

May 22, 2026

**VIA RESS AND EMAIL**

Mr. Ritchie Murray  
Acting Registrar  
Ontario Energy Board  
27th Floor - 2300 Yonge Street  
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4

Dear Mr. Murray:

**Re: EB-2025-0297 Application by Ontario Power Generation Inc. and DNNP LP by its general partner, DNNP GP Inc., (together, the “Applicants”) for an order or orders relating to payment amounts for prescribed generating facilities (the “Application”) – Request for confidential treatment for additional interrogatory responses**

The Applicants filed interrogatory responses in the above-noted proceeding on April 22 and April 24, 2026. On May 20 and 22, 2026, the Applicants filed certain revised and additional interrogatory responses (collectively, the “**May 20 IRRs**”) consisting of:

1. Interrogatory responses arising from resolutions reached between the Applicants and AMPCO, CCC, SEC, OAPPA, and OEB Staff (the “**Moving Parties**”) on motions brought by the Moving Parties as detailed in the Applicants’ letter to the Ontario Energy Board (“**OEB**” or the “**Board**”), dated May 4, 2026;
2. Interrogatory responses arising from the OEB’s Decision and Order on Motions and Intervenor Evidence, dated May 15, 2026, regarding certain motions brought by Intervenor Mr. Keith Pinto; and
3. Certain revised and additional interrogatory responses filed on May 20 and 22, 2026.

In accordance with Rule 10 of the OEB’s *Rules of Practice and Procedure* and the OEB’s *Practice Direction on Confidential Filings* (the “**Practice Direction**”), the Applicants hereby request the OEB’s approval to (i) permanently redact from the public record information that is non-relevant and/or (ii) treat as confidential, certain information included in the May 20 IRRs (collectively, the “**Confidential Information**”).

The Confidential Information is identified in “**Appendix A**”, which provides the basis for the Applicants’ request for confidential treatment, in accordance with Parts 5.1.4 and 11.1.2 of the Practice Direction. All proposed Confidential Information has been redacted in the public version of the Application filed with the OEB.

The Applicants have attached “**Appendix B**” (excluded from the public version of this letter) which includes the confidential (non-redacted) versions of the relevant documents. To this end, the documents that comprise “**Appendix B**”, are marked “Confidential” or “Confidential – Not Relevant”, or a combination, as applicable, and include markings to the specific portions of the documents that contain the Confidential Information.

In “**Appendix B**”, where appropriate, information for which the Applicants seek confidential treatment on the record has been marked for redaction with a red box (or shaded red, for excel tables), and labour-sensitive information has been marked for redaction with a green box. The Applicants applied blue boxes for non-relevant information which the Applicants seek to permanently redact from the OEB record.

The Applicants request, and have identified accordingly in green boxes, the portions of certain documents containing commercially sensitive labour information, the disclosure of which on the public record would be detrimental to the Applicants. Given the participation in this proceeding by two of OPG’s labour unions, the Society of United Professionals (“**Society**”) and the Power Workers Union (“**PWU**”), OPG has a particular concern with the possibility of this subset of confidential information, which has the potential to interfere with collective bargaining negotiations, being disclosed to the Society and PWU. While the Applicants have ensured that any such information has been marked as confidential and is redacted from the public record, this information would in the normal course be available to counsel, experts or consultants to a party who file the OEB’s form of confidentiality Declaration and Undertaking (the “**Undertaking**”). The Applicants understand that the Board typically grants access to confidential documents to a party’s counsel, experts or consultants that have signed the Undertaking.

In respect of the Society and PWU, the Applicants request that only external counsel and/or external consultant(s) representing these unions in this proceeding be permitted to have access to the unredacted documents containing commercially sensitive labour information, as so-identified in Appendix B, and, for external consultants, as a condition of obtaining access, the external consultant be required to execute and file (i) the standard Undertaking, and also (ii) an affidavit or sworn declaration confirming that they are at arms-length from the union and are not (and will not be) involved in any way in collective bargaining on behalf of the union through to the end of the period covered by the Application. The additional requirement in (ii) is appropriate to ensure the protection of this highly sensitive and confidential information in the circumstances, and this request is consistent with the process followed by OEB panels in certain prior proceedings.<sup>1</sup> If the Society or PWU objects to this requirement, or if the Board is not satisfied that the counsel or consultant is external to the relevant union or that they have no involvement in collective bargaining-related activities on behalf of the union over the relevant period, the Applicants reserve the right to make further submissions on this point as needed.

#### *Withdrawal of Request for Confidential Treatment – L-A1-Staff-002, Attachment 4*

In the Applicants’ April 28, 2026 confidentiality submission, the Applicants’ requested confidential treatment for portions of several interrogatory responses and attachments, including L-A1-Staff-002, Attachment 4. The request for confidential treatment of L-A1-Staff-002, Attachment 4 was made in error. The Applicants confirm that confidential treatment is no

---

<sup>1</sup> EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, April 13, 2021 at pp. 6-7.

longer sought for L-A1-Staff-002, Attachment 4. Should the OEB require any further information or clarification as to the requests made herein, please contact the Applicants or their legal counsel as required.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "A. Brown". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "A" and a long, sweeping tail on the "n".

Andrea Brown

cc:

Aimee Collier (OPG) via e-mail

Charles Keizer (Torys LLP) via e-mail

**Appendix A**

Exhibit Reference		Presumptive Confidential Treatment (Yes/No)	Type of Request <sup>[1]</sup>	Explanation and Rationale
L-A1-CCC-010, Attachment 7	Page 19	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information set out in items 2, 3, 10 and 14 on page 19 describes certain commercial arrangements in place that are related to the IPA and address OPG as a first mover of SMR technology. This information is commercially sensitive and would prejudice the future competitive position of the Applicants.</p> <p>These arrangements are highly sensitive as the IPA is a first-of-a-kind agreement and DNNP is a first-of-a-kind project. Competitors in the growing SMR market do not have access to this information and its disclosure would reveal information about how OPG and its counterparties are structuring and delivering the first SMR in North America.</p> <p><b>Third Party Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> In addition, because the redacted information also describes the first-mover arrangements between the Applicants and its technology provider, public disclosure of this information could prejudice the technology provider's competitive position in providing similar services to non-first-mover clients. It may also impair negotiations with other customers, who would rely on the redacted information in those negotiations. As a result, disclosure of this commercially sensitive information could prejudice the competitive positions of the technology provider, interfere with their future negotiations, and may produce a significant loss to them. (Practice Direction, Appendix B, Parts 1 and 2; Practice Direction, Appendix A, parts (a)(i), (iii) and (iv)).</p> <p><b>Impact on Future Negotiations:</b> If the redacted information is made public, it would also interfere with ongoing negotiations about DNNP and on other nuclear projects (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part a(iii)). The disclosure of the first-mover arrangements between OPG and technology provider would act as</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>a baseline in future negotiations, impairing OPG's and its counterparties' flexibility when negotiating future SMR execution agreements.</p> <p>In addition, any compromises that OPG's counterparties made regarding key commercial terms or otherwise will become public, which would impair OPG's relationship with those parties as they negotiate agreements for the remaining units of DNNP and for other projects. Disclosure of this confidential information would also make it less likely that parties would be willing to engage with OPG on other first mover projects like DNNP, as doing so would put their confidential commercial information at risk.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment.</b> In this proceeding, the OEB concluded that a summary of the IPA in the pre-filed evidence qualified for confidential treatment. It did so pursuant to Appendix A, Part (a)(i) (competitive position) and Appendix A, Part (a)(iii) (interfere with negotiations). For similar reasons, the redacted information – which describes commercial arrangements related to the IPA – qualify for confidential treatment.</p>
L-A1-CCC-010, Attachment 7	Page 19	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information in items 11-13 and 16 on page 19 contain commercially sensitive, non-public information regarding the financing arrangements and the nature of the parties involvement. The information is commercially sensitive and consistently treated in a confidential manner by the Applicants.</p> <p>The redacted information details the bespoke arrangement between these parties and as such, if disclosed on the public record, could prejudice the competitive position of the parties, as other clients may attempt to leverage this information into a similar arrangement. In addition, if this information is disclosed, any compromises that OPG's counterparties made regarding key commercial terms or otherwise will become public, which would impair OPG's relationship with those parties as they negotiate agreements for the remaining units of DNNP and for other projects. Disclosure of this confidential information would also make it less likely that parties would be willing to engage with OPG on other</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>first mover projects like DNNP, as doing so would put their confidential commercial information at risk.</p> <p>Finally, the terms of the financing for the project are not complete. As such, the disclosure of these details on the public record could significantly interfere with future financing negotiations carried out by the Applicants (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i), (iii), and (b)).</p>
L-A2-SEC-026	Page 2	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information consists of a breakdown of renewable generation OM&amp;A costs in OPG’s 2025-2031 Business Plan. It concerns exclusively OPG’s unregulated hydroelectric business.</p> <p>The public disclosure of this information could enable OPG’s competitors to infer and anticipate OPG’s behavior in the competitive wholesale electricity market, plan strategies, and adjust their own market offers accordingly in a way that could harm competition in the Independent Electricity System Operator’s administered market. It is not OPG’s market behavior that is affected. It is other market participants that could change their market conduct to the detriment of OPG’s competitive position by exploiting this commercially sensitive information. As a result, if this information is disclosed on the public record, it could prejudice OPG’s competitive position with respect to the unregulated hydroelectric business and impact the fair competition and market integrity (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i) and (b)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB has determined that similar information in OPG’s Business Plan related to the combined regulated and unregulated business and assets of OPG is confidential (EB-2025-0297, Decision and Order on Confidentiality - Pre-Filed Evidence, dated April 13, 2026, at pp. 12-16; see also EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, dated April 13, 2021, at p. 9; EB-2016-0152, Procedural Order No. 3, dated November 1, 2016, at pp. 3-4; EB-2013-0321, Decision and Order on Confidential Filings and Procedural Order No. 4, dated March 21, 2014, at p. 6; EB-2010-0008, Procedural Order No. 3, dated July 21, 2010, at p. 5; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>

**Appendix A**

<p>L-C1-SEC-037, Attachment 1</p>	<p>Pages 68-69</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Confidential Treatment</p>	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> This redacted information relates to scheduling information for Units 2-4 of the Darlington New Nuclear Project (“DNNP”).</p> <p>This information is commercially sensitive, and its public disclosure could prejudice ongoing and future negotiations. The Applicants are currently in the process of negotiating the definitive agreements for DNNP Units 2-4 with contractors. Disclosure of this information could prejudice those negotiations and compromise the Applicants’ ability to negotiate competitive pricing for DNNP Units 2-4, which would impede the Applicants’ ability to secure greater value for the ratepayers. (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i) and (iii)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB approved confidential treatment for scheduling information for Units 2-4, noting that confidential treatment is appropriate for future unit information, as public disclosure could prejudice ongoing negotiations for Units 2-4 and cause competitive harm (EB-2025-0297, Decision and Order on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, April 13, 2026, at p.15; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
<p>L-D1-Staff-309, Attachment 4</p>	<p>Pages 3, 6-14</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Confidential Treatment</p>	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Third-Party Proprietary Information:</b> The redacted information, contained in the Cast Iron Component Assessment Report, consists of a third party’s technical material that contains proprietary information as it relates to methods, approaches, repair processes and risk assessment in the refurbishment of components.</p> <p>OPG has been advised by the third-party author of this document that the redacted portion of the document is commercially sensitive, as it reveals their proprietary technology and methodology pertaining to their own experience in asset refurbishment that consists of trade secrets and technical information (Practice Direction, Appendix A, part (b)).</p> <p>The public disclosure of this information could prejudice the third party’s commercial interests and its competitive position, and disclosure could undermine its ability to carry on offering business services, as it would allow its competitors and other service providers to ascertain the proprietary and sensitive aspects of its methods, approaches, repair process and risk assessment in the</p>

### Appendix A

				<p>refurbishment of components (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i),(iv)).</p> <p>In addition, the third-party provided OPG with the relevant records on the basis that OPG would not publicly disclose them (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(ii)).</p>
L-D2-SEC-094, Attachment 3	Pages 16, 33	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Sensitive Non-Public Third-Party Information:</b> The redacted information consists of the vendor's (i) Workplace Safety and Insurance Board registration number, and (ii) tax registration number.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> The OEB has previously found that information of this nature was confidential (EB-2016-0152, Decision on Confidential Filings and Procedural Order No. 3, November 1, 2016, at p. 9; see also Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-D2-SEC-094, Attachment 3	Pages 26-27, 41	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information consists of insurance coverage amounts and of limitation of liability amounts. The amounts reflect the parties' negotiated positions and commercial compromises and both parties would be prejudiced in future negotiations if these details were publicly available to potential counterparties.</p> <p>This information could be used as an artificial benchmark in future negotiations, reducing both parties' ability to negotiate terms specific to a project and will prejudice their competitive position in future negotiations. As a result, disclosure could significantly interfere with negotiations by allowing future counterparties to adjust their strategies to the detriment of the ratepayers.</p> <p>Additionally, this information provides an indication of the Applicants' risk appetite which, if publicly disclosed, could prejudice the Applicants' competitive position and interfere with future negotiations.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> The OEB has previously approved a request for confidential treatment of commercially sensitive information regarding OPG's insurance policies (EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality, June 8, 2021, at p. 21) (Practice Direction,</p>

**Appendix A**

				Appendix A, Part (e)). The OEB has also previously approved a request for confidential treatment of limitation of liability amounts as commercially sensitive. (EB-2016-0152, Decision and Order on Confidentiality, January 31, 2017, at p. 9; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).
L-D2-SEC-094, Attachment 3	Pages 62-63, 78	Yes	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Billing Rate of a Third Party:</b> The redacted information consists of billing-rates of a third-party vendor. Billing rate information is commercially sensitive and presumptively confidential. Public disclosure of this information could prejudice the economic interest and competitive position of the vendor in future negotiations for the provision of similar services.</p> <p>This information could be used as an artificial benchmark in future negotiations, reducing both parties' ability to negotiate terms specific to a project and will prejudice their competitive position in future negotiations. As a result, disclosure could significantly interfere with negotiations by allowing future counterparties to adjust their strategies to the detriment of the ratepayers.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> The OEB has previously determined that information relating to third party rates should be subject to confidential treatment (EB-2016-0152, Decision and Order on Confidentiality, dated January 31, 2017 at pp. 13-14; EB-2025-0014, Decision on Confidentiality and Procedural Order No. 6, dated November 11, 2025, at pp.1-2; see also Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-D2-SEC-094, Attachment 3	Page 71-72	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Project Information:</b> The redacted information consists of the name of consultants for a specific project.</p> <p>The redacted information is commercially sensitive. Public disclosure of the third-party consultant names associated with a specific project could be leveraged by competitors to identify and obtain other information regarding those consultants' pricing, services, and fees. When combined with information regarding overall project costs and scope of work, this could enable competing vendors to calibrate their bids to maximize profit in current or future procurements. Disclosure could therefore</p>

**Appendix A**

				significantly interfere with negotiations and prejudice both OPG's and the third-party consultants' competitive positions. (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i) and (iii)).
L-D2-SEC-098, Attachment 1	Pages 1, 3 (Business Case)	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Information:</b> The redacted information contains past LCOE estimates and components of past LCOE estimates. Previous LCOE estimates have been superseded and are not relevant to any issue in this proceeding (Practice Direction, Part 11). This information would typically be redacted on the basis that it is not relevant. In the interest of resolving the motion requests of intervenors, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. However, this is without prejudice to OPG's position that this information is not relevant.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB determined that past superseded estimates are not relevant to the OEB's consideration of the issues in this proceeding (EB-2025-0297, Procedural Order No. 5, May 1, 2026, at p. 2; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-D2-SEC-098, Attachment 1	Page 3 (Financing)	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information and Competitive Prejudice:</b> The redacted information relates to confidential debt terms of OPG and the Canadian Infrastructure Bank ("CIB"). The information provides assumptions and details that could be used to discern the rate of the CIB loan.</p> <p>CIB is a unique lender with a statutory mandate to invest in, and seek to attract investment in, infrastructure projects that will generate revenue and will be in the public interest. Any information that could reveal the terms of a CIB loan is highly confidential, as access to such information could give other parties information not otherwise available that could provide a commercial advantage unrelated to this proceeding in future dealings with CIB (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i), (iv), and (b)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB approved confidential treatment of debt terms of the CIB loan (EB-2025-0297, Decision and Order on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, April 13, 2026, Item #6, at p. 4; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)). The proposed redaction contains information that</p>

**Appendix A**

				similarly relates to the debt terms of the CIB loan. (See also EB-2024-0063, Decision on Confidentiality, December 9, 2024).
L-D2-SEC-098, Attachment 1	Appendix 1, Figure 1 Page 6	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information and Competitive Prejudice:</b> The redacted information contains OPG’s assessment of three SMR technology vendors and comments about one specific vendor. The information explicitly grades vendors that OPG considered for SMR technology development in a variety of assessment categories. The additional comment expresses a view about OPG’s assessment of how one vendor works.</p> <p>This information is commercially sensitive and would lead to competitive prejudice if disclosed. More specifically, disclosure of positive vendor commentary could be leveraged by that vendor in future negotiations with OPG, to OPG and the ratepayers’ detriment. Disclosure of negative commentary could result in reputational harm for the vendor or could impact OPG’s relationships with these and other vendors, impairing OPG’s bargaining position in the future. As a result, disclosure could damage the contractual relationship, prejudice OPG and the vendor’s competitive position in the market, and jeopardize current or future negotiations. Disclosure could also result in reputational harm for that vendor (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i), (ii) and (iv)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB approved confidential treatment of OPG complaints related to vendors (EB-2025-0297, Decision and Order on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, April 13, 2026, Item #7, at p. 4). The OEB has also previously determined that information related to vendor performance is confidential (EB-2016-0152; Decision and Order on Confidentiality, January 31, 2017, at p. 12; EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality, June 8, 2021, at p. 5; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-D2-SEC-099, Attachment 1	Pages 1-3	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Information:</b> The redacted information contains past cost and LCOE estimates and components of those estimates. Previous cost and LCOE estimates have been superseded and are not relevant to any issue in this proceeding (Practice Direction, Part 11). This information would typically be redacted on the basis that it is not relevant. In</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>the interest of resolving the motion requests of intervenors, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. However, this is without prejudice to OPG's position that this information is not relevant.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB held that past superseded estimates are not relevant to the OEB's consideration of the issues in this proceeding (EB-2025-0297, Procedural Order No. 5, May 1, 2026, at p. 2; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
<p>L-D2-SEC-099, Attachment 1</p>	<p>Page 2</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Confidential Treatment</p>	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information contains undisclosed details about the Technology Collaboration Agreement (TCA), including information about shares for the estimated cost design and commercial arrangements related to the Integrated Project Agreement (IPA). If specific commercial details about the TCA were disclosed, it would harm OPG's competitive position (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part a(i)).</p> <p>The TCA is the primary agreement for development of the BWRX-300 Standard Plant Design. Like the IPA, the TCA is highly sensitive – it provides the contractual framework for developing the design of a SMR that will be delivered through the Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) model. Because DNNP is a first-of-a-kind project, no global competitor in the SMR market knows how OPG and GE-Hitachi have collaborated to develop this plant design. Thus, the TCA operationalizes a proprietary and novel approach to SMR design development for the first time. As the OEB noted in its April 13, 2026 decision and in other orders, these types of proprietary frameworks are worthy of protection (EB-2024-0115, Decision on Confidentiality, November 3, 2025, at p. 4).</p> <p>But like with the IPA, the Applicants have disclosed information about the TCA to the public given its key role in DNNP and the IPA. Exhibits D2-04-03 and D2-04-04 explain the general framework of the TCA, how the parties work together under the TCA (through the Design Center Working Group), and how the TCA facilitates early engagement by OPG into Standard Plant Design. But more granular and commercially sensitive details – like financial terms – have been withheld as disclosure would harm the Applicants' and their counterparties' commercial positions in future SMR agreements.</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>The details about how costs are shared in developing the Standard Plant Design and other commercial terms are also confidential pursuant to Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (b) – they are commercial and financial information that the TCA parties have consistently treated as confidential.</p> <p><b>Impact on Future Negotiations:</b> If these commercial details about the TCA are made public, it would interfere with ongoing negotiations about DNNP and on other nuclear projects (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part a(iii)). If these financial details are revealed, any compromises that OPG’s counterparties made in the TCA will become public, which would impair OPG’s relationship with those parties and impair their future negotiating position on the remaining units of DNNP and other projects.</p> <p><b>Third-Party Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information, if disclosed, could prejudice the competitive position of OPG and its counterparties. The cost share information and other commercial terms would act as a baseline in future agreements, impairing OPG’s negotiations on future projects and the counterparties’ ability to negotiate agreements with other customers. As a result, disclosure of this commercially sensitive information could prejudice the competitive positions of OPG and the TCA counterparties, interfere with their future negotiations, and may produce a significant loss to them. (Practice Direction, Appendix B, Parts 1 and 2; Practice Direction, Appendix A, parts (a)(i), (iii) and (iv)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB concluded that a summary of the IPA included in the pre-filed evidence qualified for confidential treatment. It did so pursuant to Appendix A, Part (a)(i) (competitive position) and Appendix A, Part (a)(iii) (interference with negotiations). Because the TCA is closely related to the IPA, details about commercial arrangements in the TCA also qualify for confidential treatment. As the pre-filed evidence explains, the roles and responsibilities in the TCA are recognized in the IPA, which forms part of the overall scope of the IPA (see Exhibit D2-04-03, p. 3) (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
--	--	--	--	---

**Appendix A**

L-D2-SEC-099, Attachment 1	Page 2	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Information:</b> The redacted information relates to an agreement involving OPG's unregulated business. This information is not relevant and would typically be redacted on the basis that it is not relevant. In the interest of resolving the motion requests of intervenors, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. However, this is without prejudice to OPG's position that this information is not relevant.</p>
L-D2-SEC-099, Attachment 1	Page 3	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information discloses the rate of interest for Units 1-4.</p> <p>The rate of interest for Unit 1 is commercially sensitive, as it may allow competitors to reverse-engineer the costing of DNNP to assist in the development of their own competing projects (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i), (iii), (iv)). Noting that one of the OEB's statutory objectives is to "facilitate innovation in the electricity sector," OPG asserts that this objective will be best served by protecting OPG's sensitive financial information underlying the DNNP, which represents a first-of-a-kind approach to nuclear power generation.</p> <p>The rate of interest information for Units 2-4 is also commercially sensitive. OPG is currently in the process of negotiating the definitive agreements for Units 2-4 with contractors, and public disclosure of this information would prejudice those negotiations and compromise the ability to negotiate competitive pricing for Units 2-4, which would impede OPG's ability to secure greater value for ratepayers (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i) and (iii)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB approved confidential treatment for Unit 2-4 information, noting that confidential treatment is appropriate for future unit information, as public disclosure could prejudice ongoing negotiations for Units 2-4 and cause competitive harm (EB-2025-0297, Decision and Order on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, April 13, 2026, at p.15; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>

**Appendix A**

L-D2-SEC-099, Attachment 1	Page 4, Appendices 1, 2, 3 and 8	No	Confidential treatment	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Information:</b> The redacted information contains cost breakdowns, cost contingency modelling, and deltas for the Class 4 and/or Class 5 estimates. The redacted information also contains scheduling information that is based on and tied to these past cost estimates. The Class 4 and 5 estimates have been superseded by the Class 3 estimate and are therefore not relevant to any issue in this proceeding. (Practice Direction, Part 11). This information would typically be redacted on the basis that it is not relevant. In the interest of resolving the motion requests of intervenors, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. However, this is without prejudice to OPG’s position that this information is not relevant.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB determined that past superseded estimates are not relevant to the OEB’s consideration of the issues in this proceeding (EB-2025-0297, Procedural Order No. 5, May 1, 2026, at p. 2; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-D2-SEC-099, Attachment 1	Appendix 4	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The proposed redactions contain scheduling information for Units 2-4. OPG is currently in the process of negotiating the definitive agreements for Units 2-4 with contractors, and public disclosure of scheduling information would prejudice those negotiations. Disclosure of this information may also compromise the ability to negotiate competitive pricing for Units 2-4, which would impede OPG’s ability to secure greater value for ratepayers (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i) and (iii)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB approved confidential treatment for similar Unit 2-4 information, noting that confidential treatment is appropriate for future unit information, as public disclosure could prejudice ongoing negotiations for Units 2-4 and cause competitive harm (EB-2025-0297, Decision and Order on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, April 13, 2026, at p.15; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-D2-Staff-117, Attachment 1	Pages 20- 291	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information includes highly technical, non-public information about the infrastructure, planning and execution approaches for construction</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>of the DNNP (e.g. required equipment and materials, site plan, organization of labour and personnel teams, timing and details of project phases, assumptions and allowances, etc.). The document is marked as proprietary and states that it “contains information that is confidential / proprietary between OPG and the GEH-ATRL-Aecon Alliance.”</p> <p>This strategic infrastructure, planning and execution information is highly commercially sensitive and, if publicly disclosed, will cause competitive prejudice to OPG and its IPA counterparties. The document provides a roadmap of how to build an SMR, identifying everything that has been included, excluded, and assumed to plan and execute the DNNP from day 1 to deployment, including non-public proprietary methods and project architecture. DNNP is a first-of-a-kind project. OPG is the global leader in developing this technology, but other companies have announced plans to do the same. If the marked information were disclosed publicly, competitors would gain competitive intelligence and trade secrets about the operational methodologies used to plan and execute the DNNP, which could assist in the development of competing projects (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part a(i) and (b)). This would provide an unfair advantage that OPG and its partners did not have as first movers in the market.</p> <p>OPG has carefully reviewed the Basis of Estimate and left unredacted all general information and non-confidential information that is already in the public domain. The marked sections will be available to intervenors for use in the application, but it is of such a technical nature that it would serve limited utility to the public’s understanding of the issues.</p> <p>OPG has also produced the comprehensive basis of estimate document (Staff 117, Attachment 2) with very few redactions, which detailed information about the RQE. Thus, the confidential information in Staff 117, Attachment 1, is not necessary for the public to understand the basis of estimate and the rationale for its public disclosure would not outweigh the competitive harms to OPG and its counterparties.</p> <p><b>Impact on Future Negotiations:</b> The level of detail contained in the proposed redactions would seriously harm future procurements and negotiations, both for Units 2 to 4 and for ongoing commercial negotiations related to equipment, material and construction sub-</p>
--	--	--	--	--

**Appendix A**

				<p>contractors for Unit 1. If vendors, consultants, and counterparties had access to the information in the proposed redactions, which includes some costing information, OPG would receive increased bid prices and have weakened negotiation leverage with its contracting partners. Similarly, OPG’s counterparties to the IPA would have weakened negotiating leverage on other projects (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(iii)).</p> <p><b>Third-Party Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information includes trade secrets and technical and commercial information belonging to OPG and its counterparties, including: proprietary designs, methodologies, labour data, procurement pricing, and product configurations. OPG and its counterparties have treated this information consistently as confidential. Public disclosure of this information could prejudice the competitive positions of these parties, interfere with their future commercial negotiations, and produce significant financial loss to them (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Parts (a)(i), (iii), (iv) and (b)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> In this proceeding, the OEB agreed that the Integrated Project Agreement (IPA) should be treated as confidential because it provides a “roadmap” of the delivery model, which is commercially sensitive and harms OPG’s position in future negotiations (EB-2025-0297, Decision and Order on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, April 13, 2026, at p. 10). The same reasoning applies to the marked information in this Basis of Estimate document, which cumulatively create a technical “roadmap” for building an SMR (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-E1-SEC-128, Attachment 2	Pages 1-56	Yes	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Competitively Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information consists of 2028-2031 forecast outage data for various power generation stations owned and operated by OPG. It includes the start date and outage length duration.</p> <p>The redacted information represents “competitively sensitive information” (“<b>CSI</b>”) within the meaning of Part 7 of OPG’s Electricity Generation License EG-2023-0231, valid until October 2, 2043. According to the license, OPG is required to implement a ring-fencing plan to ensure among other things that no CSI is</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>disclosed to affiliates as part of such ringfencing of affiliate market functions.</p> <p>Keeping CSI confidential is an OPG license requirement that is akin to a record-keeping and filing requirement where the Ontario Energy Board prohibits OPG from disclosing CSI publicly. As such, CSI should be protected as confidential on that basis (Practice Direction, Appendix B, Part 11 and 12).</p> <p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> Insofar as OPG is authorized under Part V of the <i>Ontario Energy Board Act</i>, 1998, S.O. 1998, to generate electricity, buy and sell electricity, or provide ancillary services, subject to the terms and conditions set out in the OPG's license, keeping CSI confidential is a requirement established in applicable legislation and it should also be protected on this ground (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (f)).</p>
L-F3-Pinto-001, Attachment 2	All pages	No	Confidential Information	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Information:</b> This document consists of work orders in relation to fire safety. Typically, the redacted information would not be produced or would be permanently redacted on the basis that it is not relevant. In the interest of addressing the motion requests of Mr. Pinto; however, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. This is without prejudice to OPG's position that this information is not relevant in its entirety.</p> <p><b>Physical Security Information:</b> The redacted information is highly sensitive as it concerns fire safety and physical security of OPG premises. The redacted information identifies the location and description of critical fire safety elements and systems. Public disclosure of this information could create a fire safety and security risk by enabling malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities in building design or condition in order to subvert fire safety or security measures, endanger human life or health, disrupt, or commit a theft or sabotage on OPG assets. As a result, disclosure of any part of this document could prejudice fire safety or physical security (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (c)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> OEB has previously determined that information related to the security of OPG's facilities, such as references to sensitive locations and other security matters, should be subject to confidential treatment (EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality, dated June 8, 2021, at pp. 19, 22; EB-2016-0152,</p>

**Appendix A**

				Decision and Order on Confidentiality, dated January 31, 2017, at pp. 20-21; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).
L-F3-Pinto-001, Attachment 3	All pages	No	Confidential Information	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Information:</b> This document consists of multiple fire extinguisher and fire alarm system tests and inspection reports. Typically, the redacted information would not be produced or would be permanently redacted on the basis that it is not relevant. In the interest of addressing the motion requests of Mr. Pinto, however, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. This is without prejudice to OPG's position that this information is not relevant in its entirety and certain portions of the document should be permanently redacted in any case (see "Non-Relevant Information" below).</p> <p><b>Physical Security Information:</b> The redacted information is highly sensitive as it concerns the physical security of OPG assets. The redacted information identifies the location, access to and description of critical elements and systems. Public disclosure of this information could create a security risk by enabling malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities in building design or condition in order to subvert security measures, disrupt, and commit a theft or sabotage on OPG assets. As a result, disclosure of any part of this document could prejudice physical security (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (c)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> OEB has previously determined that information related to the security of OPG's facilities, such as references to sensitive locations and other security matters, should be subject to confidential treatment (EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality, dated June 8, 2021, at pp. 19, 22; EB-2016-0152, Decision and Order on Confidentiality, dated January 31, 2017, at pp. 20-21; Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-F3-Pinto-001, Attachment 3	Page 2101	N/A	Permanent Redaction for Non-Relevance	<p><b>Non-Relevant Information:</b> The redacted information consists of information that is related to a fire extinguisher inspection and reveals the location of assets essential to emergency operations, which is highly security sensitive. Given the nature of the information redacted, this information is not relevant to the determination of payment amounts in this proceeding.</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>This information is marked for permanent redaction as it would otherwise enable malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities in building design or condition in order to subvert security measures, disrupt, and commit a theft or sabotage on OPG assets without assisting intervenors or the OEB in any of the issues to be decided as part of this proceeding (Practice Direction, Part 11).</p>
L-F3-Pinto-001, Attachment 6	All pages	No	Confidential Information	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Information:</b> This document represents a building condition assessment for one of OPG’s contracted premises (a warehouse). Typically, the redacted information would not be produced or would be permanently redacted on the basis that it is not relevant. In the interest of addressing the motion requests of Mr. Pinto, however, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. This is without prejudice to OPG’s position that this information is not relevant in its entirety.</p> <p><b>Physical Security:</b> The entire document contains references, descriptions, and images of building details in a building condition assessment, such as ingress and egress details, security measures, electric supply and distribution system.</p> <p>The redacted information is highly sensitive as it concerns the physical security of OPG assets. The redacted information identifies the location and description of critical security elements and systems. Public disclosure of this information could create a security risk by enabling malicious actors to exploit vulnerabilities in building design or condition in order to subvert security measures, disrupt, and commit a theft or sabotage on OPG assets. As a result, disclosure of this document could prejudice physical security (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (c)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment for Physical Security:</b> The OEB has previously determined that information related to the security of OPG’s facilities, such as references to sensitive locations and other security matters, should be subject to confidential treatment (EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality, dated June 8, 2021, at pp. 19, 22; EB-2016-0152, Decision and Order on Confidentiality, dated January 31, 2017, at pp. 20-21) (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p> <p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information also consists of</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>cost estimates for building capital investments for an OPG contracted premises. Insofar as OPG plans to vacate the premises in 2027, OPG notes that there are no amounts sought for recovery in the proposed 2027-2031 revenue requirements for this building, after it is planned to be vacated in 2027. The redacted information is, therefore, not relevant to this proceeding.</p> <p>The redacted information is also commercially sensitive. First, OPG will have to negotiate certain improvements at the close-out of the lease, and if the owner knows what the assessment shows in terms of estimates and work required they could try to negotiate terms that require OPG to assume greater liability for these costs. Therefore, redacting this document will protect OPG from prejudicing future negotiations with the building owner as part of negotiated tenant capital improvements which would have to be settled prior to vacating the building. Secondly, public disclosure of the cost estimates and related information associated with improvements needed in the building could impact the owner's ability to lease the property or the negotiated lease terms/cost with future tenants.</p> <p>As a result, disclosure of any part of this information could significantly interfere with negotiations between (a) OPG and the owner and (b) the owner and third parties (future tenants) (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(iii)).</p>
L-F4-CCC-091	Pages 3-4	Yes	Confidential Labour-Sensitive Treatment	<p><b>Labour-Sensitive Cost Estimate Information:</b> The redacted information includes certain cost estimates for compensation. This information is labour-relations sensitive, and is presumptively confidential because it could impact current or future collective bargaining negotiations and OPG's collective bargaining strategies (Practice Direction, Appendix B, Part 8).</p> <p>Specifically, the disclosure of this information could prejudice ongoing or future collective bargaining positions by revealing internal assumptions, benchmarks, or negotiating parameters. Disclosure would also undermine OPG's strategic flexibility in managing compensation structures, including wage escalation factors, benefits valuation, or contingency provision.</p> <p>If this information is disclosed, it would create an asymmetry in negotiations where unions or other parties, including third party arbitrators could gain access to granular wage/compensation</p>
L-F4-SEC-198	Pages 4, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, 22, 24, 27, 30-33, 35-36			

**Appendix A**

				<p>costing methodologies not otherwise publicly available, resulting in undue financial harm by inflating expectations or constraining the organization’s ability to achieve cost-effective outcomes.</p> <p>Certain information has also been redacted if its disclosure on the public record, together with other information already available on the public record, would allow for the calculation of the redacted information mentioned above.</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> The OEB has previously determined that cost estimates and underpinning assumptions that are labour-sensitive, or information that relates to collective bargaining strategies, should be subject to confidential treatment (EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality – Pre-Filed Evidence, dated April 13, 2021, at pp. 4-6; EB-2016-0152, Decision on Confidentiality, dated May 4, 2017 at p. 2); EB-2016-0152, Decision and Order on Confidentiality, dated January 31, 2017, at pp. 14-16 (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>
L-G1-Staff-238	Pages 2-3	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information:</b> The redacted information relates to annual Clean Energy Credits (“CEC”) revenues and production quantities. The redacted information is commercially sensitive.</p> <p>CEC sales are conducted in competitive markets. The disclosure of these CEC revenues and production amounts would reveal OPG’s negotiating leverage, price expectations, and negotiating parameters in this developing market to competitors who wish to secure a place in the CEC market. Disclosure of this information in a developing market could put OPG at a competitive disadvantage when negotiating these CECs, thereby prejudicing OPG’s ability to maximize value and obtain fair market outcomes in future transactions (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (a)(i) and (iii)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment by the Privacy Commissioner:</b> In Order PO-4698, OPG sought to redact CEC sale and revenue information. The Ontario Information and Privacy Commissioner (“IPC”) accepted that the CEC market is small, not fully matured, and very competitive. Disclosure of CEC revenue information would (i) diminish its value for OPG and would benefit OPG’s</p>

**Appendix A**

				<p>competitors, (ii) could reasonably be expected to disadvantage OPG’s future negotiations with other parties, and (iii) impede OPG’s ability to carry out its mandate of ensuring the supply of low-cost electricity in Ontario.</p> <p>Given this IPC Order, the OEB should maintain confidentiality of these CEC revenues and production quantities (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (d)). Otherwise, public disclosure of these CEC revenues and production quantities would render the IPC’s order moot.</p>
L-F3-Pinto-003, Attachment 3	All	No	Confidential Treatment	<p><b>Confidential Treatment of Non-Relevant Unregulated Business Information:</b> This document relates to OPG’s legal governance of its wholly owned subsidiaries. OPG’s subsidiaries are outside of the scope of this application. Information about their governance is not relevant to determining the payment amounts in this proceeding (Practice Direction, Part 11). This information is not relevant and would typically be redacted or not produced on the basis that it is not relevant. In the interest of addressing the motion requests of Mr. Pinto, OPG agreed to provide this information on the basis that it would be treated as confidential. However, this is without prejudice to OPG’s position that this information is not relevant.</p> <p><b>Commercially Sensitive Information and Competitive Prejudice:</b> OPG consistently treats information related to the governance of its unregulated business as confidential commercially sensitive information. The document itself is labelled as confidential and its disclosure on the public record could prejudice OPG and its subsidiaries’ competitive position. It would reveal confidential governance information that no competitor or other industry participant has access to (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part a(i) and (b)).</p> <p><b>Previous Treatment:</b> The OEB has previously determined that information related to OPG’s unregulated business and assets qualifies for permanent redaction (EB-2020-0290, Decision on Confidentiality, June 8, 2021, at pp. 2-3) (Practice Direction, Appendix A, Part (e)).</p>

## Appendix A

<sup>11</sup> **Types of Requests:** Requests for (1) Confidential Treatment; (2) Permanent Redaction for Non-Relevance; and (3) Permanent Redaction for Personal Information.