

# Minutes of the IESO Technical Panel Meeting

Meeting date: October 15, 2024  
Meeting time: 9:00 a.m. - 10:09 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](mailto: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
Indra Maharjan	Consumers	Attended
Forrest Pengra	Residential Consumers	Attended
Robert Reinmuller	Transmitters	Attended
Joe Saunders	Distributors	Regrets
Vlad Urukov	Market Participant Generators	Attended
Michael Pohlod	Demand Response	Attended
Lukas Deeg	Generators	Attended
Matthew China	Energy Related Businesses and Service	Attended
David Short	IESO	Attended
Michael Lyle	Chair	Attended
<b>Secretariat</b>		

Invitees	Representing	Attendance Status Attended, Regrets
Trisha Hickson	IESO	Attended
<b>IESO Presenters/Attendees</b>		
Paula Lukan		
Aaron Kucharczuk		
Stephen Nusbaum		
Jessica Savage		
Bob Yeoman		
Darren Byers		
Jo Chung		
James Hunter		
Carita Edwards		
Denise Jamal		
Carla Nell		
Adam Cumming		

## Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Administration

Trisha Hickson, IESO, welcomed everyone joining the meeting.

The meeting agenda was approved on a motion by Indra Maharajan.

The September 10, meeting minutes were approved on a motion by Matthew China.

### Introductory Remarks from the Chair:

- Michael Lyle, Chair welcomed everyone and noted that the IESO is still accepting nominations for the Market Participant, Consumer representative. The posting is still available on LinkedIn. Mr. Lyle also noted the 2024 Joint Meeting of the Technical Panel and the IESO Board of Directors to be held on December 10, 2024. The IESO will provide the panel with additional information once the details have been confirmed.

## Agenda Item 2: Engagement Update

Trisha Hickson, IESO provided an update on the prospective schedule which can be found on the Technical Panel webpage. Ms. Hickson identified upcoming sessions as part of the IESO October Engagement Days and encouraged Technical Panel (TP) members and observers to attend.

## Agenda Item 3: Changes to Exemptions Market Manual, 2.2

Paula Lukan, IESO, provided an overview as an information item to the TP regarding changes to exemptions market manual, 2.2. The overview included an introduction and background, a description of changes, stakeholder engagement actions taken, and insight into the implementation schedule. The presentation can be found on the Technical Panel webpage.

Slide 10, Vlad Urukov asked in terms of changes market participants may need to make once MRP goes live, could the IESO elaborate if the process outlined adds any extra burden to participants?

- Ms. Lukan stated that the IESO Market Rules team would work with market participants to amend any existing exemptions that need to be updated to align with the MRP rule set in time for MRP go-live.

## Agenda Item 4: Market Power Mitigation Working Group

Stephen Nusbaum, IESO, provided an update on the implementation of the Market Power Mitigation (MPM) working group. Mr. Nusbaum discussed the objectives, proposed timelines for launching the working group, and asked for the panel's input on key points for the working group's terms of reference. The presentation can be found on the Technical Panel webpage.

Regarding the proposed timeline to launch the MPM working group, slide 4, Mr. Urukov asked about the timing of the end-to-end testing schedule.

- Mr. Nusbaum noted that end-to-end testing would take about 9 weeks running from mid-January to the end of March. Mr. Nusbaum noted that the purpose of drawing attention to the timeline was to highlight that if there are questions or issues that the working group feel are important to include in end-to-end testing, or issues found as a result of end-to-end testing, the working group would be available as a venue to discuss these as required prior to go-live. Mr. Nusbaum acknowledged that the graphic depicting end-to-end testing on the slide was not accurate as end-to-end testing would be complete by end of March.

In relation to working group membership, Jason Chee-Aloy requested that the IESO consider a previous suggestion from the Technical Panel allowing Market Participants and stakeholders to have the ability to nominate and place representatives on the working group, as opposed to the IESO alone determining the working group membership.

- Mr. Nusbaum asked Mr. Chee-Aloy for clarity on who he believed should have the ability to appoint members.

Mr. Chee-Aloy suggested an approach where the working group could be divided into segments, and, as an example, generators could appoint one member, customers could appoint another, etc.

- Mr. Lyle noted that this approach could raise challenges with respect to governance issues and the working group's agreement with the nominations. Mr. Lyle further noted that the call is open to all stakeholders, and anyone is welcome to put forth a nominee.

Mr. Chee-Aloy acknowledged the challenges noted by Mr. Lyle and agreed that the working group will require individuals with a technical background and a level of commitment to the working group but reiterated his request for the IESO's consideration of this suggested approach.

- Jessica Savage, IESO, noted that regardless of the approach adopted, it does not preclude a Technical Panel member from endorsing a candidate through the targeted call.

Mr. Chee-Aloy provided further clarification on the suggested approach by indicating that it is intended to mitigate potential concerns about the balance of perspectives of the working group members. Mr. Chee-Aloy suggested an alternative approach such that the Technical Panel could have visibility into the members the IESO intends to place on the working group and provide input on those member selections, based on the relevant criteria

- The IESO acknowledged Mr. Chee-Aloy's comment and expressed openness to the Technical Panel's thoughts to the criteria used for the selection process.

On the topic of membership, Mr. Urukov asked if the 4 to 8 non-IESO members could be increased should there be interest from additional qualified individuals.

- Mr. Nusbaum noted that yes, the IESO could adjust the number of members based on the quality and quantity of applicants.

Regarding transparency of the working group discussions, Mr. Urukov asked the IESO to expand on the confidentiality considerations of the working group. Mr. Urukov noted that participants may struggle to provide the level of detail that explains the issues without divulging commercially sensitive information. Has the IESO thought about how the working group would navigate such confidentiality issues?

- Mr. Nusbaum noted that there could be a non-disclosure type of agreement within the working group to ensure that discussions and materials are not shared outside of the working group. Mr. Nusbaum noted that this would need to be captured in the Terms of Reference with the working group members and that the IESO is open to any suggestions and recommendations.

Mr. Urukov noted in relation to roles and expectations (*slide 9: first bullet: members will be expected to focus on enhancing overall market efficiency*) the language of "enhancing overall market efficiency" does

not align with his understanding of the working group's purpose. Mr. Urukov noted that while the overall notion is relevant, the focus should be on the principle of fairness, reciprocal treatment, and dealing with specific issues of the MPM framework, rather than the broad enhancement of market efficiency. Mr. Urukov added that the working group is not a market design group but rather a targeted engagement on specific MPM issues.

- Mr. Nusbaum agreed with Mr. Urukov's statement and added that regarding market efficiency it is important to look at the impact of the issues on market efficiency. While it is not the purpose of the group to improve market efficiency, it is necessary for the working group to consider market efficiency when considering MPM issues. Mr. Nusbaum acknowledged that in the slide 'maintaining' market efficiency is a more accurate characterization than 'enhancing' market efficiency.

Mr. Chee-Aloy noted support for Mr. Urukov's comments and added that the purpose is more on the application of the MPM framework in terms of rules, meeting obligations, processes and procedures, timing, outcomes etc. and opining on whether the framework is accomplishing what was intended.

- Mr. Nusbaum acknowledged there was room to improve the language by perhaps utilizing the wording of "application" of the framework and "supporting market efficiency". This is what the IESO was attempting to capture. Additionally, the IESO's perspective is that the working group is to review unintended outcomes of the MPM framework overall, and not the venue to focus on a specific resource's issue if that issue is an appropriate outcome of the application of the MPM framework.

Mr. Urukov noted that the lack of discussion on the IESO's role in the working group, particularly around analysis and how the IESO plans to commit and communicate comprehensive explanations related to the root cause of unintended outcomes back to the working group.

- Mr. Nusbaum acknowledged that more information could be provided around the IESO's role and committed to discussing this with the working group. Mr. Nusbaum added that there is a shared accountability for the IESO and members to bring forward analysis to explain how unintended outcomes occurred.

Mr. Urukov acknowledged and asked the IESO to include reference to the IESO's role in the working group's Terms of Reference.

- Mr. Nusbaum acknowledged this suggestion.

In terms of bringing forward issues to the working group, Mr. Urukov asked how a participant who may not have a designated staff member as part of the working group could bring topics to the working group.

- Mr. Nusbaum noted that issues brought to the IESO from MPs through customer relations would be shared directly with the MPM team. The IESO would then analyze the issues with the participant and/or decide if it is something that should be brought forward to the working

group. The participant could also request the IESO bring the issue forward. Mr. Nusbaum added that other avenues to contact the working group could be considered, however it is understood that participants can bring forward issues using the current processes in place to contact the IESO.

- Ms. Savage noted that Technical Panel members are also an avenue for issues to be brought forward to the IESO.

Rob Coulbeck supported Mr. Urukov's comments and asked if issues could be brought forward through MACD or MSP.

- Mr. Nusbaum noted that the IESO does receive information regarding areas the MSP is investigating prior to reports being released, so this could be another avenue.

In relation to the working group's consensus on specific matters, Mr. Urukov asked what the process would be where the working group has considered a matter but does not reach consensus on the root cause or agree on a solution. How would this information be presented to the Technical Panel and how would the IESO ensure a comprehensive view of the information from the working group.

- Mr. Nusbaum noted that in the case of multiple views between working group members, the working group ultimately fulfills an advisory role to the IESO and the Technical Panel. The IESO will continue to put forward its own recommendations based on its analysis and input from stakeholders. The working group will need to determine how to present their recommendations in the event there are multiple views that do not align. In addition, if it is a prioritization of issues and certain stakeholders rank issues differently in this prioritization, then the working group will need to determine what to do when it is unable to reach a consensus.

On the topic of member qualifications:

- Ms. Savage reflected on previous comments regarding the role of the Technical Panel in determining the composition of the working group. Ms. Savage noted that while it is the role of the IESO to appoint the working group members, the IESO is open to discussing the applicants the IESO intends to place on the working group with the Technical Panel. Ms. Savage suggested that this could take place as an in-camera conversation with the Technical Panel. As such, if the IESO moves forward with this plan then it is important to hear the Technical Panel's input into the required qualifications of the working group members and the selection criteria that are being applied.

Mr. Chee-Aloy acknowledged this and added that the criteria should focus on individuals who are operating facilities, interacting with the IESO on schedules, dispatch instructions, compliance matters, and settlements, etc. Mr. Chee-Aloy added that participants who have consistently been or may be impacted by the MPM framework as it's currently understood should be included to participate. In addition, participants that have experience with conduct and impact tests and the type of ex ante and ex post mitigation that is applied in the US markets would be helpful.

- Mr. Nusbaum acknowledged Mr. Chee-Aloy's contribution.

On the IESO's proposal of in-camera MPM working group meetings, Mr. Chee-Aloy noted that allowing for observers may have its benefits in terms of transparency. However, having a member in attendance from MACD may be a hindrance to an open discussion with Market Participants. Mr. Chee-Aloy added that the matters being discussed in the working group will be matters of application of the framework from an effectiveness point of view in terms of fairness, but there are also aspects that will deal with compliance and charges, sanctions, etc. as well as aspects of gaming and anomalous behavior which then leads to discussions of investigations and reports etc. On the one hand there is discussion about being open to transparency, but on the other hand market participants may be reluctant to be open and transparent with representatives from MACD and MSP being present. What are the IESO's thoughts on representation on the working group from MACD and MSP and how they will be integrated into the working group?

- Bob Yeoman, IESO noted that MACD is part of the working group as the administrator of the MPM process. MACD's role regarding the working group is to ensure that the MPM Framework is working as it is intended and achieving the desired outcomes. Mr. Yeoman added that MACD's role on the working group is not to identify issues or build cases based on information shared by Market Participants in the working group. Mr. Yeoman noted that he cannot speak on behalf of MSP, but from a MACD perspective, it is very important to note that being present is solely for the purposes of the MPM Framework. Mr. Yeoman acknowledged the perceived sensitivity of MACD's presence from a Market Participant point of view, but reiterated the goal is to work with participants in the same manner as other IESO staff.

Mr. Chee-Aloy acknowledged and noted there will likely be more to come on this in terms of potential members considering the dynamics and what that means.

Mr. Lyle passed the floor to Ms. Lukan for a follow-up related to agenda Item 3: Changes to Exemptions Market Manual, 2.2

Ms. Lukan noted for the panel that regarding existing exemptions that may need to be amended to align with the MRP rules set, the Market Rules team has performed a high-level preliminary assessment of the exemptions and found that there were five or so that needed to be amended. Ms. Lukan noted that the IESO encourages Market Participants to look at their own exemptions and determine any changes that may need to be made.

Mr. Urukov asked if there are deadlines for the exemption request.

- Ms. Lukan noted that the MRP go live date is the aim, but if there is an existing exemption where more substantial changes need to be made, then the IESO encourages Market Participants to reach out to MACD to discuss any forbearance that may be required to help that Market Participant prior to MRP go live date. MACD is aware and ready to have conversations with Market Participants that have concerns around the amendments and timing.

Mr. Urukov acknowledged the response.

- Ms. Lukan added that most of the existing exemptions are of an operational nature and relate to technical items contained in the appendix to chapter 4, and there was no material changes made to that section of the market rules. Despite the number of 50 or so existing exemptions, there are not many that require changes.

Mr. Urukov asked if there would be an update this year on the insurance policy, *Error and Omissions insurance for negligence*.

- Mr. Lyle acknowledged that he would follow up with the panel regarding this matter and timing.

Mr. Chee-Aloy asked for confirmation that the MPM working group information and the recently approved MRP rules are on target to be brought forward to the IESO board.

- Mr. Lyle confirmed that the items are on target.

Mr. Chee-Aloy acknowledged the confirmation and followed up by asking if the vote and rationale that Technical Panel members provided for the vote of the Final Alignment batch were included in the package of materials going to the IESO Board.

- Mr. Lyle confirmed that the Technical Panel member's vote and rationale was shared.
- Ms. Savage noted that the Technical Panel member's vote and rationale is posted publicly on the IESO proposed Market Rule amendments webpage.

### Other Business

No other business was brought forward.

### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:09 a.m.

The next regular TP meeting will be held on November 12, 2024.



### **Action Item Summary**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
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	

DRAFT