

Demand Response Working Group – Meeting Notes

February 12, 2019

Meeting Notes

Dates held: February 12, 2019	Time held: 9:00am to 1:00pm	Location: Crowne Plaza, Toronto International Airport
Company	Name	Attendance Status (A) Attended; (WebEx) Attended via WebEx
Alectra Utilities	DeJulio, Gia	A
AMPCO	Forsyth, David	Webex
AMP Energy	Luukkonen, Paul	A
Bruce Power	Zhang, Alvin	A
Cascades	Ross, Josh	Webex
CGI	Graham Hughes	Webex
City of Toronto	Cheng, Jessie	Webex
City of Toronto	Gu, Michael	A
City of Toronto	Koff, Chaim	A
City of Toronto	Poto, Angelo	A
Customized Energy Solutions	Withrow, David	Webex
Direct Energy	Cavan, Peter	Webex
Direct Energy	Clicker, Owen	Webex
Direct Energy	Galarneau, Kenneth	Webex
Ecobee	MacCaull, Aira	Webex
Electra	Carr, Daniel	Webex
Enel X	Chibani, Yanis	Webex
Enel X	Griffiths, Sarah	A
Great Circle Solar Mgmt Corp	Antic, Tina	Webex
Great Circle Solar Mgmt Corp	Macabales, Deonnie	Webex
Great Circle Solar Mgmt Corp	Wharton, Karen	Webex
HCE Energy	Michael Crown	Webex
Hydro One Network	Katsuras, George	Webex
Ivaco Rolling Mills	Abdelnour, Francois	A
Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines	Tomlinson, Patrick	Webex
Nest/Stem	Amaral, Utilia	A
Independent Consultant	Coulbeck, Rob	A
Northland Power	Samant, Sushil	A
Northland Power	Swan, Darrell	A
Northland Power	Windsor, John	A
Northland Power	Zajmalowski, Mike	A
NRG Curtailment Solutions, Inc.	Popova, Julia	Webex
NRG Curtailment Solutions, Inc.	Shelly, Christopher	A

Dates held: February 12, 2019	Time held: 9:00am to 1:00pm	Location: Crowne Plaza, Toronto International Airport
Company	Name	Attendance Status
NRG Curtailment Solutions, Inc.	Vukovic, Jennifer	Webex
Ontario Energy Board	Holder, Ryan	A
Ontario Power Generation	Kim, Jin	A
Ontario Power Generation	Urukov, Vlad	Webex
Power Advisory	Lusney, Travis	A
Power Advisory	Simmons, Sarah	A
Shell Canada	Lasik, Phil	Webex
Resolute Forest Products	Degelman, Cara	Webex
Resolute Forest Products	Ruberto, Tony	A
Resolute Forest Products	Giardetti, Peter	A
Rodan Energy Solutions	Goddard, Rick	A
Rodan Energy Solutions	Nathwani, Rahi	Webex
Rodan Energy Solutions	Row, William	Webex
Rodan Energy Solutions	Stewart, Blaire	Webex
Rodan Energy Solutions	Holowatsky, Yuri	Webex
Sinopa Energy	Collins, Ron	Webex
Southcott Ventures	Lampe, Aaron	Webex
Sussex Strategies	Hiltz, Bonnie	Webex
Toronto Hydro	Marzoughi, Rei	Webex
TransCanada	Kuntz, Margaret	Webex
Rayonier Advanced Materials	Laflamme, Serge	A
Union Gas	Dent, Dave	Webex
Voltus	Grav, Jorgen	Webex
IESO	Campbell, Alexandra	A
IESO	Gojmerac, Mark	A
IESO	Nusbaum, Stephen	A
IESO	Rashid, Fahad	A
IESO	Savage, Jessica	A
IESO	Short, David	A
IESO	Singh, Diljeet	A
IESO	Versteeg, Peter	A
IESO	Young, Jennifer	A
IESO	Yung, Ambrose	A
IESO	Zaworski, Richard	A
Prepared by Peter Versteeg, please report any corrections, additions or deletions by e-mail to engagement@ieso.ca		

All meeting materials are available on the IESO web site at: <http://www.ieso.ca/en/Sector-Participants/Engagement-Initiatives/Working-Groups/Demand-Response-Working-Group>

Introduction – Jennifer Young, IESO

The IESO welcomed participants and described the format of the meeting.

Demand Response (DR) Testing Update – Ambrose Yung, IESO

The IESO led stakeholders through an update of the proposed changes to the Test Activation Protocol, a review of Test Activation Duration, as well as Market Manual updates of DR Enhancements coming in May.

A participant asked if the new Advisory Notice would be in the form of an email.

The IESO replied that the Advisory Notice will be available through the Online IESO Portal and the IESO website. Participants will continue to get a Standby Notification and an Activation Notification through email.

A participant asked if the Test Activation Duration of 4 hours only applies to Hourly Demand Response (HDR) resources and if Dispatchable Load (DL) is tested separately.

The IESO replied that the Test Activation Duration of 4 hours only applies to HDR resources. For DL it usually relies on data from in-market activations but will test DL directly if this is not available.

A participant asked if the Incremental Capacity Auction (ICA) Capacity Check Test will be more stringent than the DR Test Activation.

The IESO replied that the ICA will have a Capacity Qualification process that will measure resources on an Unforced Capacity basis and it will test for the full amount it expects to be available. There will not likely be a 20% dead-band as in the current DR test.

A participant asked what standard is being used to test HDR resources, such as an event 4-hour average or an hourly bright-line against a 15% dead-band, and what constitutes a “pass”.

The IESO replied that it can provide statistics on the performance of previous years’ HDR resources.

A participant asked if the Test Activation Duration applies to DLs participating in the HDR program as part of an aggregator portfolio.

The IESO replied that it would see these resources as HDR resources and this would apply to them.

A participant noted that the timing of these tests is not consistent with when system emergencies happen. The participant asked the IESO to consider a two-week window for the test similar to other markets.

The IESO replied that it will take this back for consideration.

Editor’s note: the IESO is unlikely to adopt a two-week window for testing given the seasonal product being developed and the current approach to qualifying and settling resources.

Background on the DR Audit Provisions - Richard Zaworski, IESO

The IESO led stakeholders through a discussion on the context and background on the requirements for DR audit provisions.

DR Measurement Data Audit Process and Data Acquisition (Virtual – C&I) – Fahad Rashid, IESO

The IESO led stakeholders through a discussion on the DR Audit Process, Meter Data Submission, the IESO's response to DRWG feedback, and next steps.

A participant asked why all payments are subject to clawback in the case of an overpayment (Market Rule Chapter 9 - Section 4.8.3), but only the adjustment is due in the case of an underpayment (Market Rule Chapter 9 - Section 4.8.4).

The IESO replied that if the DRMP fails to submit data in a timely manner the Market Rules require the IESO to recover all payments as part of the recovery clause (Section 4.8.3). However, there are cases when a DRMP may have failed an activation, and realized that it had submitted incorrect data to the IESO. The DRMP has the opportunity to submit corrected data via Notice of Disagreement. In these cases, the IESO can make adjustments to the payment as part of the distribution clause (Section 4.8.4).

A participant noted that it would make the most sense for the Market Rules (Chapter 9 - Section 4.8.3/4.8.4) to be equal for both overpayments and underpayments.

The IESO noted this and thanked the participant for this suggestion.

A participant asked what the ratio is of physical load to virtual load in the HDR program.

The IESO replied that the majority of load in the HDR program is virtual.

A participant asked how material the issues found in the audit review were.

The IESO replied that in 2017 it conducted about 20 audits representing about \$5M in availability payments handed out over the months audited. The failures observed were associated with roughly \$3M of those availability payments.

A participant asked if the IESO has engaged with Local Distribution Companies (LDCs) to resolve the issues outside of a Demand Response Market Participants (DRMPs) control.

The IESO replied that while it has not yet engaged directly with LDCs it is reviewing the requirements internally and how they pertain to LDCs.

A participant asked if LDC statements are the only legal unit of measurement and why actual LDC interval data cannot be used. The timing of meter reads can cause a misalignment of data with LDC statements, but actual LDC interval data would resolve this.

The IESO replied that DRMPs can directly collect data from the meter or from LDCs. Under the existing audit program, IESO requires LDC statement whether the data is collected through the LDCs or directly from the meter. Meter data from an LDC may be deemed as data from a true source to determine the accuracy of actual measurement data. However, there is a need to establish provisions to enable this. In the audit, the IESO did not observe many issues in LDC statements but it can address these as needed.

A participant noted that there are high costs associated with acquiring LDC statements versus LDC interval data, and asked if there is a lower cost way to meet the IESOs data needs.

The IESO replied that it will review internally to see if LDC interval data can meet IESO requirements.

A participant noted that KYZ pulses were a common way of gathering data in Demand Response 3 and Capacity-Based Demand Response program installations. They are not explicitly mentioned in the rules but are not excluded either.

The IESO replied that the market manuals only mention two ways by which data can be collected. The first one is to directly access the meter and second one is to gather data through the LDC. There is no explicit mention of collecting data using KYZ pulses in the Market Manuals. However, past audits reveal that KYZ pulses have been used by the DRMPs to collect meter data.

A participant asked if data from a Measurement Canada meter would be acceptable to the IESO. DRMPs could then submit a Record of Installation (ROI) or an LDC statement.

The IESO replied that the DR Auction program does not allow data from meters not installed directly by the LDC, even if they are approved by Measurement Canada. Participants noted in the design of the Demand Response Auction (DRA) that a simplified process for contributor management and measurement data submission was needed. The metering requirements therefore focus on the use of an IESO or LDC revenue meter.

A participant noted that KYZ pulses are being phased out by many utilities and therefore additional metering will be a requirement.

The IESO replied that the requirements for record keeping on the DRMP will increase with additional metering compared to what is proposing under the current structure. The industry needs to look at what can be done to overcome barriers to access existing infrastructure.

A participant noted that they need to understand what constitutes a failure in the audit and that an audit should be limited to event months only. Punitive administration charges are being applied for non-event months even though resources are available because aggregators cannot match up data perfectly.

The IESO thanked the participant for their comments.

A participant noted that an issue in acquiring data from just 1MW of a resource that has a 20MW obligation and 25MW of registered load can cause more than a 1% error in the data, and under the current rules the entire resource could be valued at zero. One useful change to the program rules would be to submit data at the contributor level. This would provide more visibility to the IESO and an avenue for participants to prove their resources are still available if there are measurement data issues.

The IESO replied that it would take this proposal back for review.

A participant asked if the IESO requires LDC statements for physical contributors.

The IESO replied that it does not require LDC statements for physical contributors as physical contributors are registered in the wholesale market and subject to an audit process defined in the market rules for registered wholesale meters

A participant asked if the IESO intends to audit up to 7 years as publicly traded companies do not want the liability of a potential audit on the books this length of time.

The IESO replied that it does not intend to go back 7 years to audit, but it does want to make sure that this information is available if there is a need.

A participant asked for more information on the review of requirements for behind-the-meter storage as part of the DR program and if this will be discussed at the Energy Storage Advisory Group or the DRWG.

The IESO replied that it is looking at how requirements for behind-the-meter storage will impact the system and that it will discuss these at the DRWG and at other forums if needed.

A participant asked if load displacement methods such as behind-the-meter generation are included as part of the behind-the-meter energy storage review.

The IESO replied that participants specify at the time of registration whether load reduction or behind-the-meter generation will be used. Currently, behind-the-meter generation is not being reviewed as there are already requirements specified in the Market Manual for this.

A participant asked where behind-the-meter storage is being reviewed (ESAG, Market Renewal, DRWG, LDC engagements) and what the scope of that review is.

The IESO replied that it is currently in the process of reviewing behind-the-meter storage internally. IESO will share any information pertaining to this review at the appropriate engagement forums.

A participant noted that the need for LDC statements means that smaller resources such as a commercial store will be held to an IESO physical registration standard and this will prevent these resources from participating.

The IESO thanked the participant for their comments.

A participant noted that LDCs are only required to retain 18 months of data by the Ontario Energy Board for auditing purposes and the IESO should have similar requirements.

The IESO replied that it recognizes the disconnect in regulations for data retention. This is under review but currently the Market Rules require record retention for 7 years and processes and audit responsibilities are built around this requirement.

Day-Ahead Market (DAM) High Level Design (HLD) Considerations for Hourly Demand Response (HDR) Participation – Mark Gojmerac, IESO

The IESO led stakeholders through DAM HLD considerations and implications for HDR resource participation.

A participant asked if HDR resources are themselves market participants.

The IESO replied that HDR resources are DR market participants, the participation model distinguishes between energy market participants and DR market participants.

A participant noted that as Market Renewal progresses there should be a greater focus on LDC stakeholdering. Visibility at the distribution level and questions about responsibility, how LDC systems evolve, who requires revenue grade meters, and who is responsible for errors and omissions will all be important.

The IESO acknowledged the feedback and thanked the participant for the comment.

A participant noted a lack of consultation and decisions in the HLD about HDR participation in the DAM. The participant asked if further work on the DAM will be presented to the DRWG as DAM decisions will have a big impact on aggregators.

The IESO replied that the Engagement Plan for Detailed Design will provide clarity on which stakeholders should participate in which design discussions. Detailed design will outline the participation models for all resources including DR under the incremental capacity auction and renewed energy market.

A participant asked if a load with an energy or ancillary service position in the DAM would be exposed to uplift.

The IESO replied that uplift in the DAM will not be based on DA schedules but will continue to be allocated based on Real-Time load and export consumption in the Real-Time Market.

A participant asked if there will be any changes with respect to aggregation rules for DR resources across LDCs.

The IESO replied that aggregating across LDCs introduces some complications and is easier to integrate if appropriate metering is in place.

Market Rule Amendment Proposal Demand Response – Peter Giardetti, Resolute Forest Products

Resolute Forest Products (Resolute) led stakeholders through an overview of its Market Rule Amendment Proposal.

A participant asked if the generator was dispatched by the IESO or if this was self-generation.

Resolute replied that this is self-generation.

A participant asked if the net change in DR load issue would also occur at the distribution level.

Resolute replied that it is not sure.

Market Rule Amendment Proposal Demand Response – Alexandra Campbell, IESO

The IESO provided further context on predecessor programs, the current Demand Response Auction (DRA) program and the potential implications of the Resolute Proposal on the broader market.

A participant asked if the 25MW Resolute injects into the grid is paid based on the Hourly Ontario Energy Price.

Resolute replied that the generator is part of a power purchase agreement (PPA) which takes into account how much is being generated regardless of whether there is demand response.

A participant asked if the net change in DR load is 55MW when the newsreel is down with Resolute injecting 30MW back into the grid under a PPA.

Resolute replied that this is correct.

A participant asked if the IESO could be more specific about other configurations that may have a similar issue.

The IESO replied that there are many different ways that loads and generators could be configured and measured, and therefore this proposed rule change could have broader implications. This proposal could mean metering in one way for one program and metering in a different way for other programs and it is a concern for the IESO that participants could have different metering configurations depending on the program that they are in. This issue could have broader market implications as well.

A participant asked if the IESO had a specific configuration that it has an issue with.

The IESO replied that it has not done a detailed analysis but, as an example, a participant could end up not being a net injector depending on the size of the generator and the load. It is important to look at what a resource is able to contribute to the grid that allows the IESO to match supply and demand, and the IESO needs make sure that what it is paying for is actually providing value to the system.

A participant asked if the IESO agrees with the intent or interpretation of the rule and if it will propose a re-write.

The IESO replied that it needs to have a further understanding of the issue and its implications before it establishing a formal position on the proposed amendment.

A participant asked if there is anything in the Market Rules or Market Manuals about injection and withdraw channels.

The IESO replied that virtual resources with behind-the-meter generation to offset load will only get load reduction payments for the load that is offset, they will not be credited in DR for excess generation or injection. In the Resolute case, there are some questions about whether there is a load reduction or if generation is being injected into the grid for load reduction payments.

Resolute replied that the DR program is a response to an activation and they are not changing generation in this case. The DR revenue meter was installed in this configuration to make sure that there is not a change in generation to make it look like Resolute is reducing load. When activated, Resolute is shutting down the newsmill and reducing its load by 55MW.

A participant noted that this issue should be looked at not just as load reduction but as one that will impact the ICA as the capacity product can include generation and a reduction in load.

The IESO replied that if the load and generator were metered separately with the generator having a PPA it would not be able to participate in the ICA. The IESO would have to look at what happens when different metering situations apply for different programs.

A participant noted that the principals governing open access and competition on the distribution system should be discussed, as utilizing accessible data and managing distributed generation for the benefit of the ratepayer is important. There does not appear to be an agency taking responsibility for bringing these pieces together. The participant asked where the IESO sees that centralized vision and responsibility.

The IESO replied that it will take this back for consideration. It wants to make sure that it does not allow metering configurations to exist that do not provide the intended benefits to the electricity system.

A participant asked if a third meter directly in front of the newsmill would solve the problem.

The IESO replied that it may not, particularly if the newsmill was supplying demand response. Different metering configurations can lead to different measurements and the IESO would like to utilize only one meter to avoid this.

A participant asked Resolute if their electricity costs for the newsmill are based on 60MW during normal operation and only 5MW during DR activation.

Resolute replied that the PPA is confidential but the newsmill buys back the entire amount whether it is from the grid or from the generator.

A participant asked if the generator is metered on its own and if the IESO can see the data.

Resolute replied that there is a revenue grade meter on the generator.

A participant shared support for the proposed rule change and wanted to understand what issues the IESO has with it or to see a counter-proposal.

The IESO noted that the Technical Panel is asking for feedback on this Market Rule amendment proposal and asked participants to provide written submissions on this rule to rule.amendments@ieso.ca by February 21, 2019.

Expanding DR to Uncontracted (Stranded) Generators – John Windsor, Northland Power

Northland Power led stakeholders through a presentation and discussion on the value of expanding the Demand Response Auction to uncontracted generators and other potential capacity providers.

A participant had the following comments: 1) The DRA is a transition mechanism for load and more work is needed so loads can participate in the market, these priorities should not be shifted. 2) Since the IESO is opening up market mechanisms such as the DRA it should open up the OR market for loads. 3) The name of the DRA should change and rules and governance issues should be reviewed. 4) More transparency is needed on how the demand curve is created. 5) More meetings are needed to work out all these issues.

Northland replied that it is not suggesting that generation is DR but that both load and generation can meet a capacity requirement and the economics should determine who meets the demand.

A participant asked if the Kingston Cogen facility can provide energy, capacity, and ancillary services now as it does not need to participate in the DRA for these purposes.

Northland replied that Kingston needs a higher energy price to cover marginal costs. If a capacity program covered more fixed costs it would be able to better participate in energy and ancillary programs.

A participant noted that if the IESO opens up the DRA it should also open up products that DR can provide and utilization payments should be part of that discussion. Another participant expressed concerns about such a major change in the DRA given relatively short notice.

The IESO thanked participants for their comments.

Meeting Ontario's Capacity Needs After 2019 - David Short, IESO

The IESO led stakeholders through a discussion on the plan for evolving the DRA and meeting Ontario's capacity needs after 2019.

A participant noted that there was no stakeholdering in the decision to evolve the DRA.

The IESO replied that the IESO signaled that it was not going to sign additional contracts at the 2018 Technical Planning Conference and based on the forecast this is the time to make these changes.

A participant noted that the Technical Planning Conference focused on 2023 and changes for 2020 is ambitious. Engagement on this evolution need to start right away and has to include other opportunities for DR to create a level playing field.

The IESO replied that stakeholdering will follow the day after the ICA's HLD stakeholdering session and the evolved DR design will follow shortly after the release of the ICA HLD.

A participant asked if other opportunities for load, such as utilization payments for DR and Operating Reserve opportunities for HDR will be part of the discussion in evolving the DR.

The IESO replied that the focus on this new engagement will be on expanding the auction and it will have to determine separately how to manage DRWG issues. The IESO will clearly identify for stakeholders where each of these issues will be covered.

A participant stated that it is problematic for the IESO to pick and choose which revenue opportunities to provide for different resources. Opening up the DRA to generators for a DR capacity payment but not the ancillary services market or utilization payments for DR is an example of this.

A participant asked if it would legitimize the proposed amendment if the DRA was open to generators and Resolute did not have a PPA.

The IESO replied that it will have to look at this in more detail.

A participant asked if a market participant providing capacity in the ICA or the evolved DRA would get compensated equally whether it is generation or a reduction in consumption.

The IESO replied that if there is a mix of generation and DR the IESO would have to look into that.

A participant asked why DR and behind-the-meter generators would not be compensated the same for providing the same capacity product.

The IESO replied that they would be compensated the same, although the way in which we perform the initial upfront capacity qualification process may be different.

A participant asked if the price per MW of capacity will be the same.

The IESO replied that the price per MW is the same but assessment, measurement, and delivery will vary for different resources.

A participant noted that net generation is precluded under the DRA rules and asked how a resource that can both inject and displace load would not get compensated for these services.

The IESO replied that it will take this back for consideration. There are different rules for different resource types and currently the IESO cannot accommodate a resource that injects and withdraws. It has been working to create a level playing field in developing the ICA.

A participant noted that if generators are compensated in the DRA, behind-the-meter generation should be compensated as well.

The IESO replied that it will take this back for consideration.

A participant asked if the IESO considers DR to be competitive with other resources noting that updates to Market Rules, and Market Manuals need to be completed for DR to compete from a financial perspective.

The IESO replied that in other jurisdictions the capacity auction is a good opportunity for DR. It helps keep the market liquid and competitive and this is what it hopes for in Ontario. Making sure DR is as viable as any other capacity product is part of the DR work plan discussion.

A participant asked if there would be a new DR work plan or stakeholdering session to discuss the evolution of the DRA.

The IESO replied that a new engagement will discuss how to evolve the auction, and the 2019 DR work plan will be a separate engagement. The DR work plan is still open for comment and will guide the DRWG over the next few years.

Update to the 2019 DR Work Plan – Alexandra Campbell, IESO

IESO led stakeholders through a discussion on the 2019 DR work plan.

A participant asked if the IESO could release a Target Capacity for the 2019 TCA earlier in the year.

The IESO replied that it does not have an answer to this yet. The engagement on the transition from the DR auction will discuss the process to determine Target Capacity.

A participant asked if the capacity associated with the 2019 TCA will be known before the IESO provides the Q3 plan on post-2020 capacity needs.

The IESO replied that it will work to be more specific on dates over the next 6 months and it recognizes that the Target Capacity is a key component to a healthy market. It will post the Target Capacity in the Pre-Auction Report at the end of September or beginning of October.

A participant noted that enabling DR through participation in other markets such as OR should be the highest priority item on the DR work plan.

The IESO thanked the participant for their comments.

A participant asked how the Market Rule Amendment Proposal should be addressed now that the DRA will evolve.

The IESO replied that it will have to take this back for consideration as there should be more analysis on the proposal in the context of the evolution of the DRA. It will note to the Technical Panel that the DRWG needs to explore this question further.

A participant asked if the Market Rule Amendment Proposal could be resolved by the December auction.

The IESO replied that rule language has been proposed and the Technical Panel is looking for broader stakeholder input. The IESO would have to have a final proposal to the IESO Board by August for any changes to occur for the December auction. The IESO will aim to have a follow-up discussion on this at the next DRWG meeting.

A participant asked how the DRWG should provide feedback to the Technical Panel.

The IESO replied that based on today's discussions it will go back to the Technical Panel and note the request for more information on IESO's position, and if this should be viewed differently given the DRA evolution. The Technical Panel has asked for feedback from stakeholders on the amendment submission and this too will factor into how they proceed with this amendment when they meet on March 5.

Resolute noted that it believes the rules are clear and that they are living up to the intent of the program. The amendment proposal intends to provide greater clarity and it is looking for a decision as soon as possible.

Conclusion and wrap up – Jennifer Young, IESO

The IESO thanked all participants and that the IESO welcomes feedback from all stakeholders. Feedback should be sent to engagement@ieso.ca by March 8. Feedback on this Market Rule amendment proposal should be sent to rule.amendments@ieso.ca by February 21, 2019.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm.

Action Item Summary

Responsible Party	Action Item
IESO	Provide statistics on the performance of previous years' HDR resources.
IESO	Consider a two-week window for the DR test similar to other markets.
IESO	Review internally to see if LDC interval data can meet IESO requirements.
IESO	Consider allowing participants to submit data at the contributor level.
IESO	Clarify in Market Manual 12 that the IESO does not intend to go back 7 years to audit.
IESO	Provide more information on the review of requirements for behind-the-meter storage as part of the DR program.
IESO	Consider where principals governing open access and competition on the distribution system should be discussed.
IESO	Identify for stakeholders which engagements each issue related to DRWG will be discussed.
IESO	Consider if it would legitimize the proposed amendment if the DRA was open to generators and Resolute did not have a PPA.
IESO	Consider how a resource that can both inject and displace load could get compensated for these services.
IESO	Determine how the Market Rule Amendment Proposal should be addressed now that the DRA will evolve.
IESO	Have a follow-up discussion on timing for the Market Rule Amendment Proposal at the next DRWG meeting.
Stakeholders	Provide further feedback on the Market Rule Amendment Proposal
IESO	Note the need for more information on IESO's position at the Technical Panel.