

RE: CoS Edits : MB20 / CAB Sub / PinkNote

From: "Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)" <martin.schlaepfer@ontario.ca>
To: "Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)" <andrew.teliszewsky@ontario.ca>, "Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)" <carolyn.calwell@ontario.ca>
Cc: "Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY)" <serge.imbrogno@ontario.ca>, "Whittington, Matt (ENERGY)" <matt.whittington@ontario.ca>, "Baker, Carys (ENERGY)" <carys.baker@ontario.ca>
Date: Fri, 05 May 2017 13:10:37 -0400

Thanks, Andrew.

Martin

-----Original Message-----

From: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)
Sent: May-05-17 11:55 AM
To: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY); Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)
Cc: Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY); Whittington, Matt (ENERGY); Baker, Carys (ENERGY)
Subject: Re: CoS Edits : MB20 / CAB Sub / PinkNote

Good Afternoon:

Page 21 : "...attempts to mitigate the risk..." should become "...mitigates the risk to the extent possible..."

Remove the "attempts". Just "mitigates to the extent possible..." is enough caveat, I suspect.

Many thanks, in advance.

Andrew

Andrew Teliszewsky

Chief of Staff | Office of Hon. Glenn Thibeault Ministry of Energy andrew.teliszewsky@ontario.ca
416-327-3550 (o)
416-436-6370 (m)

> On May 5, 2017, at 11:42 AM, Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY) <Martin.Schlaepfer@ontario.ca> wrote:
>
> Hi Andrew,
>
> Attached is the latest turn of the CO pink note with updates to address your comments. CO requires this note asap in order to make the distribution timelines, so please advise if this is ready to share.
>
> Folks are working hard to turn the other products for review.
>
> Thanks,
> Martin
>
> -----Original Message-----
> **From:** Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)
> **Sent:** May-05-17 11:17 AM
> **To:** Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)
> **Cc:** Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY)
> **Subject:** Re: CoS Edits : MB20 / CAB Sub / PinkNote
>
> Thank you for responding!

>
> Do we know when we anticipate the next turn to come over for my review?
>
> I'll need some time for reading before we can slap on the signature page and submit and my
afternoon is busy with meetings here in Ottawa. Might want to prep CO and TBS for these not coming
to them until the weekend or Monday, I worry?
>
> Andrew
>
>
> Original Message
> From: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)
> Sent: Friday, May 5, 2017 10:27 AM
> To: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)
> Cc: Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY)
> Subject: RE: CoS Edits : MB20 / CAB Sub / PinkNote
>
>
> Yes, folks are working on turning edits.
>
> Thanks,
> Martin
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY)
> Sent: May-05-17 10:26 AM
> To: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY)
> Subject: Fw: CoS Edits : MB20 / CAB Sub / PinkNote
>
> Hey -
>
> Radio silence quite worrisome.
>
> Are these edits working their way through, please?
>
> Andrew
>
>
> Original Message
> From: Teliszewsky, Andrew (ENERGY) <Andrew.Teliszewsky@ontario.ca>
> Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 11:29 PM
> To: Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI); Reid, Michael (ENERGY); Hume,
> Steen (ENERGY)
> Cc: Schlaepfer, Martin (ENERGY); Imbrogno, Serge (ENERGY);
> Whittington, Matt (ENERGY)
> Subject: CoS Edits : MB20 / CAB Sub / PinkNote
>
>
> Good Evening:
>
> A. Edits / Questions relating to TB/MBC Submission
>
> Page 6 - On Reserve FN Delivery Credit
> - add more about H1 process and Political Accord
>
> Page 7 - "Tariff Sheet" what is that? That's a confusing paragraph. Perhaps simplify or define terms
used better.
>
> Page 7 - "final effective date of 1 October" We have different dates, if I recall, August 1st was one
date specified for something but 1 October is the latest one? Just explain / expand on this section
better, please.
>
> Page 7 - "increase" awareness of the delivery credit (replace term "spread").
>
> Page 8 - ICI Expansion

- > - add content to justify ICI regime from a system value perspective (Re: Navigant study on peak reduction, of existing participants, etc.).
- >
- > Page 12 - "first five years" - should this be "first four years" ?
- >
- > Page 13 - First paragraph of this page is duplicative of the last paragraph of preceding (page 12). Not exact, but basically totally a repetition. Consider edits.
- >
- > Page 13 - "should interest costs increase" Needs to have more explanation / risk mitigation details. The bullet above has the note "reverse is true". Could use that again. Reverse is also true if interest costs are lower than 5%. Plus OPG is incented to manage these costs down, right. Add content / structure here, please.
- >
- > Page 14 - ESO should be "IESO" in first paragraph, I think?
- >
- > Page 15 - "judges political" is a paragraph that really feels out of place across this entire document as an editorial comment as opposed to fact based. Consider revision.
- >
- > Page 15 - needs significant content addition about the mitigation efforts done to manage the risks outlined by Binnie. We discussed this when reviewing the Cab Sub, but should also appear here. My basic rule of thumb here is as much content (Binnie + three bullets section above) should also be spent describing the efforts undertaken to address these concerns. Otherwise this just hangs and does a significant disservice to LSB and everyone who has done fantastic work to noodle on these crunchy constitutional concerns.
- >
- > Page 16 - Distribution Rate Protection
- >
- > Needs more content about who (which LDC's participating) and how many
- > individuals (in aggregate) participating. (800,000?)
- >
- > Page 16 - On ReserveFN Delivery Credit
- >
- > Needs more content about who (which LDC's impacted / implementing) and how many individuals will benefit.
- >
- > Page 21 - stale chart/ diagram. Use Blakes' pictograms
- >
- > Page 22 - Sensitivity Analysis
- >
- > This strikes me as odd. Just a point in time snapshot and we could conceivably generate several other scenarios that are equally likely to transpire. Consider cutting this section.
- >
- > Page 24 - 2nd Paragraph. "First Five years" - should this be "four years"?
- >
- > Page 24 - OPG would require..."in exchange FOR X" the bullet hangs.
- >
- > Page 25 - 4th paragraph. Odd construct. "For less than half of the GA" Suggest indicating the exact. "About half" or "about 40%"?
- >
- > Page 26 - Remove extra "R" in "RRRRRP" heading.
- >
- > Page 27 - Energy has a number of "Bilateral" tables with the COO...
- >
- > Page 28 - Add ICI content regarding system value of ICI, Navigant study.
- >
- > Page 30 - Energy will report back "as part of PRRT" (not in the fall)!
- >
- > Page 35 - Communications
- > Add content regarding RAP (Redesign Action Plan)
- >
- > ---
- >
- > PART TWO : Cabinet Submission Edits
- >
- > Page 3 : perhaps no edit - but how does this "15 business days " clause square with the

conversation at Integration meeting Thursday morning with OEB regarding the regulation they need before publishing the July RPP?

>

> Page 6 : each chevron should be a different colour, please.

>

> Page 20 : "The AG may CHOOSE TO...staff have provided A technical..."

>

> Page 22 : First sentence of the third bullet is awkward / unclear. Re-write / re-phrase, please.

>

> Page 26 : First Bullet "Upon Royal Assent, Energy intends..."

>

> Page 26 : each box should be a different colour, please.

>

> Page 28 : OESP Email from this week said "192,000 enrolled" so should just update bullet to "Over 192,000 have been enrolled"

>

> Page 29 : remove "(TBC)" from third main bullet

>

> Page 29 : add reference to work with Federal Government & CRA

>

> Page 35 : Energy will return WITH updated out-year figures AS PART OF

> THE 2018-19 PRRT PROCESS

>

> Page 44 : Write out "Ontario FairHydro Plan" in the second bullet.

>

> Page 46 : Cut this slide. Replace with page 13 from the Caucus Deck.

>

> Page 47 : Cut this slide. Replace with Slide #17 from the Caucus Deck

>

> After current Page 49 : Add Slide 21 (snap ribbon) from Caucus Deck.

>

> Question: Are we appending the KPMG / E&Y opinions to this submission, the same as we did with Binnie back in March 2017? Have received some KPMG content to review. But wondering if we have anything from E&Y, please?

>

> ----

>

> PINK NOTE COMMENTS:

>

> Page 7 / Page 19 and Page 20 : Same rant as previously. This content describes the risks but not the efforts undertaken to address these risks in a) drafting and b) ongoing study. From my document, looks like a significant section has been cut that is more affirmative about the work undertaken.

Leaving this out means we are not providing executive council members with all details required to assess this submission. Would like to see these deletions "MAG and Blakes are confident..." added back in. [This is not an insignificant point. If this is going to continue to be an issue, then should we hop on another quick teleconference to resolve, please?]

>

>

> Many thanks, in advance.

>

> Atel/

>

>

>

>

> Andrew Teliszewsky

>

> Chief of Staff | Office of Hon. Glenn Thibeault Ministry of Energy

> andrew.teliszewsky@ontario.ca

> 416-327-3550 (o)

> 416-436-6370 (m)

> <DLEG-847_ID49011_LRC_CBN- Rate Mitigation- Draft- No materials- V6

> cc.docx>