2026 **M12784**

NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: ***The Public Utilities Act***

IN THE MATTER OF: **A Review of NOVA SCOTIA POWER INCORPORATED's 2025 Annual Performance Standards Report**

INFORMATION REQUESTS

To: Nova Scotia Power Incorporated ("NSPI")

From: The Industrial Group

Responses Due: May 29, 2026

Contact Persons: Nancy G. Rubin, K.C.
Brianne Rudderham
Stewart McKelvey
Suite 600-1741 Lower Water Street
P.O. Box 997
Halifax NS B3J 2X2
Telephone: (902) 420-3200 / Fax (902) 420-1417

Issued at Halifax, Nova Scotia, this 7th day of May 2026.

All References (unless otherwise identified) are to Exhibit N-1, 2025 Annual Performance Standards Report.

Request IR-1:

Reference: NSPI states at page 17, lines 10-23:

> ***"As performance improves across all 405 feeders, the overall number of outages experienced by customers is reduced. However, the standards for measuring problem feeder performance become more stringent as the performance improves.***
>
> ***This positive result reduces the calculated performance threshold for individual feeders as the standard deviation narrows. As a result, the CKAIFI performance threshold for 2025 was reduced by 16 percent over 2024 and 22 percent over the previous five-year average.***

… This data shows that as the standards become more stringent as performance improves that the bar that feeders must meet to achieve the feeder standards will become increasingly challenging."

(a) Is NSPI effectively arguing that improved system performance disadvantages certain feeders? Please clarify.

(b) Does NSPI maintain that the bar is too high with the updated threshold? Please explain.

Request IR-2:

Reference: SAIDI and SAIFI Standards, p. 47.

Preamble: Target SAIDI was ≤ 4.29 and the result was 4.79. SAIDI has now missed target in multiple recent years.

(a) Please identify any structural factors preventing compliance despite increased capital spend.

(b) Please explain why SAIDI improvements lag SAIFI improvements. In providing your answer, identify any reasons within and outside NSPI's control.

Request IR-3:

Reference: Page 9, lines 2-5.

"NS Power is already seeing positive results from the $206 million invested in the first year of the reliability plan. There was a <u>19 percent reduction in outages due to trees coming into contact with power lines in 2025</u> compared to 2024 and an <u>18 percent reduction in outages due to equipment failures."</u>

And Reference: Page 49, lines 5-7.

"While SAIDI just went above target in December, there was a year-over-year improvement that is aligned with NS Power's Five-Year Reliability Plan and reliability is improving for customers."

(a) Please describe the analysis NSPI performed to conclude that the observed change in SAIDI is "aligned with" the Five-Year Reliability Plan. In doing so, please state the comparison period used to support the "year-over-year" characterization, and explain how the effects of abnormal weather and major events were treated in that analysis.

(b) With respect to the statement that NSPI is seeing "positive results" from the $206 million invested in year one of the Reliability Plan, please explain whether NSPI has undertaken any quantitative or correlation analysis linking specific projects/programs (or project categories) to changes in SAIDI and/or SAIFI. If so, please describe the methodology, inputs, assumptions, and results, and provide supporting materials.

(c) Please provide the calculations and supporting data underlying the reported 19 percent reduction in outages due to tree contact and 18 percent reduction in outages due to equipment failures.

Request IR-4:

Reference: Page 52, Figure 29.

Reference: 2026 ACE Plan (M12619), N-6, NSPI (NSEB) RIR -184.

(a) Does the data reflected in Figure 29 align with the figures provided by NSPI in response to Board IR 184(b) in the 2026 ACE Plan proceeding? If not, please identify each discrepancy and explain the reason(s) (e.g., different definitions, exclusions, time periods, or data sources).

(b) If yes, please confirm whether NSPI assumed that 40% of tree-contact outages (or tree-contact customer interruptions) are attributable to adverse weather conditions within Figure 29. Please define precisely what the 40% factor is applied to and how "adverse weather" is defined for this purpose.

(c) Please explain the basis for the 40% allocator and confirm whether this allocator is based on an industry-wide standard/benchmark (and, if so, identify the standard and provide the supporting source), or whether it is an internal NSPI assumption (and, if so, provide the rationale and any validation performed).

(d) Please confirm whether the reduction in tree-contact outages in 2025 is at least partially attributable to *improved weather* relative to 2024. If not, please explain. If yes, please describe the analysis NSPI performed to distinguish the portion of the change attributable to vegetation management and/or other reliability investments from the portion attributable to differences in weather.

Request IR-5:

Reference: Page 52, Figure 29.

Reference: 2026 ACE Plan (M12619), N-6, NSPI (NSEB) RIR-185(b)

(a) Does the data reflected in Figure 30 align with the figures provided by NSPI in response to Board IR 185(b) in the 2026 ACE Plan proceeding? If not, please identify each discrepancy and explain the reason(s) (e.g., different definitions, exclusions, time periods, or data sources).

(b) Please explain why the outage event count has decreased since 2020 while customer outage hours have increased relative to 2020. In your response, please describe the drivers of the change (e.g., event duration, customers affected per event, inclusion/exclusion criteria, changes in restoration practices, and/or major-event impacts) and provide the underlying annual totals used for Figure 30.

(c) Please confirm whether the reductions in outages in 2025 are at least partially attributable to improved weather relative to 2024. If not, please explain. If yes, please describe the analysis NSPI performed to distinguish the portion of the improvement attributable to the Five-Year Reliability Plan (or other reliability investments) from the portion attributable to differences in weather (including any normalization, major-event-day treatment, or other adjustments).

Request IR-6:

Reference: CKADI and CKAIFI Standards – Figures 35 and 36, p. 59-60.

Preamble: NSPI identifies feeders not meeting standards (CKAIDI:85S-401 and CKAIFI:57W-402, 91W-411).

(a) Please explain whether any of the above feeders now qualify as “chronic” under the Board’s methodology.

(b) Have enforcement or escalation measures been triggered? Please explain and describe all actions.

Request IR-7:

Reference: **Section 4.0 Customer-Level Reliability Data (CEMI/CELID), p. 86.**

Preamble: **NSPI states it is at the final stage of developing customer-level reliability metrics i.e. operational values but has not proposed customer-level reliability standards.**

(a) Does NSPI view CEMI/CELID as informational only, or precursors to enforceable standards? Please explain.

(b) Does NSPI oppose eventual inclusion of these metrics in its performance standards? Please explain.

(c) Having reached the end stage of the project to develop customer-level reliability metrics, please be specific regarding any remaining steps and the timeline to propose customer-level reliability metrics.

Request IR-8:

Reference: **Appendix I.**

(a) For each feeder-year where Appendix I reports CKAIFI and/or CKAIDI as zero or blank, please state whether this reflects (a) no qualifying interruptions or (b) excluded, missing or otherwise invalid data and provide an explanation for each.

(b) Please identify all rules or circumstances under which NSPI reports a zero value in Appendix I rather than (n/a), blank or footnoted data.

Request IR-9:

Reference: **Appendix I and Appendix K.**

(a) For each feeder that shows zero or missing CKAIFI/CKAIDI in Appendix I and appears in Appendix K, please state whether the Appendix K outage events were included in the index calculations and if not, why.

(b) Please quantify, by feeder and year, the number of Appendix K outage events excluded from CKAIFI and/or CKAIDI calculations.

(c) For each feeder with zero or missing Appendix I data and no Appendix K records, please state whether the feeder was energized and serving customers in the relevant year.

(d) For each feeder with any zero or missing CKAFI/CKADI value, please explain whether the feeder was tracked for performance purposes in that year and explain any untracked status.

Request IR-10:

Reference: Appendix I and Appendix K

(a) For purposes of this IR, and assuming all outages associated with feeders listed in Appendix I were eligible for inclusion, please recalculate and provide system-level SAIDI and SAIFI results by year (i.e. including feeders that reported zero or missing CKAFI/CKADI values).

(b) For each year, identify the difference between the recalculated SAIDI and SAIFI values and the reported SAIDI and SAIFI values in the Annual Performance Standards Reports.