General

Request IR-1:

Given that the 2027 ACE Plan is expected to be filed shortly after the Synapse Report (Board letter of October 29, 2026), please indicate which near-term recommendations Synapse considers practical for NS Power to address in that filing, estimate the costs to implement the recommendation, and which could be considered in the 2028 ACE Plan or later.

Request IR-2:

Reference: Page 23

Does Synapse claim that spending should be proportional to outage-cause shares? Please name any jurisdiction or standard that uses that rule, and explain how it accounts for asset condition, consequence of failure, and/or substation or transmission risk.

Request IR-3:

Reference: Pages 51–52

Please provide the evidence behind the claim that "NS Power may be spending more on capital as utilities earn profits."

(a) Does Synapse claim that capital treatment influenced NS Power's allocation decisions in the Five-Year Reliability Plan?

(b) Please identify any specific project or program where this occurred.

Request IR-4:

For findings 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, and 15, Appendix B says Synapse "examined stakeholder feedback and affirms this finding... based on the additional information provided." For each finding:

(a) identify the "additional information" relied on; and

(b) explain why each NS Power and TetraTech point summarized in Appendix B did not change the finding.

Request IR-5:

Reference: In the background section beginning on page 5 of the Synapse Report, Synapse makes reference to severe weather performance:

> In the last 25 years, Nova Scotia has experienced several powerful storms that caused widespread outages across the island.

With respect to “the island”, is Synapse referring here only to Cape Breton? Has Synapse focused its storm analysis only on Cape Breton performance?

Request IR-6:

Reference: Page 69 which states that “Synapse will work with NS Power to select like utilities based on factors such as geography, topography, environment, weather and climate, customer density, regulatory or political drivers, and utility infrastructure.”

(a) Please confirm whether this selection was carried out together with NS Power and whether it aligns with the “peer utilities” shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4 on Page 8.

Vegetation Management

Request IR-7:

Reference: Recommendation 3

(a) Please provide all analyses, calculations, source data, assumptions, and models used to support Synapse's conclusion that additional reallocation of Reliability Plan funding toward vegetation management would produce greater reliability improvements than NS Power's proposed portfolio. Please provide the estimated SAIDI, SAIFI, and customer-hours-interrupted impacts associated with each reallocation scenario evaluated.

(b) Please identify the specific amount of capital investment that Synapse recommends reallocating to vegetation management from:

(i) Transmission upgrades,
(ii) Substation upgrades,
(iii) Distribution equipment replacement, and
(iv) Grid modernization

(c) Provide the resulting estimated reliability impacts, risks, and customer impacts of such reallocation.

(d) Explain what baseline reliability performance Synapse assumes for these assets if the proposed investment is not made.

Request IR-8:

Reference: Recommendation 4

Synapse states that vegetation management programs may be under-prioritized and that funding allocations among vegetation sub-programs may not maximize reliability improvements. Please provide evidence demonstrating that:

(a) Distribution corridor widening,
(b) New ROW creation,
(c) Transmission corridor widening, and
(d) Tree trimming/removal

deliver materially different reliability outcomes per dollar invested on NS Power's system. Provide quantitative evidence supporting such conclusions.

Request IR-9:

The paragraph following Figure 10 (p. 24) of the Synapse Report states that "the unit cost of distribution corridor widening is 146 percent higher than tree trimming/removal." Page 25 states that NS Power's allocation "is only appropriate if distribution corridor widening is much more effective at reducing vegetation-related outages compared with trimming/removal activities (at least 146 percent more effective, given the unit cost premium)." Please describe how Synapse would suggest the relative effectiveness of the two activities be assessed, for example in the third-party audit recommended under Finding 3.

Request IR-10:

Did Synapse consider the potential impacts of crew availability, contractor management, safety, permitting limits, and seasonal access restrictions (e.g. Bird Nesting season, NS Roadway Spring Weight Restrictions) on possible scaling up vegetation management activities?

(a) If so, provide the analysis.

(b) If not, why not?

Request IR-11:

Please provide the basis for Synapse's comparison of NS Power vegetation management cycle lengths against Hydro One and Toronto Hydro. Please explain how differences in service territory size, customer density, forest composition, rights-of-way ownership, vegetation density, geography, storm exposure, and regulatory requirements were accounted for and normalized for.

Request IR-12:

For Hydro One and Toronto Hydro, please state the work scope behind "km addressed" (cyclical trimming versus right-of-way expansion) and the cost per km treated. Please explain why the comparison is valid given the differences between rural versus urban systems as well as the different vegetation management activities undertaken (urban cyclical trimming versus rural ROW widening).

Request IR-13:

Reference: Recommendation 3

(a) Considering Synapse's recommendation of a third-party review of NS Power's vegetation management program, please describe the scope, key questions and deliverables Synapse would consider appropriate for such a review.

(b) Please identify any specific approaches, practices or tools from other utilities that Synapse expects the audit to evaluate.

(c) Please describe Synapse's expectations for NS Power's vegetation management allocation in the 2027 ACE Plan while the audit is underway. For example, would Synapse expect the current allocation to continue until the third-party audit's recommendations are available?

Reliability Improvement Forecasting

Request IR-14:

Reference: Recommendation 13

Synapse recommends project-level and feeder-level reliability forecasting. Please identify utility examples and provide examples and supporting references for each where:

(a) Forecast feeder-level SAIDI improvements are routinely produced;
(b) Feeder-level SAIFI improvements are routinely produced;
(c) Such forecasts are used in regulatory approvals; and
(d) The forecasts have subsequently been validated against actual outcomes.

Request IR-15:

Reference: Synapse's Response to Party Feedback on Recommendation 13 found at page 89 of the Synapse Report.

Synapse acknowledges that reliability forecasting is inherently uncertain and not expected to be deterministic. Please explain how forecast feeder-level reliability improvement estimates could be objectively validated given this uncertainty and identify acceptable forecast error ranges.

Request IR-16:

Please identify the analytical deficiencies in NS Power's responses to IR-38, IR-77, IR-82, and IR-83 that led Synapse to conclude reliability improvement estimates could not be verified. Please provide a detailed list of specific missing information.

Request IR-17:

Page 7 states that "NS Power increased expenditures while maintaining SAIFI performance and observing declines in SAIDI performance." The Terms of Reference (p. 69) include "analysis of how performance improvements were determined" and "recommendations on how to evaluate progress against the goals." In Synapse's view, what information is needed to assess whether reliability expenditures have been effective? For example, would an estimate of performance in the absence of those expenditures be required?

Request IR-18:

Reference: Finding 18; NS Power's Response to IR-38

Please explain why the deterioration in reliability avoided through the approximately $898 million of "Maintain Status Quo Reliability" investment is not quantified as a reliability benefit.

Request IR-19:

Reference: Synapse Report, Page 20

Synapse states that NS Power's "[a]nnual project selection and pacing are re-assessed each year in the ACE process, applying updated risk, asset condition, and performance evaluations". Please explain how Synapse accounted for such changes in asset condition, likelihood of failure, and risk over the planning period in their assessment of investment prioritization.

Cost Effectiveness

Request IR-20:

Please provide Synapse's proposed definition of "cost-effectiveness" for reliability planning. Please explain how the proposed metric accounts for the following:

(a) consequence of failure;
(b) low-frequency/high-impact events;
(c) bulk transmission assets;
(d) substations;
(e) contingency capabilities;
(f) restoration capability; and
(g) system resilience.

Request IR-21:

Page 56 states that "undergrounding power lines substantially reduces the impact of large storms" and that covered conductor "is also better able to withstand high winds and vegetation contact." Please clarify whether Synapse is recommending that undergrounding, covered conductor, backup power, microgrids, or resilience hubs be added to the current Reliability Plan and, if so, Synapse's comparison of effectiveness to other interventions and evidence on how such programs would be accomplished in an affordable manner in Nova Scotia.

Request IR-22:

Considering the data presented in Figure 16 and Table 12, please explain how Synapse concluded that a SAIDI/$ measure is appropriate for comparing investments having substantially different reliability, operational, resilience, and consequence-of-failure characteristics.

(a) With reference to Table 12 in the Synapse Report which states that cost-effectiveness was calculated "as the SAIDI Reductions divided by the Total Investment", please explain the reasons for using total investment as the denominator in Table 12, and whether Synapse considered alternatives.

Request IR-23:

Reference: Page 23, Figure 9, Synapse finds that putting 22% of spending into vegetation-related programs "is not a reasonable allocation of funding".

(a) Please state the allocation, or range, Synapse considers reasonable, and its basis.

(b) Please explain how Synapse accounted for asset condition, end-of-life failure risk, safety, and substation and transmission assets that serve many customers.

Request IR-24:

Page 27 states that transmission-level outages "tend to be a small fraction of total outages" and that none appeared in the feeder-level data provided by NS Power. NS Power's responses to IR-3 and IR-5 (Attachment 1) report SAIDI with and without MED/EED. On that basis, Loss of Supply (which represents transmission and substation caused outages) accounted for roughly 18 to 23 percent of SAIDI in each year from 2019 to 2024.

(a) Please reconcile the statement on page 27 with this data. Please indicate whether the statement was based on data including or excluding MEDs and EEDs and provide the supporting calculation.

(b) NS Power's response to IR-42(a) (Filed May 8, 2026, under page headers IR-41) states that Transmission Corridor Widening is "focused primarily on NERC-regulated transmission lines, in alignment with NERC FAC-003-5 requirements." Please describe how this response, and the potential consequences of transmission line outage, were considered in assessing the funding for this program.

(c) NS Power's response to IR-19, Attachment 1 reports Loss of Supply CHI by feeder, and IR-28, Attachment 3 reports outages by feeder with cause and sub-cause classifications. Please describe how these data were reviewed in preparing the statement that no transmission-level outages appeared in the feeder-level data.

(d) Appendix B (p. 108) notes that Synapse "could not resolve this discrepancy." Please indicate whether further information was requested from NS Power on this point. NS Power would be pleased to provide any clarification that would assist.

Request IR-25:

Based on Synapse's finding that the percentage of vegetation investment should mirror the contribution from the outage cause, is it Synapse's position that NS Power should only invest in assets once they begin to cause outage impacts, rather than proactively addressing risks based on leading indicators or reliability risk?

(a) If so, please elaborate on the potential added costs from reactive response to outages caused by unplanned failures compared with proactive replacements.

(b) If not, please confirm if Synapse believes both leading and lagging indicators should be included in effective risk-based decision-making.

Request IR-26:

Reference: Page 21

Synapse states that a primary problem with NS Power's methodology to determine future-year budgets is that they are unlikely to be accurate. In Synapse's view, how should multi-year, project-level forecasts work alongside annual ACE Plan approvals and reprioritization in the Capital Expenditure Justification Criteria (CEJC) process?

Request IR-27:

Page 21 states that "holding allocations across investment categories constant over the plan period does not reflect prioritization of investment based on the drivers of outages over time at the feeder level." Appendix G to the 2026 ACE Plan (Section 7.0, p. 50) states that the 2026 priority feeder list "comprises 40 feeders, 31 newly identified and 9 carried over from the 2025 list," identified "based on outage events observed both in the current year and in previous years, and through engineering analysis of current feeder condition and projected load growth."

(a) Please indicate whether Section 7 of Appendix G to the 2026 ACE Plan was considered in preparing this part of the report, including the 2026 priority feeder list and the work reported on 2025 priority feeders (Appendix B to Appendix G).

(b) Please explain how the annual re-identification of priority feeders described in Appendix G relates to the statement on page 21 regarding feeder-level prioritization over time.

Request IR-28:

Finding 2 recommends that Appendix G be supplemented with "incremental costs of approved Authorization to Overspend (ATO) requests and storm rider costs, once each year is complete." Considering storm costs are recovered through a separate mechanism (M11692) which involves a distinct regulatory process and reporting, please describe the additional information or benefit Synapse expects the Board and stakeholders would gain from the duplicative effort of including storm rider costs in Reliability Plan reporting in the ACE Plan as well.

Request IR-29:

Evaluation of Proposed Investments and Investment Alternatives, sub-section "The Reliability Plan does not adequately prioritize reducing vegetation-caused outages", p. 22, the Synapse Report notes that vegetation contributed 47 percent of customer hours of interruption from 2016 to 2025, while 22 percent of Plan expenditure is vegetation related. Page 23 states that this "is not a reasonable allocation of funding." NS Power's response to IR-17 explains that transmission and substation assets are "prioritized based on condition not the number of outages they experienced." It adds that relying only on lagging indicators "becomes problematic when used as the sole basis for investment decisions particularly for transmission and substation assets."

(a) Please describe how condition-based prioritization as described in NS Power's response to IR-17, was considered in comparing the share of Plan expenditure with the share of historical customer hours of interruption attributable to vegetation.

Request IR-30:

On page 2 of the 20260918 NSPI to NSEB M12558 NSPI 5YRP - Tetra Tech Comments on Synapse 5 YRP Draft dated September 8, 2026, TetraTech said NS Power's budgeting method is conventional, has been adjusted after events, and is consistent with comparable Canadian utilities.

(a) Does Synapse dispute this?

(b) If so, please identify Canadian utility whose five-year reliability or distribution plan forecasts sub-program budgets for later years from feeder-level outage drivers. Please provide citations.

Request IR-31:

Reference: Finding 16, Page 50

With respect to Finding 16, is it Synapse's position that NS Power should shift investment focus on the most cost-effective interventions, even in cases where they do not address the driving causes of risk?

(a) If so, how does this approach positively impact reliability metrics in cases where the most cost-effective intervention does not actually address risk drivers on a given feeder?

(b) If not, does Synapse agree that cost-effectiveness considerations should only be considered to evaluate between relevant risk-mitigation options that have been screened for appropriateness?

Request IR-32:

Reference: Finding 19, Page 53

With respect to Finding 19, is it Synapse's position that NS Power should only invest in projects and areas with a clear financial cost-benefit, even in cases where performance standards (such as circuit-based measures) mandate compliance regardless of customer count, circuit length, network configuration, or cost-effectiveness of interventions?

(a) If so, is it Synapse's position that less cost-effective to maintain portions of NS Power's system should be allowed to deteriorate more than other areas, potentially at the expense of customer reliability and achievement of Board-mandated standards?

(b) If not, does Synapse agree that a cost-benefit based assessment does not adequately incorporate all necessary considerations for investment decision-making?

Request IR-33:

Reference: Finding 17, Page 50

With respect to Finding 17 and specifically customer class-based analysis, is it Synapse's position that different customer classes should be treated differently when considering the development and prioritization of reliability projects?

(a) If so, how is this consistent with the assessment of performance standards reliability metrics which do not discriminate based on customer class?

(b) If not, how does adopting such class-based analysis improve decision-making in order to achieve class-agnostic reliability metrics?

Feeder Risk Scoring

Request IR-34:

Please provide a working example applying Synapse's proposed risk-unit methodology to five actual NS Power feeders and compare the resulting ranks to NS Power's existing methodology. Please explain how investment decisions would differ as well as an estimate of the data, cost, and time needed to implement such an approach.

Request IR-35:

Please quantify the reliability benefit expected from replacing NS Power's current feeder prioritization framework with Synapse's proposed risk-unit methodology.

Request IR-36:

Reference: Finding 9, Page 36

With respect to Finding 9, does Synapse rely on a definition for critical facilities that should be considered?

(a) If so, please provide the definition source and a complete listing of facility types (and justification) that should be included.

(b) If not, what criteria should be used to create such a list and who (utility, government, others) should have the final approval of what is considered critical.

(c) NS Power's response to IR-80(a) states that "during emergency response, critical infrastructure is identified by the Nova Scotia Emergency Management Office (EMO)." Please indicate whether Synapse is aware of any provincial criteria or list of critical facilities that is available to NS Power for planning purposes.

(d) Please clarify whether Finding 9 is intended to address investment planning, as distinct from restoration sequencing during emergencies.

Request IR-37:

Reference: Page 36

With respect to Finding 9, where Synapse suggests that information on back-up power should be collected.

(a) What mechanism does Synapse propose to compel customers to report accurate and up to date details of their back-up systems, current operational readiness, maintenance status, fuel supplies, etc.?

(b) Does Synapse suggest that NS Power could/should prioritize entire feeders (including many customers not considered critical facilities) differently based on a customer's decision to invest (or not) in back-up power?

(i) If so, has Synapse considered and quantified the impacts on overall feeder or system performance (consistent with the stated goals of Performance Standards) from such decision-making?

(ii) If not, how does Synapse envision that the significant effort in collecting behind-the-meter information could positively impact risk-based decision-making?

Request IR-38:

With respect to NS Power's risk-based decision-making processes, has Synapse reviewed EA Technology's report from the Property and Assets Proceeding (M11067) and incorporated any of those findings into its assessment and report?

(a) If so, is it Synapse's position that EA Technology's findings that NS Power has "good processes and systems that identify assets and groups of assets that represent the greatest risk to the organization" and "systems and processes in place that allows them to make informed decisions on their assets" is not aligned with effective decision-making?

(b) If not, why did Synapse choose not to consider and leverage the data analyzed in this recent review of asset management practice noting that it was highlighted by NS Power as a key matter relevant to this proceeding?

Climate Change / 0.26 SAIDI Claim

Request IR-39:

Reference: Finding 20, Page 57

Synapse questions the basis of NS Power's estimated 0.26 SAIDI climate impact. Please provide Synapse's own estimate of climate-related reliability degradation over the planning horizon, including supporting methodology and assumptions.

Request IR-40:

Reference: Page 11

Please explain why Synapse's analysis of two weather stations and annual counts of days exceeding 80 km/h constitutes a suitable proxy for system-wide weather-related reliability exposure, including storm severity, storm duration, storm footprint, vegetation impacts, and restoration complexity.

Request IR-41:

Please provide the wind data, station selection criteria and any sensitivity tests (more stations, hours above 80 km/h, excluding Dorian and Fiona). Please explain how the analysis fits with the Province of Nova Scotia's 2025 Climate Change Risk Assessment.

Request IR-42:

Reference: Page 11, Figure 5

Synapse looked at only two weather stations (Halifax International Airport and Yarmouth).

(a) Please explain why two stations represent wind exposure across NS Power's ~27,500 km distribution system.

(b) Please list any other Environment Canada stations Synapse reviewed, and provide the results.

(c) Has Synapse assessed whether trends at these two sites represent conditions in Cape Breton, Northern Nova Scotia, and the Annapolis Valley?

Request IR-43:

Reference: Page 11, Figure 5

Synapse counted days with gusts of at least 80 km/h, while NS Power tracks hours, and Synapse says it "was unable to locate" hourly data. Explain how a simple day count captures how long and how intense wind events are, given that one storm day can mean anything from one hour to 20 or more hours of damaging gusts.

Request IR-44:

Reference: Page 12

Synapse concludes that "changes in wind speed cannot fully explain" missed reliability targets. Did Synapse consider any of the following outage drivers besides gust speed?:

- wind direction
- soil saturation
- leaf-on conditions
- freezing rain and ice accretion
- heavy wet snow
- storm duration

If not, explain why days with wind gusts above 80 km/h alone is a sufficient proxy for climate-related pressure on SAIDI.

Request IR-45:

Reference: Page 11 states that "the average number of days with high wind gusts between these two sites was about 14.4 days between 2016 and 2020 and 12.6 days between 2021 and 2025." Page 12 states that high winds "have not significantly increased in recent years.

(a) Figure 5 presents data for 2007 to 2025, while the comparison on page 11 uses the periods 2016–2020 and 2021–2025. Please explain the reasons for selecting these two periods, and whether the full 2007–2025 record was also considered in reaching the conclusion on page 12.

(b) Page 10 (footnote 11) refers to the province's projection that peak wind speeds will increase by 3.7 to 7 km/h by 2100. Page 53 refers to an expected increase in the frequency and severity of tropical storms. Please describe how these statements relate to the conclusion on page 12, and how that conclusion should be read in the context of a forward-looking reliability plan.

Alternate Portfolios

Request IR-46:

Reference: Recommendation 5

Synapse recommends evaluation of alternative reliability portfolios.

(a) Please confirm whether Synapse independently developed and tested any alternative portfolio. If not, explain the basis for concluding an alternative portfolio would be superior to NS Power's proposed plan.

(b) Please provide at least one alternative five-year portfolio that Synapse believes would better achieve reliability objectives in Nova Scotia than NS Power's proposed plan along with the supporting quantitative analysis.

Request IR-47:

Synapse concluded that NS Power has not optimized its investment strategy for cost-effectiveness. Please provide the alternative optimized portfolio identified by Synapse and provide:

(a) total cost,
(b) forecast SAIDI,
(c) forecast SAIFI,
(d) risk impacts,
(e) transmission impacts,
(f) substation impacts,
(g) resilience impacts, and
(h) affordability impacts.

Request IR-48:

Please list the regulatory controls Synapse thinks are lacking, given ACE Plan approvals, ATOs, and the review of projects over $1M (Finding 18).

Request IR-49:

Reference: Page 50, Table 13, Finding 16

For Finding 16's proposed alternative plan that shifts funding from equipment to vegetation, has Synapse estimated the reliability, safety and cost effects of deferring the equipment replacements? This includes higher failure rates, run-to-failure costs, and more reactive capital. If so, please provide the estimate.

Reliability Disparity / Mi'Kmaq Findings

Request IR-50:

(a) With respect to feeders serving Mi'kmaq communities, please explain whether Synapse controlled for each of the following, and if not, please explain how cause-and-effect conclusions can be drawn regarding reliability disparities:

- Feeder length;
- customer density;
- Vegetation exposure;
- Rurality;
- Accessibility;
- Asset age; and
- Outage cause mix.

(b) Figure 15 compares the average CKAIDI and CKAIFI of feeders serving Mi'kmaq communities with all other feeders, based on NS Power's response to IR-66. In that response, NS Power noted that "the portion of a feeder supplying a community may vary significantly, so direct comparisons between this subset of circuits and all others would not necessarily fully reflect the performance experienced by individual customers within those communities." NS Power is committed to understanding the reliability experienced by Mi'kmaq communities and would value Synapse's views on how that can best be assessed. Please describe how the limitation identified in NS Power's response to IR-66(a) was taken into account in preparing Figure 15 and in reaching Finding 10.

Request IR-51:

Reference: Finding 8, Page 60

NS Power collects community-level feedback at reliability and stakeholder engagements and informs project development and investments as detailed in IR-11. With respect to this feedback noted in Finding 8, is it Synapse's position that customer input should supersede performance standards requirements and risk-based decisions within the Five-Year Reliability Plan?

(a) If so, how does Synapse propose that this feedback should be weighed against condition, performance, safety, and other factors?

(b) If not, what is the intended outcome of this Finding with respect to the development and prioritization of future reliability investments?

Request IR-52:

Reference: Finding 10, Page 26 and 61

With respect to Finding 10, is it Synapse's understanding that NS Power is permitted by law or regulation to make decisions, target investments, or provide different levels of service based on the specific demographics of a community?

(a) If so, please refer to the relevant citations outlining this ability.

(b) If not, does Synapse agree that government direction and intervention would be required before NS Power could undertake such decision-making?

Request IR-53:

Reference: Finding 10, Page 26 and 61

With respect to Finding 10, what criteria does Synapse use to define "Vulnerable" or "Priority" customers. Please reference any relevant Nova Scotia-based legislation, regulations, or guidelines reviewed in support of those definitions.

(a) Is it Synapse's position that NS Power should collect and maintain detailed demographic data, including potentially private factors that may determine vulnerability, on all its customers?

(i) If so, is this limited to self disclosure? How should this be collected and kept up to date? If misrepresentation is a concern, how could that risk be mitigated?

(ii) If not, how could NS Power know the locations, and therefore the associated circuits, of these customers?

Request IR-54:

Reference: Finding 10, page 26 and 61

With respect to Finding 10, please provide a summary of comparable utilities to NS Power where customer vulnerability has been incorporated into reliability investment decision-making.

Request IR-55:

Reference: Recommendation 23, Page 65

Synapse states in Recommendation 23 that "if the next Reliability Plan includes resilience-focused investments, they should be addressed separately from reliability-focused investments" and that "NS Power should utilize a more targeted approach for investments intended to improve resilience."

(a) Please explain the planning, analytical, or decision-making framework Synapse recommends be used to identify, evaluate, and prioritize resilience-focused investments separately from reliability-focused investments.

(b) Please identify the specific criteria, metrics, and performance measures that should be used to assess resilience-focused investments.

(c) Please explain how the framework proposed by Synapse would differ from the methodologies currently used to evaluate reliability-focused investments.

(d) Please describe how costs and benefits associated with resilience-focused investments should be quantified and compared to alternative investments.

  (i) Additionally, in cases where a project is anticipated to deliver both resiliency and reliability benefits (understood by NS Power to represent the majority of investment proposed within the Five-Year Reliability Plan), how are the costs and benefits for each segregated and considered separately?

(e) Please provide examples of utility, regulator, or system operator practices where the framework proposed by Synapse has been implemented and explain how investment decisions differed as a result.

(f) Where the evaluation of an investment produces different outcomes under a reliability-focused assessment and a resilience-focused assessment, please explain how Synapse recommends such competing priorities be balanced or reconciled.

(g) Please identify the analytical model, methodology, or framework Synapse proposes should replace or supplement traditional reliability planning for resilience-focused investments.

Contact Person: **Jennifer Power**
Director, Regulatory
Nova Scotia Power Inc.
Address: **1223 Lower Water Street**
Halifax, NS B3J 3S2
Mail: P.O. Box 910
Halifax, NS B3J 2W5
Email: **Jennifer.Power@nspower.ca**

Issued at Halifax, Nova Scotia, this 13 day of November, 2026.