3 hour ahead price vs. actual prices is an issue for how to dispatch generation as well as the new OPA RFP for demand response. Does this raise reliability concerns and impact OPA programs? Mr. Chandler replied by noting the report said that as you move towards real time the accuracy improves and in terms of demand the error is under one percent which is quite good. Mr. Hunt said that as renewables increase you have less control over supply and the ability to manage dispatchable load and other demand response items become critical which is why the IESO needs to have the demand response under its control. Mr. Lubek added that though there are practical limits to what can be done, efforts to improve the 3 hour forecast are continuing. Mr. Cary requested that emphasis be continued on improving forecasting because of its importance to gas generators scheduling gas supply.

Mr. Boland requested that members read the report and reflect on his question of whether there is value in a more formalized process of action items, responses and tracking against recommendations; and if the answer to that is yes whether it should be incorporated into the performance measures.

2007-2009 Business Plan-Corporate Performance Measures – Peter Sergejewich

Mr. Sergejewich made a presentation on the staff level views of corporate performance measures, encouraging feedback from the Committee. Mr. Boland enquired whether the ISOs share performance metrics and benchmarks. The IESO is unaware of other ISOs maintaining as extensive a list of metrics and has not approached other IESOs to do a survey and standardize performance metrics. Some of this may fall out of the implementation of the FERC system of accounts.

Mr. Humphries noted that the list of metrics was long and asked how items are added and deleted. Mr. Campbell agreed that the list was too long but it reflected the input of a stakeholder board and other specific interests through the OEB hearing process. Mr. Boland suggested that you need to keep the detail in if people continue to have a lot of different indicators that they are interested in. Mr. Campbell replied that it may be a question of moving, where appropriate, a performance indicator from a corporate level to a functional level. Mr. Boland suggested that customer satisfaction should incorporate a measure of providing effective stakeholder forums and integrating these processes with the OEB and OPA.

Mr. Kerr suggested that there should be a measure of the percentage of total market cost that is reflected in energy vs. uplift. Performance measures are weighted differently by the Board for variable compensation; Mr. Campbell welcomed suggestions from the Committee on the weighting. The performance measures indicate activity areas and specific functional objectives and programs are developed in the business plan which is in the middle of development. Mr. McMillan noted that there are costs associated with being “best in class” and performance should be assessed against the value it provides.

Committee members were encouraged to submit their comments on the proposed performance measures within the next 3 weeks to enable them to be incorporated into the draft business plan. Consistent with the formal stakeholdering plan for the business plan, as posted, the IESO was soliciting comments directly from the Committee.

Mr. Boland said that the SAC had received a letter from OPG requesting SAC to recommend the formation of a task force to explore ways to improve forecasting. In the settlement of the IESO’s 2006 fee case it was agreed that the IESO would not oppose such a recommendation but reserved the right to recommend more appropriate means. Mr. Campbell clarified that the task force was to address how to narrow forecasting deviations and not to define performance measures. Considerable effort and progress has been made to improve forecasting and that before committing the resources and efforts to a task force it would be useful to assess the progress which has been made. It was agreed that the OPG request would remain an open

action item for the Committee which the Committee may consider addressed following the September presentation by the IESO on its business plan and proposed performance measures.

Other Matters

The next Committee meeting is September 5, 2006 in advance of the regularly scheduled Board meeting on September 22, 2006. The Board is also having a special meeting on September 7, 2006 to deal with the business plan. Mr. Campbell undertook to confirm with the Board whether representatives of the Committee would be invited to the special meeting. Mr. Boland said that he is unable to attend the July 27 board meeting and he encouraged Committee members to advise Mr. Humphries if they would be available to attend as part of a 2 to 3 member delegation from the Committee.

In terms of continuing work on the vision Mr. Boland said that he will draw up a summary based on the last meeting for comment at the next meeting to see if progress can be made on an agreed vision statement. In terms of themes it was agreed that each team would remain active save and except the demand response team which would await the OPA review of its pilot project in the October/November timeframe. Mr. Campbell said that on matters such as the day-ahead market and locational marginal pricing the IESO will have stakeholder engagement plans and it would be preferable to avoid creating a duplicate parallel process. Mr. Campbell undertook to contact the relevant members of the Committee to ensure that their input is taken into account as part of the stakeholdering process. Mr. Boland said that the Committee will look at themes and if an issue goes through the stakeholder process the Committee team designed to flesh out the issue will be absorbed into the larger stakeholder process. The Committee will, however, continue to provide input to the Board and IESO management regarding the IESO's business plan.

The meeting adjourned.