

Ms. Nancy Marconi  
Registrar  
Ontario Energy Board  
P.O. Box 2319, 27th Floor  
2300 Yonge Street  
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

March 13, 2025

**EB-2024-0198 – Enbridge 2026-2030 DSM Application**  
**Pollution Probe Reply Submission on the Draft Issues List**

Dear Ms. Marconi:

In accordance with Procedural Order No. 1 for the above-noted proceeding, below are Pollution Probe's reply submissions related to the Draft Issues List.

Pollution Probe has reviewed the submissions from parties on the Draft Issues List and confirms that the recommendations in Pollution Probe's March 7, 2025 submission remain valid. In general, stakeholders noted that the Draft Issues List provided a good foundation and some adjustments or additions were suggested by stakeholders. Pollution Probe provided input related to the wording suggestions that address specific items that would need to be considered and determined in this proceeding. Alternatively, Pollution Probe suggested that the OEB could simply include wording when the Issues List is finalised to reinforce that each issue will enable the appropriate flexibility to cover the relevant scope related to each issue. This approach has been leveraged previously by the OEB since specific wording in an issues lists is not meant to intentionally restrict consideration of relevant information and options required to provide a comprehensive decision. If there is risk that Enbridge or other parties may take a position that the Issues List is meant to be more restrictive, it could be beneficial to add the additional clarifying wording to each issue, as appropriate. It appears that Enbridge may be suggesting in its correspondence that the OEB is restricted on the scope of the proceeding based on the content of what Enbridge included in its application. This is clearly not correct and the OEB has the ability to prudently ensure that the proceeding includes all appropriate considerations, even if (and perhaps especially if) certain ones are not included in Enbridge's filing. This applies to DSM Framework issues among others.

The record and OEB Decision in this proceeding will need to be sufficient to provide clear direction on how DSM needs to proceed on and after January 1, 2026. Pollution Probe will not repeat the recommendations included in its March 7, 2025 submission and the comments below are meant to be read in conjunction with Pollution Probe's initial submission, which remains pertinent.

Enbridge indicated that it was unclear on the scope of Issue 1 in relation to the term "integrated planning", or if that term was meant to only include the OEB's Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) Framework. Provincial policy has evolved since 2021 to include a desire for energy planning integration to occur at a scale broader than the scope addressed in the OEB IRP Framework. This is true for energy considerations for both existing and new buildings which fall under the scope of DSM. It appears that Issue 1 on the Draft Issues List may have been meant to include these broader considerations and not limit consideration solely to the OEB IRP Framework.

Enbridge suggests enhanced wording for Issue 11e to be “Is Enbridge Gas’s proposed Large Volume Program Scorecard, including targets and performance metrics appropriate, including the impact of the opt-out framework proposal as proposed?”. This proposed change appears to be beneficial since it enables consideration of whether the proposed opt out proposal is appropriate.


Enbridge proposed a change to Draft Issue 12. Pollution Probe suggests that the original wording proposed for Issue 12 in the Draft Issues List is more appropriate and better aligned with the direction flowing from the EB-2021-0002 Decision.

Enbridge suggests changing wording for Issue 13 to be “Are Enbridge Gas’s research and development proposals appropriate?”. This proposed change appears to be appropriate. Similar to the comments included in Pollution Probe’s March 7, 2025 submissions, this issue implicitly includes what should occur if the proposal is not appropriate and the OEB may wish to add that language as explicit language to the issue.

Environmental Defence Canada (EDC) and Green Energy Coalition (GEC) recommend certain adjustments to include DSM Framework issues to be included for the Issues List in this proceeding, similar to what was done previously. Although Framework issues could be considered implicitly included under a broad interpretation of issues in the Draft Issues List, it seems to make sense to include them explicitly in the manner recommended by EDC and GEC.

The School Energy Coalition (SEC) suggested the inclusion of the following issue to the Issues List: “Should the OEB continue to sole source DSM programs through Enbridge Gas Inc., or should some or all of the DSM offerings be designed and/or delivered by one or more other program administrators? If the latter, what process should be used to identify and procure the services of those new participants?”. If the OEB wants to ensure that cost-effective DSM is maximised beyond that which Enbridge has proposed (or is able) to deliver, it will require consideration of alternative options for achieving such outcomes. A wide range of options are available for the OEB to consider beyond those which Enbridge has filed in its application. Options also include piloting alternatives during the term starting January 1, 2026 to avoid a five year delay. Even if the OEB were to decide not to pursue any of those options during this plan term, it would be prudent to assess those options now and have a clear understanding on what would be required to leverage them during or after this plan term. None of these options happen overnight as the OEB and Province has seen in their request for enhanced cost-effective partnering over the past decade or more. Some changes can take time and if certain options fail to achieve the outcomes desired, delaying the required adjustments will result in lost opportunities and sub-optimal net benefits to Ontario energy consumers over the plan term.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of Pollution Probe.



Michael Brophy, P.Eng., M.Eng., MBA  
Michael Brophy Consulting Inc.  
Consultant to Pollution Probe  
Phone: 647-330-1217  
Email: [Michael.brophy@rogers.com](mailto:Michael.brophy@rogers.com)

Cc: Enbridge Regulatory (via email)  
All Parties (via email)  
Richard Carlson, Pollution Probe (via email)