

FW: Feedback & requirements for May 1 TB/MBC

From: "Strang, James (TBS)" <james.strang@ontario.ca>
To: "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <cindy.veinot@ontario.ca>
Cc: "Graham, Helen (TBS)" <helen.graham@ontario.ca>
Date: Tue, 02 May 2017 18:01:43 -0400
Attachments: RE_ Feedback & requirements for May 1 TB_MBC.msg (200.7 kB)

Below is what was sent over to Energy. Teleconference took place April 20, 2017.
Attached is the latest on the leg. amendments for the social programs – from April 26th.

James

From: Fung, Felix (TBS)
Sent: April 13, 2017 11:50 AM
To: Reid, Michael (ENERGY); Chander, Sunita (ENERGY)
Cc: Graham, Helen (TBS); Sawosch, Mercedes (TBS); Strang, James (TBS); Skubel, Chris (TBS); Hosick, Sarah (TBS); Arbabzadeh, Nina (TBS)
Subject: Feedback & requirements for May 1 TB/MBC

Hi Michael and Sunita,

We've had internal discussion here with Karen Hughes, OPCD and our legal folks. Below is feedback on draft leg as well as requirements for May 1 TB/MBC.

- For May 1, 2017, Energy needs to submit a complete TB/MBC signed submission as soon as possible. Energy should be providing a full package of documentation including financial, accounting, and legal assessments covering GA smoothing and support programs (including the affordability fund) moving to government funding.
- Re: proposed legislation, there seems to be separate GA smoothing legislation from legislation for moving support programs recovering from ratepayers to being government funded programs. Will this remain the case or will they be combined into one package?
- To understand what Energy is trying to accomplish with its proposed legislation. Sharing supporting briefing materials even if draft would be helpful. For example:
 - Do the programs moving to government funded need to be consistent with requirements of typical government funded programs?
 - If so, what needs to change, what needs to drop/be added etc.
 - Should all programs have the same treatment? For existing programs determine if existing admin model continues or is it replaced?
 - Materials should include dollar forecast profile of runoff of the IESO variance balance.
 - What is Energy trying to achieve with its provisions, such as, for settlement, overpayment (applying to non-public monies first/ getting public monies back), deemed debt retirement charge (is this known to OFA/OEFC). Terminology (e.g., "settlements") definitions would be helpful.
 - Clarify whether Section 79 of the Ontario Energy Board Act is the RRRP program? If it is, why just amending with adding sections only, not repealing and replacing as with OESP?
- Would be helpful if Energy could explain how changes are related to future payments coming from the province (if not explained in briefing material)

- Appears aspects needed to frame future program as being supported from tax base have been brought over from other legislation, though there's uncertainty around whether all provisions are relevant/appropriate to rate base/tax base transition. Drafting needs to be checked against needs for the administration of public money vs funding from the rate base (which is not public money).
- Which part of MOF has agreed to take on duties that would be assigned to them by the draft legislation, including those with respect to audit powers, records retention, inspections/enforcement, overpayments etc

Is there an expectation at Energy that the provisions create a foundation for an accounting obligation on the province? AR for the province?

Thanks - let us know if it would be helpful to set up a meeting to discuss this further.

Felix

Felix Fung

Manager, Resources Portfolio

General Government, Planning and Resources Branch | Planning and Expenditure Management Division

Office of the Treasury Board | Treasury Board Secretariat

7 Queen's Park Crescent E., 3rd Floor, Toronto M7A 1Y7
(416) 327-0203

