Minutes of the IESO Technical Panel Meeting

Meeting date: July 14, 2026
Meeting time: 9:00 a.m.– 10:20 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
Cory Cook	Consumers (non-market participants)	Attended
Rupali Jain	Energy Related Businesses and Service	Attended
Margaret Koontz	Generators	Attended
Vlad Urukov	Market Participant Generators	Attended
Michael Pohlod	Demand Response	Attended
Matthew China	Energy Related Businesses and Services	Attended
Devon Huber	IESO	Attended
Michael Lyle	Chair	Attended
Secretariat		
Trisha Hickson	IESO	Attended

IESO Presenters/Attendees

Presenters:	**Attendees:**
Josh Duru	Jo Chung
Hok Ng	James Hunter
Laura Zubyck	Robin Bates
Darren Byers	

Agenda Item 1: Introduction and Administration

Trisha Hickson welcomed everyone joining the meeting.

The meeting agenda was approved on a motion by Robert Reinmuller.

The June 9, 2026, meeting minutes were approved on a motion by Margaret Koontz.

Introductory Remarks from the Chair:

Michael Lyle, Chair noted that a distributor representative is expected to be nominated to the IESO Board in August for approval and noted the vacancy for the renewable generator representative position following Jason Chee-Aloy's departure. Mr. Lyle reminded the Panel that a notice seeking candidates was issued through the IESO bulletin on June 25 and encouraged members to promote the opportunity within their professional networks. In addition, Mr. Lyle noted that Jason Fitzsimmons had recently assumed the role of President and Chief Executive Officer of the IESO. As a result, the previously scheduled August discussion between the Technical Panel and the Markets Committee would be deferred to allow Mr. Fitzsimmons additional time to become established in his new role before meeting with the Panel.

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 and noted that the July engagement days agenda would be included in the IESO bulletin.

Agenda Item 3: 2026 Capacity Auction Enhancements

Jo Chung advised the panel that, on June 9, the Panel received an overview of the proposed market rule updates related to the UCAP Adjustment Charge and the Emergency Activation Payment formula. The deadline for stakeholder feedback on the draft market rule amendments and associated manual changes presented during the May 28 stakeholder engagement session closed on June 11. No concerns or suggested revisions were raised by stakeholders. One written comment from a stakeholder indicated that the draft market rule and manual content were consistent with the design presented during the March stakeholder engagement. Mr. Chung also informed the panel that, prior to the meeting, comments and questions regarding the proposed rule amendments had been received from Vlad Urukov, and the matter was referred to Laura Zubyck, Supervisor of Capacity Auction, to address and provide clarification on those questions.

Laura Zubyck noted that the questions related to the application of the in-period UCAP Adjustment Charge under various scenarios, as well as suggestions to improve clarity within the rules. She expressed confidence that the process and structure of the rules correctly capture the intended implementation of the UCAP Adjustment Charge, while acknowledging that there may be an opportunity to enhance clarity. Ms. Zubyck further noted that detailed examples illustrating the application of the charge across different notice of disagreement (NOD) scenarios could address many of the questions raised. Pending the Panel's vote to post the amendments, the comments and questions would be treated as an early submission to the posting process, with formal written responses and examples to be provided as part of the September vote to recommend materials.

The associated materials are available on the Technical Panel webpage.

Mr. Urukov asked whether the submission of a NOD changes the period during which the UCAP Adjustment Charge is applied.

- Ms. Zubyck confirmed that, at a high level, the submission of a NOD does affect the application period of the UCAP Adjustment Charge. She explained that when no NOD is involved, the adjustment charge is applied from the start of the obligation period up to the settlement date, after which the obligation is adjusted downward, and no further adjustment charge is required. However, when a NOD is submitted, the obligation is not immediately adjusted because the NOD must first proceed through the applicable review process. As a result, the UCAP Adjustment Charge continues to be applied during that period to recover payments as though the obligation had already been adjusted, pending determination of whether the NOD results in a change to the de-rate.

Mr. Urukov asked whether the proposed approach assumes that a NOD will be resolved within the applicable obligation period, noting that NODs can sometimes take a considerable amount of time to resolve.

- Ms. Zubyck explained that no such assumption is made. She noted that a NOD may or may not be resolved within the obligation period, and therefore the obligation is not adjusted when a NOD is filed. This approach allows the NOD review process to proceed without prematurely changing the obligation. If the NOD remains unresolved beyond the end of the obligation period, the applicable de-rate can still be adjusted and the obligation period can be resettled once the review process is complete. Mr. Urukov acknowledged the explanation.

On a motion moved by Forrest Pengra, the Technical Panel unanimously voted to post the market rule amendments for stakeholder comment.

Item 4: Chapter 3 Market Rule Amendment Process Refresh.

Darren Byers noted that the Panel received an overview at the May meeting of the proposed amendments to the provisions governing the rule amendment process in Chapter 3. Members were reminded that the Panel determined that the amendment submission warranted further consideration. The objective of the proposed amendments is to improve readability and provide greater clarity regarding the rule amendment process, particularly as these provisions have remained largely unchanged since market opening. Since the initial discussion, the IESO has revised the rule provisions, updated the Market Manual, and made conforming changes to the Technical Panel Terms of Reference.

The associated materials are available on the [Technical Panel webpage].

Mr. Urukov sought clarification on the role and significance of education sessions within the market rule amendment process, and whether an education session carries the same procedural weight as a stakeholder engagement and can replace the warrants consideration process.

- Mr. Lyle confirmed that the initiative had, in fact, been subject to a warrants consideration vote at the May Technical Panel meeting. Mr. Chung further noted that the subsequent pause in discussions was due to the additional time needed to draft the supporting documents.

Mr. Urukov acknowledged his misunderstanding and confirmed his understanding that education sessions do not replace stakeholder engagement or warrants consideration requirements.

Mr. Urukov noted that Section 4.3 does not explicitly reference a vote in determining whether an amendment submission warrants consideration. He added that the Technical Panel Terms of Reference previously specified that such determinations required a majority vote, whereas the current wording refers only to a determination without defining how that determination is made. He suggested adding greater specificity regarding the process for deciding whether a proposal warrants consideration, including the voting requirement.

- Mr. Chung noted that Mr. Urukov raised a valid point and acknowledged that the majority voting requirement may have been inadvertently removed from the draft Terms of Reference. He noted that the provision is not currently captured in either the market rules or Market Manual 2.3 and indicated it could be added back to the Terms of Reference. Mr. Chung advised that the matter would be reviewed and that the IESO would likely reintroduce language specifying the majority vote requirement for an amendment submission or a vote to post decision.

Mr. Urukov expressed agreement with this approach and thanked the IESO for the clarification.

Mr. Urukov asked whether the proposed amendments appropriately preserve the IESO’s ability to defer minor amendments and bundle them into omnibus amendment packages for consideration at a later date. He noted that, while minor amendments may bypass the vote-to-post stage, they still proceed through the vote-to-recommend process and observed that the IESO has historically consolidated minor and administrative amendments into omnibus packages rather than advancing each amendment individually.

- Mr. Byers explained that, in previous instances, the IESO had consolidated multiple minor amendments into omnibus packages and brought them forward together through the customary approval process. He indicated that neither the current rules nor the proposed amendments would prevent the use of omnibus amendment packages in the future. Robin Bates confirmed that the intent of the proposed framework is to preserve the ability to advance omnibus packages of minor amendments, consistent with past practice. She further noted that, if helpful, additional language could be included in the Market Manual to clarify that authority.

Mr. Urukov agreed that such clarification would be valuable, noting that the approach has been used previously and is an established practice.

Mr. Urukov commented that the proposed provisions are clearer and more readable than the existing rules and expressed appreciation for the effort to modernize and update them. He then sought clarification on Sections 4.3.4 and 4.3.5, specifically regarding the requirement for consultation with the Secretary of the Dispute Resolution Panel and the Chair of the Market Surveillance Panel (MSP). He asked about the significance of these consultations, what outcomes may result from them, and how they could affect the rule amendment process.

- Mr. Byers noted that the consultation requirements are carried forward from the existing rules and were retained in the proposed amendments to avoid inadvertently changing the current rights and obligations established in the market rules. Ms. Bates explained that the intent is to ensure that individuals responsible for overseeing the dispute resolution and market surveillance processes are made aware of, and have an opportunity to comment on, any rule changes that could affect those functions. She indicated that the outcome of such consultations could vary significantly, ranging from no concerns being raised to identification of substantive issues that could require reconsideration of a proposed amendment.

Mr. Urukov further noted that Section 4.5.2.4 requires the IESO's written report to the IESO Board to include the views of the Secretary of the Dispute Resolution Panel and the Chair of the MSP and questioned whether the consultation process involved anything beyond obtaining and documenting their feedback.

- Ms. Bates responded that explicitly including their views in the Board package helps ensure that the Board is aware of any concerns or objections before approving a rule amendment. Mr. Chung referenced a previous amendment to Chapter 3, during which the Secretary of the Dispute Resolution Panel was notified of the proposed changes and advised that there were no concerns. He added that the consultation serves primarily as an opportunity for those parties to identify concerns or provide input on proposed amendments affecting their areas of responsibility.

Mr. Urukov acknowledged the clarification.

Michael Pohlod asked whether additional clarity had been added regarding the process that applies when a vote to recommend a rule amendment does not pass. He noted that his understanding of past practice was that, even where the Technical Panel did not recommend a proposed market rule amendment, the IESO could still advance the proposal to the Board. He questioned whether that practice was being changed and suggested that it may be preferable for an amendment that fails to receive a recommendation from the panel to be returned to the IESO for further work rather than proceeding to the Board.

- Ms. Bates explained that where a vote to recommend does not pass, the matter is not recommended by the Technical Panel; however, the rules do not explicitly state that the process ends at that point. She noted that the rules provide no alternative procedural path, prompting further discussion regarding how such situations are handled in practice. Mr. Chung clarified that even where a majority of Technical Panel members vote against a proposed amendment, the matter will still proceed to the IESO Board. He explained that, following completion of the Technical Panel vote, the Board retains the authority under the market rules to consider the proposal and may choose to approve the amendment, reject it, or refer it back to the Technical Panel for further consideration and work.
- Mr. Lyle noted that the authority to make market rule amendments ultimately rests with the IESO Board under its legislative mandate. He stated that while significant opposition from the Technical Panel would be an important factor in the Board's deliberations, the final decision remains the Board's responsibility.

Mr. Pohlod also asked whether a vote to recommend is determined by a plurality or a majority vote.

- Mr. Byers indicated that the voting threshold would be addressed through the Technical Panel Terms of Reference and acknowledged that, consistent with an earlier discussion raised by Mr. Urukov, the majority-vote requirement may need to be reinstated or clarified within that document.

Mr. Pohlod acknowledged the clarification.

Mr. Urukov sought confirmation of his understanding of Section 4.5.2, noting that the provision describes the steps that occur following a Technical Panel vote but does not distinguish between votes that are in favour, opposed, unanimous, or otherwise. He asked whether all of the subsequent procedural steps, including submission to the Board, occur regardless of the outcome of the vote. He also requested clarification regarding how stakeholder and Technical Panel views are communicated to the Board, and under what circumstances comments are provided in their original form rather than as summarized by the IESO.

- Mr. Chung confirmed that the processes set out in Section 4.5.2 apply regardless of the outcome of the Technical Panel vote. He explained that whether the Panel's recommendation is favourable, unfavourable, or unanimous, the related materials and recommendations continue through the established process and are provided to the IESO Board for consideration. Mr. Chung further noted that, in the interest of transparency, all Technical Panel materials, recommendations, and related information are published on the proposed market rule amendments website and made available to stakeholders.

Mr. Urukov observed that there had previously been discussion regarding whether stakeholder views are summarized by the IESO or presented in their original form.

- Mr. Chung explained that Board packages generally include summaries of comments; however, the market rules contain provisions requiring written comments to be submitted directly to the Board in certain circumstances, including where stakeholders disagree with a Technical Panel determination. He noted that this requirement exists in the current rules and has been retained in the revised provisions. Mr. Chung added that stakeholder engagement materials, Technical Panel comments, and related documentation are publicly posted to ensure transparency throughout the rule amendment process.

Mr. Urukov acknowledged the explanation and indicated his understanding of the process.

Rob Coulbeck noted that stakeholders have historically expressed concern that, while Technical Panel comments and recommendations are available, they do not always have visibility into the materials and recommendations presented by the IESO to the Board. He asked whether the proposed amendments address this issue.

- Mr. Chung explained that this concern had previously been addressed in 2018 through recommendations arising from an advisory group review. He noted that, except where legal redactions are required, the IESO publishes the materials provided to the Board, allowing stakeholders to review how comments and feedback received through stakeholder engagement and the Technical Panel process are characterized. Mr. Chung further advised that, particularly for contentious initiatives, all relevant comments and supporting materials submitted to the Board are made publicly available on the IESO website, subject only to necessary legal redactions.

Mr. Coulbeck acknowledged the clarification and noted that he had not been aware of the change.

Mr. Byers continued the presentation reviewing the sections with minimal or no changes, as well as the provisions that had been removed. One of the provisions that had been removed was one that permitted Technical Panel to invite comments on decisions they make on amendments that warranted consideration. Mr. Pohlod then asked whether this provision had ever been invoked by the Technical Panel in practice.

- Mr. Chung confirmed that, since 2009, the clause had never been exercised by the Technical Panel. He explained that staff considered the provision unnecessary because it would permit the Technical Panel to request further comments after it had already completed its vote and made a determination on an amendment submission. Mr. Chung noted that the market rules already provide the Technical Panel with the ability to request additional stakeholder feedback at any point prior to making a warrants consideration determination. As such, IESO staff concluded that requesting another round of comments after a determination had been made would not be a practical or logical step in the process.

Mr. Pohlod indicated that he agreed with the rationale and was primarily interested in understanding whether there had been any historical precedent for its use.

- Mr. Chung confirmed that there had not been.

Mr. Urukov commented that the revised language in the proposed new Section 11 of market manual 2.3 provided additional clarity regarding the process that applies when a market participant objects to a market manual change. He expressed concern that the provision continues to focus on situations where a manual change is made to implement a market rule. In his view, the more challenging scenario is where a standalone market manual change, with no corresponding market rule amendment, raises concerns among market participants. Mr. Urukov suggested that the wording in Market Manual 2.3 should be refined to more clearly address how participants can challenge or seek changes to market manual provisions that are not associated with an active market rule amendment process.

- James Hunter acknowledged the concern and advised that the IESO would revisit the draft manual language before the vote-to-recommend stage to determine whether additional clarification could be provided. He explained that the revised language was intended to distinguish between two scenarios: first, where market manual changes accompany a market rule amendment and stakeholders can provide input through the established market rule amendment process; and second, the more complex situation where concerns arise regarding a standalone market manual provision that is not tied to an ongoing rule amendment. Mr. Hunter noted that the previous manual language did not adequately address this latter circumstance, as it appeared to direct stakeholders immediately toward filing a market rule amendment request. He explained that the revised approach is intended to encourage participants to first raise concerns directly with the IESO through stakeholder engagement initiatives, operational contacts, customer relations channels, or other established processes, allowing discussion on whether the manual provisions appropriately support the underlying market rules. He further explained that only in the rare circumstance where the participant and the IESO remain fundamentally at odds after these discussions would a market rule amendment become the appropriate recourse. Mr. Hunter emphasized that market manuals are not viewed as a separate body of rules but rather as part of the broader market rule framework, providing administrative and procedural detail. As a result, a persistent disagreement over a manual provision may ultimately reflect a disagreement regarding the interpretation or scope of the underlying market rule itself, making the market rule amendment process the appropriate mechanism for resolution. He further noted that the IESO would review the wording to ensure the distinction between rule-related manual changes and standalone manual changes are more clearly articulated.

Mr. Urukov acknowledged the explanation and noted the commitment to further clarify the language.

Mr. Urukov expressed appreciation for the IESO's efforts in undertaking the review and modernization of the Chapter 3 provisions. He acknowledged that the initiative was likely a significant undertaking and commented that the proposed changes would help position the current and future Technical Panels for success.

On a motion moved by Vlad Urukov, the Technical Panel unanimously voted to post the market rule amendments and the Technical Panel Terms of Reference for broader stakeholder comment.

Item 5: Changes to the Establishment and Publication of Market Parameters

Josh Duru, Senior Market Rules and Manuals Advisor, advised that this presentation is intended to provide background and context regarding the proposed changes. Mr. Duru noted that the proposed amendments stem from an initiative introduced in September 2025, when the IESO proposed removing a legacy requirement that certain technical market parameters be established by the IESO Board.

The associated materials are available on the Technical Panel webpage.

Mr. Urukov sought clarification on the role of the Operating Reserve Demand Curve (ORDC) and its relationship to Constraint Violation Penalties (CVPs). He observed that, while the ORDC is linked to the CVP framework, it also appears to have a direct impact on market prices, including operating reserve clearing prices and potentially locational prices. He questioned whether, conceptually, the ORDC functions not only as part of the constraint violation framework but also as a price-setting mechanism, making its role less straightforward to categorize.

- Hok Ng explained that CVPs represent penalty values used by the market optimization engine when evaluating whether system constraints must be violated to maintain reliability. He noted that, absent mitigation, the use of these penalty values could result in extremely high prices reflecting the cost of violating system constraints. Mr. Ng explained that the ORDC is designed to temper this outcome by ensuring that these CVP values are not directly reflected in settlement prices. Instead, the ORDC produces prices that remain aligned with the relative reliability impact of constraint violations while avoiding the direct transfer of high penalty costs into market prices. In response to the observation that the ORDC appears closely tied to operating reserve clearing prices, Mr. Ng acknowledged that the ORDC influences prices but emphasized that its purpose is to reflect the relative values associated with reserve scarcity while moderating the price effects that would otherwise result from the underlying penalty values.

Mr. Urukov indicated that he understood the explanation but remained of the view that the ORDC could be interpreted as both a component of the constraint violation framework and a market price determinant. He advised that he would give the matter further consideration and may provide additional comments or questions at a later stage.

Other Business

No other business was brought forward.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

The next regular TP meeting will be held on September 15, 2026.

Action Item Summary

Date	Action	Status	Comments
Oct. 7, 2025	The IESO to report back to the	Open	To be addressed as

	Technical Panel on possible changes to enhance the market manual process once the assessment is complete.		part of the Ch.3 Market Rule Amendment Process Refresh.
Feb. 10, 2026	MR-00490-R00: Adjustments to RT MWPs For item 1: OR Lost Opportunity Cost and forbidden regions,	Open	The IESO will provide the Technical Panel with a post freshet update at the September 15, 2026 Technical Panel meeting.