

**IESO Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Minutes of Meeting
March 22, 2006
10:00 am**

Advisory Committee Members in Attendance:

Mr. Bruce Boland, Chair (representing Generators)
Mr. Bruce Campbell (representing IESO)
Mr. Bruce Lourie (representing Environmental)
Mr. Chuck Stradling (representing Commercial Consumers)
Mr. Daniel Whyte (representing Generators)
Mr. Don Thorne (representing Distributors)
Mr. John LeMay (representing Wholesale Consumer Market Participants)
Mr. Matthew Picardi (representing Marketers/Brokers)
Mr. Mike Humphries (representing Embedded Industrial Consumers)
Mr. Paul McMillan (representing Marketers/Brokers)
Mr. Steve Dorey (representing Transmitters)

Advisory Committee members absent:

Mr. Brian Bentz (representing Distributors)
Ms. Julie Girvan (representing Residential Consumers)

Presenters:

Mr. Dave Butters (APPrO)
Mr. Peter Sergejewich (IESO)

Advisory Committee Meeting with OPA Board

Mr. Boland and Mr. Stradling provided feedback on their March 2 meeting with the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) Board of Directors.

The Committee's focus is to provide advice to the IESO Board; given the interface between the two organizations, the Committee can add value in market evolution discussions.

Mr. Boland indicated that he made an offer on behalf of the Committee to meet with the OPA Board once the Committee has gotten further on their vision discussion.

IESO Senior Management Update

Day-ahead Commitment Process (DACP):

Mr. Campbell reported that the implementation phase is progressing with the help of stakeholders. The newly formed market trials working group has been working at developing test scripts for market trials that are currently scheduled to begin early in May. The project is on track for the June implementation. He indicated that the website is updated regularly with the progress of the implementation including market manuals, test scripts and important milestone dates.

IESO Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

He expressed the IESO's appreciation of the time and effort that stakeholders are putting into this and the many other on-going stakeholder efforts. It leads to better solutions and the IESO can't do it without that involvement.

Mr. Campbell asked, that at some point in the future he would like input from the various constituencies on the stakeholder process. He expressed concern about the demands on stakeholders' time and would be looking for ideas on making the process more efficient.

Mr. Boland asked if the project was within budget. Mr. Campbell responded that to the best of his knowledge it was.

Mr. Whyte asked if the DACP process had changed through implementation; if it was going better than planned or not as well as planned. Mr. Campbell responded that he'd like to wait and see what the trials show but that he thought it was progressing fairly well. It is a little early to say.

Emergency Load Response Program (ELRP):

Mr. Campbell reported that the market rules are out for stakeholder review. The market rules along with any comments received from stakeholders are going to the technical panel March 28th. The rules are scheduled to go to the board for decision on April 7th. There will be a stakeholder meeting on March 30th to review the draft market manuals and procedures including the measurement and verification that is associated with the program. Efforts are being made to raise awareness of the program to facilitate maximum participation. Market manuals are scheduled to be finalized in April. System test and market trials are anticipated in May with a June start date.

Mr. Boland asked how many megawatts were expected to enrol in the program. Mr. Campbell responded that it is anticipated that participation could be as high as 500 MWs. This is an ambitious target and will take significant effort to achieve. Mr. Kozlik cautioned that enrolment does not equal participation. It's a voluntary program.

Mr. Thorne asked what barriers exist for loads participating in this type of program. Mr. Campbell responded that there is a large education component to get people comfortable with the program and how it works; trying to make sure the IESO is not a barrier with an unduly complex process. The program design is such that participants must respond to market signals to trigger payments. The program does not guarantee a cash flow; participants must watch the market and participate when called upon.

Mr. Humphries asked the percentage of those enrolled contributing through reduced consumption or backup generators? There are different dynamics based on whether it's reduced consumption or backup generators. The decision to start up a backup generator is fairly straight forward whereas the decision to reduce consumption impacts the economics of the business. Mr. Campbell indicated that the IESO would not know this until registration in the program begins in May.

Electric Reliability Organization (ERO)/North American Electric Reliability Council (NERC) Developments:

Mr. Campbell gave an update on the ERO developments in the States. As a result of new legislation in the States, an ERO organization is being formed with continent-wide responsibility for mandatory enforceable reliability standards similar to those already in place in Ontario.

It is expected that the Ontario Ministry of Energy (MOE), other provinces and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) will recognize NERC as the ERO over the next few months. The MOE's recognition will be subject to a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the OEB and NERC. The MOU will address any items required to address Ontario specific issues.

Recognition of an ERO in Ontario should be fairly seamless as the adoption of NERC standards is already recognized in the market rules. As Ontario's reliability framework already incorporates the principles of the ERO, the expectation is that the existing compliance monitoring and enforcement program in Ontario will remain in place. Both the North East Power Coordinating Council (NPCC) and NERC have accepted and endorsed Ontario's framework.

Mr. Boland asked how changes in standards through NERC will be implemented in Ontario. How will the stakeholder input be solicited? Mr. Campbell explained that NERC has a very long transparent process in putting these standards in place. Ontario entities are encouraged to participate in that process; there are balloting procedures so it's important that Ontario entities are represented in the course of that process. Once a standard is approved by the NERC and submitted for regulatory approval, there is an opportunity to go through a remand process back to NERC if needed. It is important that Ontario entities with concerns about standards don't wait and rely on a remand process.

Mr. Boland asked how many organizations have the resources to actively monitor NERC proceedings. He stated that OPG does to some extent but they are a pretty big company in the business of electricity generation. He wondered if there is a role for the IESO to play in trying to keep Ontario participants aware of what's going on rather than think that the participants are going to be out there monitoring everything NERC is doing.

Mr. Campbell responded that the IESO could communicate key standards that are being contemplated. Given the way the approval process works, if the IESO tweaks stakeholders; it's going to be important to either get back to us so that we could deal with the issue, if that's appropriate, or that it be brought forward directly in the standards process.

Mr. Dorey asked if the enforcement role that the IESO is claiming in Ontario is similar to what the ISOs' in the States are doing. Mr. Campbell explained that our structure is different. The IESO's Market Assessment and Compliance Division (MACD) will continue with its monitoring compliance and sanction activities within the province. In the states their surveillance and compliance is done by a 3rd party.

Mr. Whyte explained that subsequent to the expected appointment of NERC as the ERO; NERC will delegate its authority to regional entities. The entity in the east will be the NPCC. In the Energy Policy Act, regional entities are specifically required to have independent boards, a stakeholder process and it will be a very hard hurdle for regional entities in the States to also control the transmission system.

Mr. Heaton questioned the possibility of standards being applied in Ontario that due to regional differences may be inappropriate. Mr. Campbell responded that regional differences are always contemplated here and that's the kind of thing where if a reliability standard came into place and there was a strong view that there ought to be some sort of regional difference here then a remand would be one mechanism for working that out. Hopefully though it won't simply arise at the point of the standard coming into place but it would have been identified and to the extent possible dealt with along the way.

Mr. Cary said that it was important that since NERC standards must be followed the IESO should express the resulting obligations that come from the NERC standards in the market rules. He also asked the IESO to clarify the OEB's role and how the process will work in the future.

Mr. Campbell said that the IESO's quarterly newsletter the Electricity Exchange will include an article on some of these NERC developments and there will also be a training Quick Take on the ERO developments on the website in April. :

Mr. Dorey inquired whether the NPCC or the OEB enforces the obligations on the system operators. Mr. Campbell responded that the NPCC will continue to do compliance on ISOs.

Mr. Boland sought clarification on who would set the fines associated with not adhering to a reliability standard in Ontario. Mr. Campbell answered that Ontario would continue to set the fines as stated in the market rules.

Mr. Boland said that it's important for the IESO to inform and consult with market participants if any of these standards have an impact on a participant's capital requirements or any other significant impact.

Mr. Boland suggested that within Ontario the discussion to date has been largely among the regulators and market operators themselves rather than involving the participants. He felt that perhaps today's discussion is a bit of a ground swell that would indicate that everyone is very interested in what the implications of this might be so we need to find processes for that.

Mr. Campbell reiterated that there's no real difference in the situation in Ontario. These standards have been in the past and will continue to be enforceable reliability standards that have to be observed by Ontario. The administrative framework around them has changed quite a bit but the way we've been doing business in Ontario is not going to fundamentally change. There's just a lot more process around all this and we just have to make sure people understand their opportunities both to participate along the way and what their protections are in the course of this.

Dispatch Issues:

Mr. Campbell provided an update on the dispatch issues discussions that have taken place with stakeholders. The discussions have included opportunities for compliance aggregation and replacement offers, increasing the compliance dead band, multi-interval optimization and load forecast smoothing.

Each of these initiatives is moving ahead through discussions with the dispatchable load working group and through pilots with market participants to test the effectiveness of various options. Some of the recommendations may involve market rule and/or market manual changes and changes to IESO systems and procedures. It is expected that many of the changes will be implemented by this summer.

Import Transactions in the Calculation of the Ontario Market Clearing Price:

Mr. Campbell identified this as an item that the IESO promised to give attention to when DACP was approved. Currently, the market pricing working group has focused most of its attention on the 12x ramp rate. It had initially intended to move quickly to discussion of this item but there has been a sense that the working group wanted to get done with 12 x before moving on and that is the current plan. It is expected that discussions will begin in May, if not sooner.

In response to a question from Mr. McMillan, Mr. Campbell made it clear that the IESO has not forgotten the Advisory Committee's advise and the IESO Board's direction to move on to development of a day-ahead market as quickly as possible.

Constrained-Off Congestion Management Settlement Credit Payments (CMSC) to Importers and Exporters:

Mr. Campbell updated the Committee on the reason why this has not been resolved as yet. Although a recommendation had been developed, there was a trade issue raised around it. So this will go back to the working group for discussion on March 29th and it is targeted to go to the June Board for decision.

Mr. Boland asked how much the delay in resolution was costing the Ontario customer. Mr. Campbell responded that there aren't payments being made that would be seen as inappropriate. If it was costing money, the IESO would move on it as an urgent rule amendment.

12x Ramp Rate

Mr. Campbell provided an update on the 12x ramp rate ongoing discussions that are taking place with stakeholders through the market pricing working group. There have been various options looked at in response to this issue and a range of pretty constructive suggestions coming forward that are being evaluated. AMPCO has worked hard to bring forward some approaches to resolving this issue that would work for them; APPrO has been very active in developing some of the proposals to resolve this. The IESO has engaged the help of NERA to evaluate the recommendations and ensure that it has been duly diligent in evaluating the proposals. However, Mr. Campbell emphasized that the IESO would be strongly predisposed to accept any consensus recommendation that might be presented by the stakeholders.

The discussions are expected to wrap up in May, with the recommended resolution going to the Advisory Committee in late May and to the IESO Board in June.

Mr. Blechta and Mr. LeMay expressed the opinion that this needs to be thoroughly analyzed and not rushed. Given the current state of Ontario's manufacturing base, any increase in costs will put more industry out of business.

Changes to 18-month Outlook:

Mr. Campbell indicated that the next 18-month outlook will have a couple of changes in the way some of the analysis is being done to arrive at the outlook. For a variety of reasons, Ontario will be in a better position going into the summer of 2006 than in 2005. Some of those reasons include additional generation, the DACP, ELRP and other market changes.

One of the changes reflected in some of the numbers replaces the existing weekly weather-normalized demand forecasts with a monthly weather normalized demand forecast. This change results in peak estimates that are higher and closer to expected seasonal peaks.

During the summer of 2005, total hydroelectric production was 15% less than forecasted capability. The other change replaces hydroelectric capability values based on market participant submissions with historical values of hydroelectric production plus contribution to operating reserve. This change better reflects the coincident capability of hydroelectric stations.

The readjustment of the forecasting analysis makes absolutely no difference to what's going to be available this summer. It will be what it will be.

There was a caution from those in attendance that the messaging around the 18-month outlook not paint an overly optimistic picture that would reverse the current momentum for new generation, conservation and demand response initiatives.

The forecasts and assessment standing committee meeting scheduled in April will discuss the changes that have been made to the forecast methodology.

Urgent Rule Amendment

Mr. Campbell indicated the IESO will be pursuing an urgent market rule amendment to stop a situation that has arisen as a result of a loophole in the rules. Due to the confidential nature of the amendment it cannot be discussed. The amendment will be taken to the technical panel for a confidential discussion prior to the next Board meeting on April 7.

Mr. Campbell suggested that perhaps at the next Committee meeting, there could be a discussion on whether this is an appropriate forum to raise such items.

12x Ramp Rate – APPrO Presentation

Mr. Butters presented an APPrO position in the interests of moving the issue forward. APPrO have engaged Navigant to assist them in their analysis of the alternative. This alternative will be presented for consideration and discussion at the market pricing working group later this week.

The APPrO has said that the correct solution to the 12x ramp rate issue is to revert to the 1x ramp rate as originally intended in the market design. This is appropriate because it is consistent with the market design principle that price should be based on the system marginal cost; it signals consumers properly with the cost that they are imposing on the system and it signals producers properly with the value of their contribution to the system. It is consistent with the design of all neighbouring markets and it is consistent with the government's policy that ratepayers pay the true cost of electricity they consume.

APPrO acknowledges that unacceptable increases in prices and volatility may result from the reversion to the 1x ramp rate. APPrO believes that much of the increase would be mitigated by the amount of generation with prices that are set by contract or regulation not in the market. If reversion to the 1x ramp rate is unachievable at this point in time APPrO, picking up on AMPCO's recommendation proposes the introduction of a subsidiary payment mechanism for ramping.

In the spirit of advancing a realistic and workable solution, the mechanism would compensate every generator and dispatchable load that provided ramp and the cost would be recovered through an increase in uplift payment paid by all consumers. The payment should be set to fully compensate owners for the additional wear and tear of ramping their units. It should encourage the retention of existing capability and the installation of new capacity as required. It should show the true cost to the market of ramping units and encourage further optimization of the dispatch processes.

APPrO believes that this recommendation can be implemented cheaply; it is consistent with neighbouring markets, demand response programs and existing OPA contracts; and, it will increase the total cost of the wholesale electricity market by no more than 6% on average. If the decision is to deal with ramping as an ancillary service, then this increases the urgency of dealing with the issue of imports being able to set prices in the market schedule.

2007-2009 Business Plan

Mr. Sergejewich prefaced his presentation by saying that the main purpose for attending was to solicit advice from the Advisory Committee. This is an opportunity for the Advisory Committee and other stakeholders to provide input in the formative stages of the business planning process. In addition to the verbal comments by Committee members during the meeting, the IESO is asking for written feedback to be submitted by April 21. The stakeholder engagement plan published on the IESO website provides more detail on this.

Mr. Sergejewich reiterated the timeline for submitting the business plan to the Minister and the OEB in the fall of this year and noted that these dates are fixed through legislation. What is different this year is the early start to the business plan process.

He identified the IESO's view of the future, and its role as the sector moves toward that future.

Mr. Humphries raised a caution around the use of the word "ensuring" by the IESO in defining its role. Unless one has control of all the variables that result in reliability, competitive price and sustainability, you cannot "ensure" these.

Mr. Boland stated that the Advisory Committee is not in a position to endorse an IESO vision at this point. It is the subject of continued Stakeholder Advisory Committee discussion. In regards to the IESO's role or purpose, he suggested that it would be more appropriate to just repeat the IESO's objects as stated in the Electricity Competition Act. By way of example he noted that the word "competitive"; was contained in describing the future and the IESO's purpose; great in theory but a lot more difficult in practice particularly in Ontario. Also, in the objects of the IESO, in the most recent legislative changes, the government specifically removed the word "competition" from the objects. Mr. Boland suggested that IESO staff is ahead of where the rest of the stakeholder community is on this aspect.

Mr. Picardi suggested that we may get to the point where there is a competitive spot market administered by the IESO but the IESO may be going beyond their mandate by making their vision competitive markets.

Mr. Cary commented that although it may be good to have a global vision; this Advisory Committee does not endorse the global vision as yet.

Mr. Whyte took issue with the word "competitive". He suggested that the business plan should be grounded in reality. Given the contracts that have been engaged by OPA, competitive is not a word for Ontario's market. The vision has to be grounded in the environment and more and more we are seeing a less competitive environment.

Mr. McMillan suggested that to try and achieve a competitive electricity market might better state what the end goal is. The other question is whether it is the role of the IESO or the OPA. How does the IESO try to build a vibrant Ontario economy when there are many others that must contribute to that? This was a huge issue the traders identified at a meeting held yesterday.

Although we appreciate what the IESO is trying to do to get there, the issue is whose role is it both in the short and long term.

Mr. Campbell made the point that these statements are meant to be aspirational and may not be solely up to the IESO. The IESO's broad direction that we hope to achieve is to support a vibrant Ontario economy through our actions and continue to evolve the competitive electricity market. This is consistent with our objects and entirely consistent with every statement of policy on what we are supposed to be doing. The IESO recognizes that it cannot achieve this on its own.

Mr. Boland asked the IESO to share any firm direction it has received from the government to the IESO on this. In looking at the actions of the government and where they are trying to steer things, he sees more on the non competitive side of the equation than on the competitive side. Mr. Campbell suggested that one need look no further than the series of speeches and policy announcements made when the new legislation was brought into force. It was always in the context of a hybrid market that was intended to evolve. As we have moved our rate cases forward, we have received letters of encouragement to get on with getting a day-ahead market in place.

Mr. Lourie thought there needs to be clarification of the IESO's statements as either vision or mission statements. Typically a vision statement is aspirational and a mission statement is one that describes how an organization will function in delivering against that aspiration. These statements seem to both be vision statements. What's missing is the organizational piece of it that says this is the IESO's role in delivering on the vision.

Mr. Boland explained that what the IESO was hearing at this point was a lot of thinking out loud. He expected and encouraged that written comments will be provided by late April on this.

Mr. Sergejewich explained that the future and purpose outlined earlier were to set the context for the IESO's strategic priorities over the planning period which he then went on to describe.

Mr. Dorey asked if the IESO would continue with their vision if support from the stakeholder community does not exist. For example, long term contracts are part of today's world and many stakeholders would like them to continue. If the IESO is out of step with the industry; are they still going to produce a vision that is counter to where the industry wants to be.

Mr. Sergejewich clarified that there is nothing in the vision that precludes the existence of long term contracts. Mr. Campbell added that it's a matter of who is involved in those long term contracts; the IESO's position is that the government should cease to sponsor the contracts in favour of the buyers and the sellers within the sector entering into contracts.

Mr. Boland suggested that there is an underlying issue that goes beyond wording. He suggests that the IESO's 2nd priority may be at odds with the 4th and 5th priorities. The issue comes if those two things are not in alignment. Does the IESO see its role as having an independent view above and beyond what the stakeholders want to see the industry evolve to or is the IESO prepared to be a facilitator of the kind of market evolution that the stakeholders who operate in the market actually want to achieve. If there is a conflict, where does the IESO land?

Mr. Campbell suggested that there is no consistent view amongst stakeholders. The choices are not that clear. There are many stakeholders in the room that think the IESO should proceed with a day-ahead market. On the resource adequacy issue, the IESO pushed hard to develop a resource

adequacy mechanism and at the end of the day there was not enough stakeholder support to proceed.

Mr. Thorne asked for clarity around the roles and responsibilities of the IESO versus the OPA. Mr. Campbell stated that both the IESO and the OPA have roles in evolving the market and in their respective business plans have been very careful to delineate non-overlapping roles being conscious of the fact that people do not want two organizations doing the same thing.

Mr. McMillan asked how the IESO determines whether it is providing services of value to its customers. Mr. Sergejewich responded that this is assessed primarily through the annual participant survey and through anecdotal evidence.

Mr. Whyte enquired whether the IESO benchmarked its costs against other ISOs. Mr. Campbell replied that benchmarking has been done at a high level. A uniform set of accounts has been implemented by FERC to allow a comparison of ISOs on a consistent basis. These are just starting to be collected and it should become much easier to do a comparison on a functional basis.

Mr. Boland made a suggestion that the priorities should evolve to include an explicit statement to deliver a “reliable” settlement system as well as a reliable system operation.

Mr. Dorey suggested that the IESO should recognize that agencies do have a vested interest in the market even if they have no financial investment in various parts of the market.

Mr. Boland felt that priority # 5 might be better if it is simply stated “Are expected to act with impartiality for the best interest of participants and stakeholders” and ended there. He also suggested that there needs to be more clarity on who the IESO was to be the capable advisor to. Perhaps also adding to or replacing the word advisor with facilitator. The idea of facilitating resolutions is an important one.

Mr. Hunt commented that with respect to priority #1, in light of the happenings in the last year, he challenges the statement that reliability will be seen as a strength of the IESO. On priority #2, suggests the IESO should consider adding something on conservation and targeted demand response complementary to the OPA’s initiatives. On priority #3, the majority of payments are made for commodity not capacity. On priority #4, he noted that although the IESO has an excellent stakeholder process, the Advisory Committee may be representative of market participants but it is not representative of suppliers to those market participants.

Mr. Picardi suggested that in priority # 5 trustworthy is a little broad but the word confident is important. Having confidence in the markets tends to lead to the concept that the IESO is going to administer the markets in an independent and confident manner; confident being that there are not a lot of mistakes in the administration of the market so stakeholders can have faith in the prices. That thought should be woven in there.

The suggestion was made that the initiative for a reliability/resource adequacy mechanism needs to be reworded to provide more appropriate wording around the wealth transfer statement.

Mr. Boland raised the question of whether it was the IESO or the OPA role to develop a reliability/resource adequacy mechanism.

Mr. Dorey felt it was important to say whether the initiatives were net benefits to consumers because at the end of the day that is what is important. What is in the ultimate interest of consumers driving the market evolution decisions?

Mr. Boland suggested that one of the other challenges the IESO has is that there might not be much benefit achieved by improving the price signal or developing a day-ahead market since the price is set through mechanisms outside the market. This makes cost/benefit analysis a challenge.

Mr. Whyte suggested that the IESO needs to use the vast amount of information it has to drive the public discussions. One of the reasons there is high congestion payments is because the transmission system in Ontario needs attention. This is the type of clarity of thought that comes from the type of information that comes out of the IESO.

Mr. Cary suggested that it may be worthwhile to put forth a longer list of programs/initiatives and allow stakeholders to prioritize those that are important.

In wrapping up this item, Mr. Boland stated that each Committee representative as well as organizations such as APPrO and AMPCO, depending on their level of interest, would likely be submitting input to the IESO on the business plan by the April 21 deadline.

Mr. Whyte commented that the fact that the IESO was starting the business planning process in March and sharing it with stakeholders in March when it isn't due until the fall is intelligent and a sign of respect.

Evolution of the Vision for the Ontario Electricity Market

Mr. Boland explained that this agenda item is to discuss process for proceeding with this item. Mr Boland requested that the next meeting focus on a vision discussion suggesting that the meeting start at 9 am with a ½ hour lunch and an end time of 3 pm. Also that the IESO management report be shortened and perhaps include a written supplement one or two days in advance and then just be available for questions.

In terms of next steps, it is expected that by next meeting all Committee members will have had an opportunity to have a good dialogue with their constituents on the vision for the market. Everyone can plan on giving a feedback report from their constituencies of what they've heard, what they see the key issues are, where they really want the market to go and where they would like it to go but they don't think it can go because there's too many roadblocks, what we need to do to remove the roadblocks if we really want to get there or how we learn to live with what we've got.

Generators have two main initiatives underway: APPrO is working through their board and their membership to develop a vision statement of their own and the second initiative is a brief survey issued to generators to get input on the key questions around the vision. After sufficient input is received through these initiatives, there will be a couple of meetings to nail down some statements that could be discussed at the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Stradling indicated he will continue to work with commercial customers on this and a meeting is planned after the BOMA conference tomorrow. At this moment they are still interested in a strongly competitive market where the end result is the best price for everybody. They will be ready to comment at the next Committee meeting.

IESO Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

Mr. LeMay at this point has not received much feedback but hopes to be ready for the next meeting.

Mr. McMillan indicated that the marketer/brokers have identified the key issues and priorities and will circle back to get a little more focus on vision to be ready for discussion at the next Committee meeting.

Mr. Thorne said that he will work with the EDA to solicit input on this and should be ready for the next meeting.

Mr. Dorey has started discussions with the other transmitters and thinks they may not come to a common vision but will bring back whatever they come up with.

Mr. Lourie has initiated discussions and does not think it should be a problem to come up with something for the next meeting.

Mr. Humphries is working with Mrs. Morris to try and establish a contact list. The CME has a vision but that will be different from the rest of the constituents. Mr. Humphries was not sure if he will be in a position to report in the next month.

Closing Remarks

Mr. Boland reminded members of the opportunity to bring forward any items they feel need to be discussed at the Committee meetings. The next meeting will include an agenda item on this.

At the next meeting the intent is to continue to encourage the participation of Paul Shervill from the OPA and a representative from the Ministry in the vision discussions.

