

NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: *More Access to Energy Act*

– and –

IN THE MATTER OF: AN APPLICATION by the INDEPENDENT ENERGY
SYSTEM OPERATOR OF NOVA SCOTIA made pursuant to
Section 29 of the More Access to Energy Act for the review of its
Fee Recovery Mechanism

INFORMATION REQUESTS

To: **David A. Luther**
Nova Scotia Independent Energy System Operator
(IESO Nova Scotia)
1791 Barrington Street, Unit 1010
Halifax, NS B3J 3K9

From: The Consumer Advocate

Responses Due: **September 22, 2026**

Copies: 1 electronic copy (PDF searchable)

Contact Person: **David J. Roberts**
Consumer Advocate
Pink Larkin
1463 South Park Street
Halifax, NS B3J 3S9
Tel: (902) 423-7777
Email: droberts@pinklarkin.com

1 **Request IR-1:**

2
3 Please elaborate on Figures 10-13 by:

- 4 (a) Providing an illustrative schedule for a future year for Options 1 and 2. It is suggested that
5 Fiscal Year 2027/28 be used to avoid complications involving the decision in M12663.
6 (b) In your response to (a), include dates for each steps in the filing and decision-making
7 process.
8 (c) Please explain the rationale for setting FY3 fees in FY3-Q2 (Option 1) or FY2 fees in FY2-
9 Q2 (Option 2) rather than setting FY2 (or FY3) fees in FY1-Q4 (or FY2-Q4).

10
11 **Request IR-2:**

12
13 Regarding the proposal for Option 2, as described on p. 30-37 of the Application, please confirm
14 the following statements. If not confirmed, please explain.

- 15
16 (a) The compliance filing would include the following new information: (i) a report on actual
17 expenditures from FY1 and (ii) recalculated FY1 fees.
18
19 (b) The compliance filing would indicate true-up fees for each LSE that reconcile actual FY1
20 fees received from the LSE with the new information identified in the response to part (a).
21
22 (c) The compliance filing would occur after the Board decision on the forecast revenue
23 requirement for FY2 (which would have been filed in December) but before the FY2 fees
24 would go into effect, presumably in June.
25
26 (d) The report on actual expenditures from FY1 would necessarily include assumptions about
27 actual expenditures during the final weeks of FY1 in order for it to be filed prior to FY2
28 fees going into effect.
29
30 (e) The report on recalculated FY1 fees would necessarily include assumptions about actual
31 load during the final weeks of FY1 in order for it to be filed prior to FY2 fees going into
32 effect.
33
34 (f) The compliance filing would not be subject to a hearing process; prudence review deferred
35 to FY3 application process.
36
37 (g) The total fees for FY2 would be the sum of: (i) fees for each LSE, allocated on a forecast
38 per-MWh basis, based on the Board's decision on the forecast revenue requirement for
39 FY2 and (ii) the true up fees for each LSE as described in part (b).
40

41 **Request IR-3:**

42
43 Regarding Option 2, please explain how errors in assumptions about actual expenditures and load
44 during the final weeks of FY1 (see IR-2 parts d and e) would be considered, if at all, in any filings.
45
46

1 **Request IR-4:**

2
3 With reference to Figure 13, if parties are not satisfied with use of a compliance filing in Option
4 2, please provide the views of IESO NS on a mid-year rate adjustment to account for the true-up.
5 For example, a mid-year adjustment on the following schedule, assuming a paper hearing that
6 proceeds such that a Board decision is issued in November.

- 7
 - An August 1 true-up filing application, instead of a July true-up compliance filing
 - A paper hearing with a Board decision on the true-up issued in November, instead of an
8 August decision including the true-up along with the FY1 allocation adjustment and FY2
9 base fee
 - A December 1 true-up rate adjustment effective during the December 1 – November 30
10 period

11
12 If the above schedule is not considered reasonable, please provide your own suggested variation
13 on Option 2 that is both expedited relative to Option 1 but also allows for review of the true-up
14 rather than use of a compliance filing.
15

16
17 Please also comment on whether the IESO is aware of any reason that an effective date of January
18 1 for a true-up adjustment could have advantages for any of the LSEs in terms of their standard
19 schedules for customer rate adjustments.
20

21 **Request IR-5:**

22
23 Regarding both options, please comment on whether carrying costs on over- or under-recovered
24 amounts from FY1 (see p. 31 of the Application) that are incurred in FY2 or FY3 would be (i)
25 fully recovered through the true-up adjustment or (ii) as costs incurred in the respective year and
26 recovered through either the approved fees or the respective true-up adjustment.
27
28
29