

Re: EXTERNAL - FW: Consultation Draft v4

From: "Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)" <carolyn.calwell@ontario.ca>
To: "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <cindy.veinot@ontario.ca>, "Rehob, James (ENERGY)" <james.rehob@ontario.ca>, "Nelms, Scott (MOF)" <scott.nelms@ontario.ca>, "Huang, Jackson (MEDG/MRIS)" <jackson.huang@ontario.ca>
Cc: "Petsche, Nadine (TBS)" <nadine.petsche@ontario.ca>, "Hosick, Sarah (TBS)" <sarah.hosick@ontario.ca>
Date: Thu, 22 Jun 2017 19:49:57 -0400

This is great - thank you!

Original Message
From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 6:45 PM
To: Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI); Rehob, James (ENERGY); Nelms, Scott (MOF); Huang, Jackson (MEDG/MRIS)
Cc: Petsche, Nadine (TBS); Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: FW: EXTERNAL - FW: Consultation Draft v4

Carolyn -- see below -- OPG is on it.

Cindy

-----Original Message-----
From: MAUTI John -FIN & C CTRL [mailto:john.mauti@opg.com]
Sent: June 22, 2017 6:44 PM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Kim Marshall; JORDA Jenny -FIN & C CTRL
Cc: Petsche, Nadine (TBS); Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: RE: EXTERNAL - FW: Consultation Draft v4

We had a call with our lawyers earlier today and EY and all recognize that this language is ambiguous, combining cash and accrual based concepts. Will be addressed in next turn.

Sent with BlackBerry Work
(www.blackberry.com)

From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS) <Cindy.Veinot@ontario.ca<mailto:Cindy.Veinot@ontario.ca>>
Date: Thursday, Jun 22, 2017, 6:32 PM
To: Kim Marshall <Kim.Marshall@ieso.ca<mailto:Kim.Marshall@ieso.ca>>, JORDA Jenny -FIN & C CTRL <jenny.jorda@opg.com<mailto:jenny.jorda@opg.com>>, MAUTI John -FIN & C CTRL <john.mauti@opg.com<mailto:john.mauti@opg.com>>
Cc: Petsche, Nadine (TBS) <Nadine.Petsche@ontario.ca<mailto:Nadine.Petsche@ontario.ca>>, Hosick, Sarah (TBS) <Sarah.Hosick@ontario.ca<mailto:Sarah.Hosick@ontario.ca>>
Subject: EXTERNAL - FW: Consultation Draft v4

*** Exercise caution. This is an EXTERNAL email. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ***

Kim, John and Jenny – please see the email trail below – it relates to the draft regulation for the GA and I'm looking at Version 4 – there is a question as to whether the finance amount in section 5 of the reg is a cash or accrual based concept – there are elements of both as the section is currently written.

Could you please review and let me know your understanding.

I'm not sure if the interest issue that we are meeting on next week impacts this decision or not.

Thanks,

From: Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI)
Sent: June 22, 2017 5:21 PM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Rehob, James (ENERGY); Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Cc: Huang, Jackson (MEDG/MRIS); Nelms, Scott (MOF); Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: RE: Consultation Draft v4

Thanks very much, Cindy. On my read of this and if I'm following your comments correctly, then it would seem that 5(2)1 add uncertainty because it's not clear how it would be applied and therefore should come out because it creates ambiguity. 5(2)2, 5(2)3 and 5(2)4 seem to provide more certainty because they show how to determine the amounts at different points in time (based on cash amounts).

Do you agree? We're trying to figure out how to respond to Leg Counsel's comments in a practical way.

From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Sent: June-22-17 4:03 PM
To: Rehob, James (ENERGY); Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Cc: Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI); Huang, Jackson (MEDG/MRIS); Nelms, Scott (MOF); Hosick, Sarah (TBS)
Subject: RE: Consultation Draft v4

Hi James – based on my read, there is a disconnect between using the term “cash basis of accounting” in 5(2)1. and the descriptions in 3. and 4.

Cash basis of accounting is generally understood to be a method that records transactions when the cash is received or paid. Sections 3. and 4. of 5(2) refer to including amounts that are not yet paid (which would be appropriately included under an accrual basis of accounting). Under the cash basis of accounting, these amounts would not be included and yet it seems the intent is to include them.

The language in 5(1)1. and 2. imply a mix of cash and accrual concepts – amounts that are “payable” during the period could mean either that an amount has to be paid during the period to be included (cash basis) or that a liability has been incurred, therefore, the amount is payable during the period (accrual basis). In 2.iii. the use of the term “received” would generally only be interpreted to be a cash basis concept.

What is the intention of this section re: cash vs. accrual?

I'm reviewing the balance of the draft and will send along my comments re: s. 14 once I'm through it.

Cindy

From: Rehob, James (ENERGY)
Sent: June 22, 2017 3:35 PM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Cc: Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI); Huang, Jackson (MEDG/MRIS); Nelms, Scott (MOF)
Subject: RE: Consultation Draft v4

Cindy, I am also hoping to receive your feedback to the NTDs from Legislative Counsel under s.5(2) (“Finance Amount”) relating to “cash-basis accounting”.

Many thanks!

Best,
James

From: Rehob, James (ENERGY)
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 11:40 AM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Cc: Calwell, Carolyn (ENERGY/MEDEI/MRI); Huang, Jackson (MEDG/MRIS); Nelms, Scott (MOF)
Subject: FW: Consultation Draft v4

Confidential/Solicitor & Client Privileged

June 22, 2017

Good morning, Cindy. We are pleased to attach the next consultation draft for the proposed General Regulation which, if approved, would be made under the OFHPA.

Cindy, we are hoping to receive your feedback in particular on the detailed "Financing Plan" principles enunciated in s.14. Let us know if those pose any concerns for you from an accounting perspective.

You may also note that Legislative Counsel, due to drafting practices, has removed some of the definitions. They were creating some confusion. Legislative counsel's intention was to communicate concepts in a more direct fashion, particularly about the relationship between various types of "amounts" and "the period of time" in which they are (or are to be) paid or received.

In many cases the substantive provisions themselves elaborate the principles previously provided for in the definitions.

We ask that you please give careful consideration to the approach and the language Legislative Counsel has proposed with a view to making the approach work if it is possible.

Thank you,

James

James P. H. Rehub
Senior Counsel
Ministry of the Attorney General
Legal Services Branch
MAG Civil Law Division
Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Economic Development and Growth, Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science, Ministry of Infrastructure, Accessibility Directorate of Ontario
56 Wellesley Street West
Toronto, ON M7A 2E7
Tel: 416-325-6676
Fax: 416-325-1781
james.rehub@ontario.ca<<mailto:james.rehub@ontario.ca>>

Notice

This communication may be solicitor/client privileged and contain confidential information only intended for the person(s) to whom it is addressed. Any dissemination or use of this information by others than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you have received this message in error please notify the writer and permanently delete the message and all attachments. Thank you.

THIS MESSAGE IS ONLY INTENDED FOR THE USE OF THE INTENDED RECIPIENT(S) AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, PROPRIETARY AND/OR CONFIDENTIAL. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, dissemination,

distribution, copying, conversion to hard copy or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this message in error, please notify me by return e-mail and delete this message from your system. Ontario Power Generation Inc.