



# Meeting Notes

---

DERs Connection Review (EB-2019-0207)  
Working Group Meeting

---

**Meeting Date:** May 2, 2022

**Time:** 1:00 pm –3:40 pm

**Location:** Ontario Energy Board  
via MS Teams

**Attendees:**

Bob Braletic	Alectra
Andrew Houston	Alectra
Nishant Gehani	BBA
Nicholas Gall	CanSIA
Phil McNee	Demand Renewables
Thomas Ladanyi (Tom)	Energy Probe
Ian Jarvis	Enerlife (for BOMA)
Justin Wahid Rangooni	Energy Storage Canada
Kent Elson	Elson Advocacy (for Environmental Defense)
Kathy Farmer	EDA
Tatjana Dinic	ESA
Ryan Boudreau	Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI)
Jason Savulak	Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI)
Raed Abdullah	Hydro Ottawa
Greg Sheil	London Hydro
Mark Thompson	Ministry of Energy

*These notes are for the Working Group purposes only and do not represent the view of the OEB.*

Bryan Pelkey	Ministry of Energy
Neryed Ragbar	Ministry of Energy
Naqvi Syed	Ontario Power Generation
Steve Pepper	Ontario Society of Professional Engineers
Michael Brophy	Pollution Probe
Larry Herod	STEM
Utilia Amaral	STEM
Marc Brouillette	Strapolec (for CME and OCC)
Benson Lo	Toronto Hydro
Jordan Hoogendam	Zon Engineering
Brian Hewson Raj Pattani Helen Guo Jason Craig Catherine Ethier Rachel Anderson Natasha Gocool	Ontario Energy Board Staff

*These notes summarize the information provided during the working group meeting and key points of the issues presented in the published materials.*

### **Summary of Recommendations and Action Items**

1. The Working Group supports the ongoing development of the Risk Framework, with an initial focus on characterizing and communicating connection complexity for a potential applicant. The Working Group supports the distinction between a “framework”, which establishes higher-level principles, and a “tool”, which would represent the operationalization of a framework and may be developed at a later date.
  
2. The Working Group recommends that existing requirements in RRR s. 2.1.14 remain unchanged for net metering and embedded generation. The Working Group further recommends that existing requirements in RRR be updated to include the following:
  - Number of Preliminary Consultation Reports issued
  - Number of CIAs completed within DER Connection Procedures prescribed timeframe
  - Number of CIAs completed after DER Connection Procedures prescribed timeframe
  - Number of CIAs completed
  - Number of DERs connected

*These notes are for the Working Group purposes only and do not represent the view of the OEB.*

3. The Working Group supports the Process Subgroup's recommendation that issues pertaining to connection cost estimating be revisited in a future tranche, in order to ensure recommendations, remain relevant as Hydro One progresses its internal initiatives to i) improve cost estimate uncertainty and ii) potentially revisit the way in which estimates are presented.
4. The Working Group endorsed the bi-directional EV connections issues list presented by the Technical Subgroups and supports expanded investigations in Tranche 4 for uni-directional EV connections issues.
5. The Working Group established the following Subgroup priority items:
  - a. Process Subgroup:
    - i. Connection Cost Estimating
    - ii. CAE for Small Generators
    - iii. Capacity Deposits
    - iv. RRR on Types of Connected DERs
    - v. Connection Deposit Refund Timelines
  - b. Technical Subgroup:
    - i. EV Connections Issues (Uni-Directional)
    - ii. Risk Framework Development
6. The Working Group agreed that the following issues would be in the Parking Lot, for potential consideration in the future:
  - a. Dispute Resolution.
  - b. Revisions to Agreements (may be addressed in Tranche 4 depending on progress on other items).
7. OEB staff will review the following Working Group-identified issues and report back to the Working Group on whether they are in-scope and whether there are alternative mechanisms better-suited to addressing the issues identified:
  - a. Prioritization of capacity allocation.
  - b. Methodology for application of Chapter 3 to energy storage DERs.
  - c. Potential implications of EV charging kWh billing (in light of questions raised by members).

## Meeting Summary

### 1. Land Acknowledgement and Opening Remarks:

- OEB staff presented a Land Acknowledgment.
- A recap of the completed work and achievements to date was provided by the Vice President, Consumer Protection and Industry Performance (Brian Hewson). The

*These notes are for the Working Group purposes only and do not represent the view of the OEB.*

Vice President, CPIP conveyed the OEB's commitment to the DER Connections Review, and emphasized the importance of ensuring the consultation is meeting needs identified by Working Group members. The importance of Working Group member participation was highlighted.

- OEB staff noted it envisions the working group will continue to meet approximately bi-monthly, with approximately monthly subgroup meetings and additional ad hoc meetings for small groups, as required.
- It was noted that OEB staff values the input from the members as it assists OEB staff in understanding the challenges observed within the industry. OEB staff thanked members for their continued efforts in providing additional clarity and transparency into improving the process for DER connection.
- It was discussed that Working Group recommendations would be captured in meeting summaries, which would then be reviewed by Working Group members within a prescribed time before being accepted as a record of the meeting. The Working Group would strive for consensus, but where it is not achieved may still make a recommendation with dissents noted.
- Following the opening marks, the following items were raised by Working Group members:
  - Issues pertaining to the way in which capacity is allocated. Some members raised a concern that large-scale battery storage projects occupy all available capacity, making it difficult or not possible for smaller projects to subsequently connect to a given feeder. OEB staff advised that this issue would be reviewed offline to determine the appropriate forum for it to be addressed, given linkages between ongoing OEB consultations.
  - Means for revising the DERCP and stakeholder engagement for subsequent revisions. OEB staff indicated that, as articulated in the Notice of Amendment, stakeholder engagement would be tailored to the nature of the revision, and the DER Connections Review would be the main forum for engaging with stakeholders for revisions to the DERCP.
  - Questions related to whether billing for EV charging station use on a per kWh basis would trigger requirements for licensing.

## **2. Technical Subgroup Risk Framework:**

- An update on the Risk Framework and the recommendation to the Working Group was provided by Nishant G. (BBA).
- A staged approach for the development of the Risk Framework was presented, with Stage 1 focusing on providing an early indication of connection complexity.
- A distinction was made between a Risk Framework and a Risk Tool, with the Framework providing a higher-level concept which could later be operationalized through a Tool. The output for Stage 1 was proposed to be a Framework.
- A member suggested that there is already a degree of consistency between utilities in terms of higher-level approaches to describing connection risk, including through

preliminary consultations, and questioned whether a Risk Framework on its own would add value. The presenter explained that although there was a high-level consistency in technical requirements between utilities, discussions within the Risk Framework Small Group uncovered the value of providing a more systematic and standardized approach to evaluating and communicating that risk to an applicant. Further, the presenter noted that while the objective of Stage 1 is to develop a Risk Framework (as distinct from a Tool), the Working Group may direct the Technical Subgroup to develop a Risk Tool in subsequent stages, if it is deemed appropriate.

- The Working Group was in consensus for the recommendation presented.

**Recommendation:**

- The Working Group supports the ongoing development of the Risk Framework, with an initial focus on characterizing and communicating connection complexity for a potential applicant. The Working Group supports the distinction between a “framework”, which establishes higher-level principles, and a “tool”, which would represent the operationalization of a framework and may be developed at a later date.

**3. Process Subgroup on RRR:**

- RRR recommendations from the Process Subgroup were presented by Larry H. (STEM). The recommendations were intended to evaluate whether new processes are being accessed by applicants, and to confirm distributor performance with respect to CIA timelines.
- In review of the RRR recommendations, a member enquired if the current requirements include distinguishing net metered customers by rate class.
  - It was noted that the current requirements do not distinguish net metered customers by rate class.
  - A member noted the importance of distinguishing between rate classes and suggested it be discussed within the next tranche.
- Another member suggested identifying the percentage of LDC customers on a constrained feeder be added to the RRR reporting requirements, to improve infrastructure planning, and suggested this be considered in Tranche 4.
- The Working Group members were in consensus of the recommendations for RRR Reporting Requirements.

**Recommendation:**

- The Working Group recommends that existing requirements in RRR s. 2.1.14 remain unchanged for net metering and embedded generation. The Working Group further recommends that existing requirements in RRR be updated to include the following:

—Number of Preliminary Consultation Reports issued

*These notes are for the Working Group purposes only and do not represent the view of the OEB.*

- Number of CIAs completed within DER Connection Procedures prescribed timeframe
- Number of CIAs completed after DER Connection Procedures prescribed timeframe
- Number of CIAs completed
- Number of DERs connected

- For Tranche 4, Working Group members identified the following items for additional consideration by the Process Subgroup:
  - Tracking rate class of net metered customers.
  - Tracking percent of customers on constrained feeders.
  - Tracking MW capacity of connected DERs.

#### **4. Process Subgroup on Connection Cost Estimating:**

- The Connection Cost Estimating recommendation was presented by Larry H. (STEM).
- The presenter, and Jason S. (Hydro One), provided an overview of discussions in the Process Subgroup, including in relation to status updates from Hydro One related to ongoing initiatives to improve connection cost estimating processes.
- It was discussed that the Process Subgroup should receive updates from Hydro One as appropriate and re-evaluate whether further review is warranted, once the outcomes of Hydro One's ongoing initiatives are better known.
- The Working Group was in consensus for the recommendation presented.

#### **Recommendation:**

- The Working Group supports the Process Subgroup's recommendation that issues pertaining to connection cost estimating be revisited in a future tranche, in order to ensure recommendations, remain relevant as Hydro One progresses its internal initiatives to i) improve cost estimate uncertainty and ii) potentially revisit the way in which estimates are presented.

#### **5. Technical Subgroup on Bi-Directional EV's:**

- The issues list for bi-directional EV chargers was presented by Jordan H. (Zon Engineering).
- A Working Group member questioned whether the issues identified scaled up to larger installations, for example for larger residential or commercial buildings. The presenter replied that issues may scale, but larger installations would be covered by established processes and technical requirements for small, mid-sized, and large DERs; the issues list presented was more focused on micro and near-micro sizes (nominally below 50 kW, as an indicative figure for discussion purposes).
- A Working Group member enquired whether the group reviewed operational considerations for Distributors integrating DERs, including bi-directional EVs; the presenter noted that such issues were generally out of scope, and OEB staff confirmed that such considerations, while relevant to the discussion, are expected to be explored in other consultations currently underway.

*These notes are for the Working Group purposes only and do not represent the view of the OEB.*

- A member enquired whether regulatory requirements for EV charging providers would change if they charge customers on a per kWh basis; OEB staff indicated it would review to evaluate the best forum for this question to be addressed.
- The Working Group was in consensus regarding the bi-directional EV issues list.

**Recommendation:**

- The Working Group endorsed the bi-directional EV connections issues list presented by the Technical Subgroups and supports expanded investigations in Tranche 4 for uni-directional EV connections issues.

**6. Tranche 3 Close Out:**

- The Working Group confirmed endorsement of the prior four recommendations.
- OEB staff thanked the members for their continued efforts during Tranche 3.

**7. Proposed Topics and Priorities for Tranche 4**

- OEB staff presented potential topics for Working Group consideration in Tranche 4.
- Following discussion, the Working Group identified the following items for Tranche 4:

**Process Subgroup**

1. Connection Cost Estimating
2. CAE for Small Generators
3. Capacity Deposits
4. RRR on Types of Connected DERs
5. Connection Deposit Refund Timelines

**Technical Subgroup**

1. EV Connections Issues (Uni-Directional)
  2. Risk Framework Development
- The Working Group confirmed that, for EV issues, it considers the bi-directional EV issues list to be endorsed, so that the Technical Subgroup can focus its efforts on the uni-directional case.
  - The Working Group agreed that the following issues would be in the Parking Lot, for potential consideration in the future:
    1. Dispute Resolution.
    2. Revisions to Agreements (may be addressed in Tranche 4 depending on progress on other items).
  - OEB Staff indicated it will review the following Working Group-identified issues and report back to the Working Group on whether they are in-scope and whether there



are alternative mechanisms better-suited to addressing the issues identified:

1. Prioritization of capacity allocation.
2. Methodology for application of Chapter 3 to energy storage DERs.
3. Potential implications of EV charging kWh billing (in light of questions raised by members).

**8. Next Steps:**

- OEB staff will bring the approved Tranche 3 recommendations forward for OEB review as appropriate.
- OEB staff will internally discuss the additional discussion items (see point 6 in the “Summary of Recommendations and Action Items” above) requested by members and will provide an update at subsequent meetings.
- OEB Staff anticipates Tranche 4 subgroup and ad hoc meetings will begin in May 2022, with the anticipation of concluding Tranche 4 by presenting recommendations to the Working Group in late Fall 2022.

**Next Meeting:** To be determined