

Minutes of the IESO Technical Panel Meeting

Meeting date: February 10, 2026
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	Attended
Vlad Urukov	Market Participant Generators	Attended
Michael Pohlod	Demand Response	Attended
Matthew China	Energy Related Businesses and Service	Attended
David Short	IESO	Attended
Michael Lyle	Chair	Attended
Secretariat		
Trisha Hickson	IESO	Attended

IESO Presenters/Attendees

Presenters:

Jo Chung
Adam Cumming
Darren Byers
Alicia Gaetan

Attendees:

Megan Cairns
Karen Backman
Johnathan Paredes

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.

Both the December 2nd and January 10th meeting minutes were approved on a motion by Jennifer Jayapalan, subject to revising Jennifer Jayapalan's attendance to "regrets" in the January 10th minutes.

Introductory Remarks from the Chair:

Michael Lyle, Chair welcomed everyone and noted one update for the panel stating that the IESO has commenced interviews with prospective new panel members. Mr. Lyle noted that he anticipates new appointments to be present at the April meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Engagement Update

Ms. Hickson provided an update on the prospective schedule which is posted on the Technical Panel webpage and identified upcoming sessions as part of the IESO February Engagement Days and encouraged panel members and observers to attend.

Agenda Item 3: Adjustments to Real-Time Make-Whole Payments

Darren Byers, IESO opened the discussion by noting that, at the January meeting, the Technical Panel voted to post the proposed amendments on real-time make-whole payments for stakeholder review, explaining that the three items within the amendment package aim to address unwarranted make-whole payments associated with infeasible operating reserve, particularly ahead of the spring freshet period when such payments would otherwise increase. Two stakeholder submissions were received,

one from Vlad Urukov and another from OPG, both primarily focused on item one, which addresses operating reserve and hydroelectric resources with forbidden regions. Mr. Byers explained that current market rules prevent hydroelectric resources from receiving make-whole payments for energy within forbidden regions but do not prevent such payments for operating reserve, resulting in payments for infeasible OR volumes. Item one corrects for this by applying the same exclusion to operating reserve. Stakeholder comments centered on concerns about the volume of edge case scenarios, noting that over the past seven months approximately 95% of dispatch intervals reflected the engine respecting the forbidden region (and thus appropriately reducing make-whole payments), while the remaining 5% comprised infrequent edge cases beyond the scope of the current initiative and without an easily workable solution. Mr. Byers also noted four changes made to the proposal since the vote to post version, which are highlighted in the supplemental proposal and summarized in the accompanying memo. He concluded by inviting questions with members of the Markets team present to support the discussion.

The presentation and associated materials are available on the [Technical Panel webpage](#).

- Mr. Urukov thanked the IESO for providing analysis based on earlier comments and noted that the Technical Panel consistently benefits from receiving the accompanying technical specifications. Mr. Urukov further noted that the correction proposed for implementation would introduce the same ratio of accurate to inaccurate corrections as currently exists for energy settlements, notably, the 95/5 split observed over the last seven months. Mr. Urukov stated that in his view, the key assessment is whether the correction of the 95% portion related to Operating Reserve (OR) is more materially significant than the 5% inaccuracy embedded in the current rules, specifically the instances in which the IESO incorrectly reduces the make-whole payment applicable to suppliers. Mr. Urukov highlighted that this ratio may change during freshet, when system behaviour on the supplier side can shift and OR considerations may evolve in ways not typically observed at other times of the year. To provide additional confidence, recognizing that the rule is not perfect and contains an underlying inaccuracy, he requested that the IESO commit to returning to the Technical Panel with an update on this item following freshet. Mr. Urukov suggested a timeline of June or July for such an update, for the purpose of confirming that the implemented change is not, on a net basis, resulting in reduced accuracy.

Karen Backman, IESO noted that as with all market rule amendments, the IESO tracks and monitors outcomes to ensure the amendments achieve their intended purpose, and this applies to item one. With respect to the 95/5 split, Ms. Backman noted that part of the post amendment monitoring would include assessing whether that split remains consistent. If the split remains the same, it will indicate that the amendment is successful. If the split changes and the amendment is not effective, the IESO would then consider ways to improve the situation. Ms. Backman added that the results of this monitoring could be brought back to the Technical Panel, should the Panel be interested in them.

- Mr. Urukov acknowledged and asked that the IESO note this as an action item.

Mr. Lyle acknowledged and confirmed that the IESO will add the action item to the Technical Panel meeting minutes.

- Robert Reinmuller asked whether the IESO has sufficient data to identify when the identified issues occur, noting their assumption that such data is available. He expressed the view that the proposed correction is prudent in support of an efficient market. Mr. Reinmuller asked whether the IESO intends to return at a specified time to report on outcomes and suggested that such a commitment should be placed on the record. Mr. Reinmuller then proposed that the IESO monitor the issue over the next six months and subsequently report back to confirm whether the correction is functioning as intended, for example, whether the previous 5% error margin has been reduced to 1%, recognizing that some margin of error will always exist. He noted that this would reflect positively on the process and on the IESO by demonstrating active follow through identifying an error, correcting it, monitoring it, and reporting transparently on the results. Mr. Reinmuller cautioned against the risk of overcorrection, which could adversely impact generators. He suggested that once the item is approved, the IESO return at the six or twelve month mark to report on whether the correction is effective.

Ms. Backman noted that the observed make-whole payments do not impact market prices. She added that the IESO could look at returning to the Technical Panel with an update on what is observed post amendment, reporting on whether the change has succeeded and to what extent. If any concerns arise, the IESO would similarly report those findings. Ms. Backman emphasized that this work is part of the organization's ongoing continuous improvement efforts and that the monitoring of make-whole payments is not a one time exercise.

It was noted by Mr. Lyle that an update will be provided to the Technical Panel in March, regarding the timing of this report back on the results of the analysis.

- Mr. Urukov and Mr. Reinmuller acknowledged.

On a motion moved by Robert Reinmuller, the Technical Panel voted to recommend for IESO Board approval the market rule amendments associated with the adjustments to real-time make-whole payments. Mr. Lyle noted that voting rationale should be sent to the IESO by February 13, 2026.

Agenda Item 4: Updates to Contingency Event Definitions

Adam Cumming, IESO provided a procedural overview, noting that most market rule amendment proposals undergo stakeholder engagement before coming to the Technical Panel, after which they are deemed to warrant consideration under the Technical Panel's Terms of Reference. For this item, due to its minor administrative nature, no stakeholder engagement was conducted. Following the education presentation and any questions, the Technical Panel will be asked to vote that the item warrants consideration and to assign it a regular priority. If the Panel determines the amendment submission warrants consideration, the IESO Board will be informed and the item will proceed through the normal

amendment process, with the intention of returning to the Technical Panel in April with red-lined amendments for review. Adam Cumming then turned the presentation over to Alicia Gaetan.

The presentation and associated materials are available on the [Technical Panel webpage](#).

- Mr. Reinmuller acknowledged that the wording change makes sense but asked whether it applies only to the balancing side for operating reserve, or whether the change extends to the operations side of the market rules as well. He noted that the most severe single contingency for operating reserve may not be just one element, but involve multiple elements, such as a line and several inverter-based resources rather than the traditional N-1 single element assumption. Mr. Reinmuller asked for clarification on whether this change is limited to operating reserve or signals a broader future shift in real-time operations away from the “single contingency” definition.

Ms. Gaetan noted that the change is not intended to affect operational processes. She added that the IESO currently interprets “most severe single contingency” to mean the same as “first contingency loss,” referring to the loss of a single component consistent with an N-1 contingency and identifying the largest associated loss. Ms. Gaetan acknowledged that work is underway in the NERC space that may, in the future, broaden this definition to include sympathetic losses of inverter-based resources, but this is not currently part of the formal definition. As such, there is no functional change in interpretation, and the IESO’s understanding remains the same as before.

- Mr. Reinmuller acknowledged this response.
- Mr. Urukov noted that, within Chapter 11, only “second contingency loss” and “contingency event” are defined terms, while “first contingency event” appears in the market rules but is not formally defined. He observed that this creates a misalignment and suggested that additional work may be needed to ensure both terms are clearly defined and consistent within the rules.

Mr. Cumming noted that the issue has been identified and added that one of the terms is currently defined in the market manuals, while the other is defined in the market rules. Mr. Cumming noted that the IESO is considering cleaning up these terms, likely by consolidating them in a single location to ensure consistency and uniformity across the documents.

- Mr. Urukov acknowledged these points.

On a motion moved by Robert Reinmuller, the Technical Panel voted that the amendment submission warrants consideration with a regular priority.

Agenda Item 5: Expected Market Rule Amendments – 2026

Jo Chung, IESO noted that the 2026 Market Rules memo highlights the potential market rule

amendments expected to be brought before the panel in 2026. Mr. Chung noted that the timing may shift depending on stakeholder engagement timing and other new higher priority items that may arise. He added that the panel will be provided with an update throughout the year.

- Mr. Reinmuller asked when the IESO returns with the schedule for upcoming amendments, some of which may need to come to the Technical Panel, possibly the Strategic Advisory Committee (SAC), and then the Board, will the IESO provide clear visibility on all required steps for each amendment. He noted that having this information would help the Panel understand the timing involved in moving each amendment through the full approval process.

Mr. Chung noted that the vast majority, if not all, market rule amendments will begin at the stakeholder engagement stage, where any proposed changes, whether design related or otherwise, will be reviewed and stakeholder comments will be solicited on draft market rule amendments and manual changes. Once the stakeholder engagement process is complete, market rule amendments will come to the Technical Panel first as an education item, followed by the vote to post and vote to recommend stages. Mr. Chung added that engagement updates and bulletin items will keep the Panel informed so that all change initiatives remain on the Panel’s radar well in advance.

- Mr. Reinmuller acknowledged this response.

Mr. Lyle noted for clarity that market rule amendments are not brought forward to the Strategic Advisory Committee, as this venue is for discussions at the strategic level.

Other Business

No other business was brought forward.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:38 a.m.

The next regular TP meeting will be held on March 3, 2026.

Action Item Summary

Date	Action	Status	Comments
Oct. 7, 2025	The IESO to report back to the Technical Panel on possible changes to enhance the market manual process once the assessment	Open	

is complete.

Feb. 10, 2026 MR-00490-R00: Adjustments to RT-MWPs

For item 1: OR Lost Opportunity Cost
and forbidden regions,
the IESO will provide the Technical
Panel with a post freshet update at a date
to be specified at the March 3, 2026
Technical Panel meeting.

Open

DRAFT