Ontario Energy Board | Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario

EB-2026-0142

Independent Electricity System Operator

Application for Approval of 2026, 2027 and 2028 Revenue Requirements, Expenditures and Usage Fees

DECISION ON ISSUES LIST AND PROCEDURAL ORDER NO. 1
June 19, 2026

The Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) filed an application with the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) on April 23, 2026, under section 25(1) of the *Electricity Act*, *1998* (Electricity Act), seeking approval for its revenue requirements, expenditure, and usage fees for 2026, 2027, and 2028 (the application).

The application will be heard by Commissioners James Sidlofsky (presiding), Damien A. Côté, and Robert Dodds.

Requests to Intervene

A Notice of Hearing (Notice) was issued on May 25, 2026. Each of the following applied for intervenor status:

- Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario (AMPCO)
- Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters (CME)
- Consumers Council of Canada (CCC)
- Electricity Distributors Association (EDA)
- Energy Probe Research Foundation (Energy Probe)
- HQ Energy Marketing Inc. (HQEM)
- the Power Workers Union (PWU)
- School Energy Coalition (SEC)
- The Society of United Professionals (SUP)
- Vulnerable Energy Consumer Coalition (VECC)

By letter dated June 15, 2026, the IESO stated that it had no objections to the requests to intervene in this proceeding.

AMPCO, CME, CCC, EDA, Energy Probe, HQEM, PWU, SEC, SUP, and VECC are approved as intervenors. The list of parties in this proceeding is attached as Schedule A to this Procedural Order.

Cost Eligibility

AMPCO, CME, CCC, Energy Probe, SEC, and VECC applied for cost eligibility. These parties are eligible to apply for an award of costs under the OEB's *Practice Direction on Cost Awards* (Practice Direction).

Cost eligible intervenors should be aware that the OEB will not generally allow the recovery of costs for the attendance of more than one representative of any party unless a compelling reason is provided when cost claims are filed.

Consistent with the Practice Direction, parties are reminded that, in determining the amount of a cost award, the OEB will consider (among other things) whether the cost eligible party has demonstrated through its participation and documented in its cost claim that it has made reasonable efforts to: (a) combine its intervention with that of one or more similarly interested parties and to co-operate with all other parties, and (b) ensure that its participation was not unduly repetitive and was focused on relevant and material issues.

Being eligible to apply for recovery of costs is not a guarantee of recovery of any costs claimed. Cost awards are made by way of OEB order at the end of a hearing.

The IESO's Proposed Streamlined Review

In the cover letter to its application, the IESO requested a streamlined review of its application to support an efficient and timely determination. The IESO's proposed approach comprises the following steps:

1) Approve the IESO's proposed Issues List, "to ensure that the scope of the review is limited to the alignment of the proposed expenditures and revenue requirements with the Minister-approved Business Plan and the setting of the appropriate fees".

2) Establish an interrogatory process led by OEB staff. OEB staff would submit its interrogatories first. Intervenors would then propose additional interrogatories, and OEB staff would decide which if any of them to present to the IESO.

3) Once the IESO responded to the interrogatories, there would be no further procedural steps or argument before the OEB would render its decision.

The IESO suggested that these steps would be "consistent with the Board's adoption of active adjudication to enable more efficient and cost-effective regulatory proceedings". The IESO also pointed out that when the Minister of Energy and Mines approved the

IESO's business plan, he expressed support for timely consideration of the application by the OEB, including through approaches such as a streamlined review.

In the Notice, the OEB invited prospective intervenors to comment on the draft Issues List and identify any additional measures that may assist in the simplification of the proceeding, or contribute to the just and most expeditious disposition of the proceeding.

1. Issues List

Multiple parties including AMPCO, SEC, CME, and CCC opposed the IESO's proposed wording changes to the Issues List, which shift the test from whether costs are "appropriate" to whether they are "aligned with the Minister's approved Business Plan."

The parties argued this change improperly narrowed the OEB's role under the Electricity Act, which requires an independent assessment of the reasonableness and appropriateness of expenditures, revenue requirements, and fees. Parties emphasized that alignment with the Minister's plan may be relevant, but it is not the legal standard, and warned that the proposed wording would limit the OEB's ability to conduct a substantive review. CME further noted that the legislation contemplates two distinct reviews, one by the Minister and one by the OEB, and that the OEB must apply its own statutory mandate rather than simply confirm consistency with the business plan.

VECC raised both procedural and substantive concerns. Procedurally, it argued that requiring parties to comment on the draft Issues List at the intervention stage is unusual and unfair, as it forces a significant review of the application before parties know whether they are eligible for cost awards. VECC also objected to what it viewed as the IESO's attempt to bypass the normal issues-list development process by effectively asking the OEB to accept its proposed list without broader input. Substantively, VECC criticized the list as overly detailed and narrowly framed, particularly where it limits review to alignment with the Minister's approved business plan rather than allowing for a broader assessment of appropriateness.

HQEM's submission focused on the charge determinants used for the Usage Export Fees, expressing concern that they were materially under historical values, which could result in over-collection of revenues should 2026, 2027, and 2028 export volumes be closer to historical values. To address this, HQEM recommended adding sub-issues under Issues 2.1–2.3 to explicitly examine the reasonableness of the charge determinants for fee-setting purposes.

The IESO responded to comments on its proposed Issues List and streamlined process by letter dated June 15, 2026. The IESO submitted that its proposed wording for Issues 1.1 – 1.9 and 4.1 reflects the unique aspects of the process that are built into section 25 of the Electricity Act, and “[a]s the IESO’s proposed expenditure and revenue requirements are derived from the Minister-approved business plan, it is appropriate that the issues related to those aspects of the application be specifically framed in relation to the Minister’s approval.” In the IESO’s view, its “proposed approach to the Issues List will focus the proceeding on the essential aspects of the application that need to be adjudicated by the [OEB].”

Decision on Issues List

The OEB denies the draft Issues List submitted by IESO in its application and approves the Issues List attached in Schedule B for reasons that follow.

The Electricity Act does not require OEB alignment with the approved business plan

The OEB does not agree with the IESO’s proposed wording of Issues 1.1 – 1.9 and 4.1, which would ask whether various cost components sought for recovery through IESO fees are “aligned with the Minister's approved Business Plan”. Instead, the OEB replaces this text by the word “appropriate”. This is consistent with the approach taken during the last OEB review of the IESO’s proposed revenue requirements, expenditures and usage fees in 2022.[1]

There are two separate reviews prescribed by sections 24 and 25 of the Electricity Act. First, pursuant to section 24 of the Electricity Act, the IESO is required to obtain the Minister’s approval of its proposed business plan. The Minister, having received the business plan, may either accept it, or refer it back to the IESO for further consideration. Second, pursuant to section 25 of the Electricity Act, the IESO is required to submit “its proposed expenditure and revenue requirements”, as well as “the fees it proposes to charge”, to the OEB for review. The OEB may “approve the proposed expenditure and revenue requirements and the proposed fees or may refer them back to the IESO for further consideration with the Board’s recommendations.”

There is no language in the Electricity Act which limits the OEB to only reviewing the IESO’s application to be consistent with, or dependent upon, the approved business plan. The OEB’s responsibility, as part of the review process, is to ensure that the IESO's expenditures, revenue requirements and fees are reasonable and consistent with the purposes of the Electricity Act and the OEB's objectives under the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* (OEB Act).

[1] See EB-2022-0318.

There is no legal explanation in this case to deviate from past practice

In its submission, the IESO provides no legal explanation for its requested changes from prior practice. On the other hand, parties enumerate numerous substantive reasons for denying the IESO requested approach. While the OEB strives “to revisit past practices and determine if it is possible to drive greater efficiencies in the review of an application”,[2] it will do so only in instances where it is able to maintain adequate procedural fairness and meet the objectives of the OEB Act and (in this case) the purposes of the Electricity Act.

The HQEM additional issue is encompassed in Issues 2.1 – 2.3

The OEB agrees with HQEM that the reasonableness of the forecast export volumes used as charge determinants in the methodology the IESO relied upon to derive the Usage Fees for export customers for 2026, 2027 and 2028 can be examined. The OEB is satisfied that this is encompassed within Issues 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 in the Issues List accompanying this Procedural Order, and that no revisions to those issues are necessary.

2. The IESO’s Proposed Process

A number of parties strongly opposed the IESO’s proposed streamlined process. The crux of these submissions was that the process would be unfair and would not permit sufficient scrutiny of the application. In particular, the parties objected to the proposal of having OEB staff vet any intervenor interrogatories, and to the removal of any opportunity for intervenors to present arguments on the merits of the application. Some also suggested that a settlement conference would be helpful.

In its June 15, 2026 letter, the IESO disagreed with comments made by some parties suggesting that its proposed procedure would violate the governing legislation or the requirements of procedural fairness. The IESO submitted that section 25 of the Electricity Act does not require the OEB to use any specific procedure in conducting its review, and that subsection 25(7) explicitly permits the OEB to exercise its powers without holding a hearing.

The IESO requested three weeks to file its responses to interrogatories in the event that the OEB declines to implement the IESO’s proposed OEB staff-led interrogatory process.

[2] IESO Letter, June 15, 2026

Decision on Process

For the reasons that follow, the OEB will not adopt the IESO's proposed streamlined process. The OEB will, however, shorten certain elements of the proceeding and take other steps in the interest of disposing of this matter as efficiently as possible.

There are three elements to the IESO's proposed streamlined process.

The first – having the OEB limit its consideration of the proposed expenditures and revenue requirements to their alignment with the Minister-approved business plan – has been addressed and rejected above.

The second and third elements – having OEB staff prepare a set of interrogatories and determine which of the intervenor-proposed interrogatories to include in the final set; and eliminating argument so that the OEB would immediately move to deliberating on the application after receiving the IESO's interrogatory responses – are addressed below.

The IESO's perceived interrogatory process efficiencies are unfounded

With respect to the IESO's proposed approach to interrogatories, the OEB finds that placing OEB staff in the position of determining which intervenor interrogatories will be allowed, and which will not, is neither appropriate nor more efficient.

From an efficiency perspective, having OEB staff prepare an initial set of interrogatories, circulate it, receive proposed additions, make determinations on a final list, and deal (or have the Panel deal) with potential disputes would be time-consuming and may, in fact, result in a longer process. The OEB considers it more efficient in this case to have OEB staff and the parties file their own interrogatories. As the IESO is an experienced applicant, the OEB is confident that the IESO will be able to deal with duplicate interrogatories, to the extent any are filed.

Additionally, while the OEB seeks to continuously improve its processes and generate greater regulatory efficiencies, an applicant seeking an expedient process is also expected to clearly outline how it intends to positively contribute to this desired expediency. An adjudicative process involves multiple parties and realizing efficiency gains often depends on the contributions of all those involved in the process. In the current case, the OEB observes that the IESO did not offer any procedural efficiency contributions in its application (for example, by proposing a shorter timeline for its interrogatory responses) beyond eliminating what the OEB considers important elements of the proceeding (as discussed below).

Consistent with the provisions of the Practice Direction, the OEB encourages intervenors to avoid repetition and duplication in interrogatories, where possible. The OEB reminds intervenors that among its considerations in determining the amount of a cost award to a party are whether the party demonstrated through its participation and in its cost claim that it “made reasonable efforts to combine its intervention with that of one or more similarly interested parties, and to co-operate with all other parties”. The Practice Direction also ensures that an intervenor “made reasonable efforts to ensure that its participation in the process, including its evidence, interrogatories and cross-examination, was not unduly repetitive and was focused on relevant and material issues”.[3]

The IESO’s proposal would deny procedural fairness (the right to be heard)

The OEB has several concerns with respect to the IESO’s proposal to move directly to the Panel’s deliberation and decision phase on the application following the IESO’s filing of interrogatory responses.

First, while the Minister’s approval of the business plan is a relevant and important fact, it is separate from the review the OEB is required to undertake pursuant to section 25 of the Electricity Act. Both the purposes of the Electricity Act and the OEB’s objectives under the OEB Act include the protection of the interests of consumers with respect to prices and the adequacy, reliability and quality of electricity service. The OEB will be assisted in its deliberations by the submissions of intervenor representatives who are well-positioned to comment on those matters.

Second, the OEB agrees with SEC, CCC, SME and other intervenors that the ability to file submissions is foundational to the hearing process, and that the IESO’s streamlined review proposal does not constitute a hearing. While the IESO states that it “recognizes that it is also important that [its proposed] streamlined review maintains transparency, fairness and provides an opportunity for interested parties to undertake a substantive review of the IESO’s evidence”,[4] its proposal is not, in fact, conducive to such ends.

Third, the OEB has consistently conducted hearings for the IESO and its predecessors, and the OEB has benefited from intervenor participation in those proceedings, an attribute which has meaningfully reinforced the legitimacy of the resulting decision, to the benefit of the IESO and all Ontarians.

Fourth, having determined that it is going to conduct a hearing in this case, the OEB intends to ensure that it is procedurally fair (and that it allows for the possibility of a

[3] *Practice Direction on Cost Awards*, paras.5.01(c) and (d)
[4] Cover letter to the IESO application, p.1

settled outcome, as discussed below). The OEB agrees with AMPCO that an adjudicative process ought to be commensurate with the increases sought by an applicant. The IESO's proposed approach would allow intervenors to ask questions, but would not allow them to be heard. The OEB considers the denial of a right to make submissions on this application – an application that contemplates an increase of almost $100 million from its settled and OEB-approved 2025 revenue requirement of $229.7 million[5] to a proposed 2026 revenue requirement of $328.8 million – to constitute a significant denial of procedural fairness.

The IESO's proposal would remove the possibility of achieving a settled outcome

The OEB notes that the IESO proposal would not only eliminate final submissions, but it would also eliminate a settlement conference, which had been an element of its previous multi-year revenue requirement and fees proceeding.[6] That settlement conference resulted in a complete settlement of the issues. In its *Practice Direction on Settlement Conferences*, the OEB states:

> The Ontario Energy Board is committed to the settlement conference process as part of its objective of achieving greater regulatory efficiency and effectiveness. A successful settlement conference process will result in OEB decisions that are in the public interest and are accepted by the parties while at the same time achieving savings in time and money to all participants.[7]

The OEB believes that providing for a settlement conference in the current proceeding will create an opportunity for the parties to possibly resolve the application in a cooperative manner, either completely or partially, so that the issues to be addressed in argument are reduced or eliminated.

The above notwithstanding, the OEB will seek to maximize opportunities for expediency and efficiency

In addition to providing for the settlement conference, the OEB is already taking a number of other steps to streamline this proceeding and achieve a timely disposition of the application, consistent with its obligations[8] under the OEB Act:

- The OEB has opted to not provide for a technical conference in this proceeding, so discovery will be limited to one round of interrogatories and responses.

[5] EB-2022-0318
[6] EB-2022-0318
[7] *Practice Direction on Settlement Conferences*, p.1
[8] See section 4.3(11) of the OEB Act for instance.

- A settlement conference is being scheduled in relatively short order despite the OEB's and the parties' busy summer regulatory schedules.
- The OEB invited interested parties to comment on the IESO's draft Issues List in the Notice of this proceeding and is issuing its decision on the Issues List as part of this Procedural Order No. 1.

The decision on an Issues List (in electricity rate cases and even in the previous IESO revenue requirement and fees case) typically follows the initial procedural order: in the previous IESO case, the OEB's decision on that Issues List was issued approximately two weeks after Procedural Order No. 1.

The OEB acknowledges VECC's comments about challenges for a prospective intervenor in reviewing the application and commenting on the draft Issues List before a decision is made on cost eligibility. However, the OEB expects that a prospective intervenor in any of its proceedings would review the application before requesting intervenor status and cost eligibility. Moreover, in this case, the proposed Issues List was a modified version of the OEB-approved Issues List used in the IESO's previous revenue requirement, expenses and fees case – a proceeding in which VECC participated. The OEB considers its approach to the draft Issues List in the current case to have contributed to efficiency without creating an undue burden on prospective participants.

As a matter of general fairness, the OEB expects the party seeking an expedient process to share in the incremental burden caused by their request, relative to a normal case. The OEB therefore expects the IESO to adhere to the timelines set out below – timelines which were elongated in response to the IESO's request for a three-week period for interrogatory responses.

Confidentiality Request

In the cover letter to the application, the IESO requested confidential treatment for certain information. The OEB intends to deal with this matter through a separate procedural order.

The OEB is making provision for the following related to this proceeding. Further procedural orders may be issued by the OEB.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ORDERS THAT:

1. The Issues List attached as Schedule B is approved.

2. OEB staff and intervenors shall request any relevant information and documentation from the IESO that is in addition to the evidence already filed, by written interrogatories filed with the OEB and served on all parties by **July 9, 2026**.

3. The IESO shall file with the OEB complete written responses to all interrogatories and serve them on all intervenors by **July 29, 2026**.

4. A settlement conference among the parties and OEB staff will be convened on **August 5-6, 2026**, starting at 9:30 a.m. If necessary, the settlement conference will continue on **August 7, 2026**. This will be a virtual event and information on how to participate will be provided in advance of the conference.

5. **Within 48 hours** of the conclusion of the settlement conference, the IESO shall file a letter informing the OEB of the status of the settlement discussions including whether a tentative agreement had been reached or if the parties propose to continue the settlement discussions.

6. If there is no settlement proposal arising from the settlement conference, the IESO shall file a statement to that effect with the OEB by **August 13, 2026**. In that event, parties shall file and serve on the other parties by **August 20, 2026** any submissions on which issues shall be heard in writing, and for which issues the OEB should hold an oral hearing.

7. If there is a settlement, any settlement proposal arising from the settlement conference shall be filed with the OEB on or before **August 28, 2026**. In addition to outlining the terms of any settlement, the settlement proposal should contain a list of any unsettled issues, indicating with reasons whether the parties believe those issues should be dealt with by way of oral or written hearing.

8. Any submission from OEB staff on a settlement proposal shall be filed with the OEB and served on all parties by **September 4, 2026**.

Direction for preparing materials

- Parties are responsible for ensuring that any documents they file with the OEB, such as applicant and intervenor evidence, interrogatories and responses to interrogatories or any other type of document, **do not include personal information** (as that phrase is defined in the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*), unless filed in accordance with Rule 9A of the OEB's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

- Filings should clearly state the filing date and the sender's name, postal address, telephone number and e-mail address.
- Other than for applications or as otherwise required or directed by the OEB, parties are not required to submit a cover letter for materials that are self-evident (e.g., interrogatories, submissions) unless the cover letter includes a request or additional information not included in the materials themselves.
- Parties are strongly encouraged to use bookmarks in their filings to aid in navigation.
- Parties should not append to their evidence entire OEB documents (e.g., decisions, policy documents, guidelines). Rather, parties should provide citations to the documents and a clear and concise summary of the relevant part(s) of the document. Parties are encouraged to use hyperlinks for complete, permanent, and publicly available versions of the documents, when possible.
- Parties should refrain from quoting material from documents unless it is essential to support their interrogatories or arguments.
- Parties are not required to provide a summary of the procedural history of a proceeding but may refer to that history where and to the extent needed for context to orient an issue or discussion.
- Parties must: (a) disclose where generative artificial intelligence was used to generate content included in a filing and (b) confirm that the accuracy of the portion of the filing generated by generative artificial intelligence has been verified by the party or its representative without the assistance of generative artificial intelligence.

How to file documents with the OEB

- Parties are required to quote file number (i.e., **EB-2026-0142)** for all materials filed and submit them in **searchable/unrestricted PDF format** (i.e., no printing or copying restrictions) with a digital signature through the OEB's online filing portal.
- Parties should use the document naming conventions and document submission standards outlined in the *Regulatory Electronic Submission System (RESS) Document Guidelines* found at the File documents online page on the OEB's website.
- Parties are encouraged to use RESS. Those who have not yet set up an account, or require assistance using the online filing portal can contact registrar@oeb.ca for assistance.
- Cost claims are filed through the OEB's online filing portal. Parties are encouraged to visit the File documents online page of the OEB's website for more information. Parties that are eligible for a cost award and that do not currently have an account in the cost claim portal should create an account as

soon as their cost award eligibility has been confirmed by the OEB. All parties shall download a copy of their submitted cost claim for the purposes of service on the party(ies) paying cost awards as per the Practice Direction on Cost Awards.

- All communications should be directed to the attention of the Registrar and be received by **4:45 p.m.** on the required date.
- With respect to distribution lists for all electronic correspondence and materials related to this proceeding, parties must include the Case Manager, Katherine Wang, at Katherine.Wang@oeb.ca and OEB Counsel, Ian Richler, at Ian.Richler@oeb.ca.

Email: registrar@oeb.ca
Tel: 1-877-632-2727 (Toll free)

DATED at Toronto, **June 19, 2026**

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Ritchie Murray

Digitally signed by Ritchie Murray
Date: 2026.06.19 15:49:10 -04'00'

Ritchie Murray
Registrar

SCHEDULE A

APPLICANT AND LIST OF INTERVENORS

PROCEDURAL ORDER NO. 1

INDEPENDENT ELECTRICITY SYSTEM OPERATOR

EB-2026-0142

DATED: JUNE 19, 2026

Independent Electricity System Operator
EB-2026-0142

APPLICANT & LIST OF INTERVENORS

June 19, 2026

APPLICANT	Rep. and Contact Information for Service
Independent Electricity System Operator	**Gissella Lopez** Senior Advisor, Regulatory Affairs Independent Electricity System Operator Tel: 416-836-2494 gissella.lopez@ieso.ca

APPLICANT COUNSEL

	Patrick Duffy Stikeman Elliott LLP Tel: 416-869-5257 pduffy@stikeman.com

INTERVENORS	Rep. and Contact Information for Service
Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario	**Shelley Grice** Consultant Tel: 647-880-9942 shelley.grice@rogers.com
Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters	**Scott Pollock** Borden Ladner Gervais LLP Tel: 613-787-3541 spollock@blg.com

APPLICANT & LIST OF INTERVENORS

June 19, 2026

Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters	**Lydia Salgo** Borden Ladner Gervais LLP Tel: 416-367-6000 lsalgo@blg.com
	Wynne Bischoff Practice Assistant Borden Ladner Gervais LLP Tel: 613-237-5160 Ext: 30258 WBischoff@blg.com
	Pratik Bhalerao Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters Tel: 437-961-9272 Pratik.Bhalerao@cme-mec.ca
Consumers Council of Canada	**Lawrie Gluck** Consultant North End Consulting Inc. Tel: 647-222-7743 lawrie.gluck@northendconsulting.ca
	Julie Girvan Consultant Consumers Council of Canada Tel: 416-322-7936 jgirvan@uniserve.com

APPLICANT & LIST OF INTERVENORS

June 19, 2026

Electricity Distributors Association	**Brittany Ashby** Senior Regulatory Affairs Advisor Electricity Distributors Association Tel: 416-886-4420 Ext: bashby@eda-on.ca
	Ted Wigdor Vice President Electricity Distributors Association Tel: 905-265-5362 twigdor@eda-on.ca
	Rudra Mukherji Senior Regulatory Affairs Advisor Electricity Distributors Association Tel: 905-265-5330 rmukherji@eda-on.ca
Energy Probe Research Foundation	**Michael Ladanyi** TL Energy Regulatory Consultants Inc. Tel: 416-274-3743 mjladanyi@pm.me
	Tom Ladanyi TL Energy Regulatory Consultants Inc. Tel: 416-423-3685 tom.ladanyi@rogers.com

HQ Energy Marketing Inc.	**Marc-Antoine Fleury** Regulatory Manager HQ Energy Marketing Inc. Tel: 438-874-7011 fleury.marc-antoine4@hydroquebec.com
	Marie-Ève Cayer Senior Legal Counsel HQ Energy Marketing Inc. Tel: 514-702-5409 cayer.marieeve@hydroquebec.com
Power Workers' Union	**Bayu Kidane** Senior Consultant Econalysis Consulting Services Tel: 416-837-0524 bkidane@econalysis.ca
	Sladjana Krljanac Power Workers' Union Tel: 416-322-2441 skrljanac@elenchus.ca
School Energy Coalition	**Mark Rubenstein** Counsel Shepherd Rubenstein Professional Corporation Tel: 647-483-0113 mark@shepherdrubenstein.com

School Energy Coalition	**Jay Shepherd** Counsel Shepherd Rubenstein Professional Corporation Tel: 416-804-2767 jay@shepherdrubenstein.com
	Brian McKay Ontario Education Services Corporation Tel: 416-340-2540 SEC@oesc-cseo.org
Society of United Professionals, Local 160	**Rebecca Caron** Society of United Professionals, Local 160 Tel: 416-979-2709 regulatory@thesociety.ca
	Colin Fraser Consultant Society of United Professionals, Local 160 Tel: 289-681-8708 tresckow44@gmail.com
	Martin Hastings Vice President, IESO Local Society of United Professionals, Local 160 Tel: 416-979-2709 hastingsm@thesociety.ca

APPLICANT & LIST OF INTERVENORS

June 19, 2026

Society of United Professionals, Local 160	**Bohdan Dumka** Consultant Society of United Professionals, Local 160 Tel: 647-947 3015 bohdan.dumka@gmail.com
Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition	**Mark Garner** Consultant - Project Manager Consultant Tel: 647-408-4501 markgarner@rogers.com

SCHEDULE B

DRAFT ISSUES LIST

PROCEDURAL ORDER NO. 1

INDEPENDENT ELECTRICITY SYSTEM OPERATOR

EB-2026-0142

DATED: JUNE 19, 2026

Final Issues List

1.0 Revenue Requirement, Operating Costs and Capital Spending

1.1 Is the IESO's Fiscal Year 2026 revenue requirement of $328.8 million appropriate?

1.2 Is the IESO's Fiscal Year 2027 revenue requirement of $357.2 million appropriate?

1.3 Is the IESO's Fiscal Year 2028 revenue requirement of $364.4 million appropriate?

1.4 Is the IESO's 2026 projected staffing levels and compensation (including salaries, benefits, pensions and other post-employment benefits) appropriate?

1.5 Is the IESO's 2027 projected staffing levels and compensation (including salaries, benefits, pensions and other post-employment benefits) appropriate?

1.6 Is the IESO's 2028 projected staffing levels and compensation (including salaries, benefits, pensions and other post-employment benefits) appropriate?

1.7 Is the IESO's 2026 capital expenditure budget of $60.5 million appropriate?

1.8 Is the IESO's 2027 capital expenditure budget of $58.4 million appropriate?

1.9 Is the IESO's 2028 capital expenditure budget of $51.1 million appropriate?

2.0 Usage Fees

2.1 Is the methodology used to derive the IESO's proposed 2026 Usage Fees to be paid commencing January 1st, 2026 appropriate?

2.2 Is the methodology used to derive the IESO's proposed 2027 Usage Fees to be paid commencing January 1st, 2027 appropriate?

2.3 Is the methodology used to derive the IESO's proposed 2028 Usage Fees to be paid commencing January 1st, 2028 appropriate?

2.4 Is the IESO's proposal to charge or rebate the difference between the approved 2026 IESO Usage Fees and the interim fees following OEB approval in accordance with the Settlement Schedule and Payment Calendar posted by the IESO on its website1 appropriate?

2.5 Is the proposed January 1st, 2027 effective date for the IESO's 2027 Usage Fees appropriate?

2.6 Is the proposed January 1st, 2028 effective date for the IESO's 2028 Usage Fees appropriate?

3.0 Other Fees

3.1 Is the IESO's proposal to charge organizations an Application Fee of $2,000 to process a market registration application to participate in the IESO-administered markets appropriate?

3.2 Is the IESO's proposal to charge proponents a Registration Fee of up to $2,000 to participate in an Electricity Service Procurement and Program appropriate?

3.3 Is the IESO's proposal to charge proponents a Submission Fee for Electricity Service Procurement and Programs of up to $25,000 to evaluate and process a submission in response to a Request for Qualification (RFQ), Request for Proposals (RFP), or other solicitation in an Electricity Service Procurement and Program appropriate?

3.4 Is the IESO's proposal to charge proponents a System Impact Assessment Fee at an hourly rate of $190/hr to assess the impact of a new or modified connection to the IESO controlled grid appropriate?

3.5 Is the IESO's proposal to charge proponents an Expedited System Impact Assessment Fees at an hourly rate of $190/ hr to assess the impact of a new or modified connection to the IESO controlled grid appropriate?

3.6 Is the IESO's proposal to charge proponents a Technical Feasibility Study Fee at an hourly rate of $190/hour for activities of $190/ hr to assess the impact of a new or modified connection to the IESO controlled grid appropriate?

3.7 Is the IESO's proposal to charge proponents a Reliable Integration Fee at an hourly rate of $190/hour for activities the IESO undertakes to reliably integrate new or modified facilities to the IESO-Controlled Grid appropriate?

3.8 Is the IESO's proposal to charge proponents a Transmission Registration Fee of $2,000 per registration, payable every 24 months from the original registration date to review, process and maintain applications to the Transmission Procurement Registry appropriate?

3.9 Is the IESO's proposal to charge a Transmission Procurement Submission Fee of $100,000 for transmission projects with an estimated capital cost of less than $500 million, $150,000 for transmission projects with an estimated capital cost of $500 million to less than $1 billion and $200,000 for transmission projects with an estimated capital cost of $1 billion or greater to evaluate submissions appropriate?

3.10 Is the IESO's proposal to charge participants Training Fees of $180 per person from January 1, 2027 to December 31, 2027, and $225 per person as of January 1, 2028 for half day public courses, $420 per person from January 1, 2027 to December 31, 2027, and $525 per person as of January

1, 2028 for full day public courses, and $900 per course from January 1, 2027 to December 31, 2027, and $1,125 per course as of January 1, 2028 for half day private courses and $1,800 per course from January 1, 2027 to December 31, 2027, and $2,250 per course as of January 1, 2028 for full day private courses appropriate?

4.0 Operating Reserve

4.1 Is the IESO's proposal for a proposed Operating Reserve of $30 million in the Forecast Variance Deferral Account (FVDA) appropriate?

5.0 Commitments from Previous OEB Decision

5.1 Has the IESO responded appropriately to outstanding OEB directions from previous proceedings?