

Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Federal Regulator Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission)	OESC Code Rule: Appendix B Note to Rule 2-000 a) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: This change is a significant concern. CNSC staff do not perform any verification activities against the Ontario Electrical Safety Code. ESA needs to remain the Authority Having Jurisdiction. The nuclear power plant (NPP) operators are expected to apply all applicable codes at the federal, provincial and municipal levels. Specifically, there is an explanatory note in the Power Reactor Operating Licences that states: "(i) Nothing in this licence shall be construed to authorize non-compliance with any other applicable legal obligation or restriction." In addition, Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC)'s design requirements for NPPs are established at a high level (safety goals and objectives) to ensure that public dose limits will be met. For electrical power systems, this means that the design needs to ensure that there's sufficient capacity to support the safety functions of the connected loads, and that the availability and reliability of the system has to be commensurate with the safety significance of the loads. (See CNSC's regulatory document REGDC-2.5.2, Design of Nuclear Power Plant Section 8.9 - https://www.cnsc-ccsn.gc.ca/eng/acts-and-regulations/regulatory-documents/published/html/regdoc2-5-2/#sec8-9) The Electrical Safety Code (ESC) is much more in-depth when compared to CNSC's regulatory requirements for electrical systems as it provides detailed requirements for the design of individual components, specific electrical protection, etc.	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments. Federal, provincial, and municipal jurisdictions rely on ESA to ensure safety of electrical installations and equipment. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the years, coupled with their service programs with specific generators, has played a pivotal role in ensuring safe electrical installations at these facilities. 	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-001</u>



ubmitted y	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	Finally, CNSC staff do not assess compliance against the ESC. Therefore, CNSC staff disagree with the proposed change; the Electrical Safety Authority (ESA) needs to remain as the authority having jurisdiction with respect to the ESC.		
	Modify current Appendix B Note to Rule 2-000 a). Where Codes issued by the Ontario Energy Board under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998, require a connection authorization, this Code applies to electrical installations specified in Item a). Codes issued by the Ontario Energy Board can be referenced on the Ontario Energy Board website.		
	This Code applies to electrical equipment and electrical installations used in the generation of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public. Where electrical equipment and associated systems of the generating stations are under Federal or other Provincial jurisdictions (such as Technical Standard and Safety Authority "TSSA", Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission "CNSC", etc.), these electrical equipment and associated control systems are outside of the Scope of this Code. Suggestion for Improvement: Suggested text in yellow.		
	This Code applies to electrical equipment and electrical installations used in the generation of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public.		
	The Electrical Safety Authority (ESA) is the authority having jurisdiction with respect to this code. In the event of any perceived or real conflict or inconsistency between the codes at the federal, provincial and municipal levels, the electrical power operator shall consult with those authorities having jurisdiction at the nuclear facilities (such as the		



	2024-OA-001: Rule 2-000 a), amended Description of Change: Amend existing Ontario Amendment to add licensed generators in the Scope of OESC.				
Submitted	Submitted Stakeholder Comment Propose Propose Propose				
by					
	Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission [CNSC]) to determine the approach to resolve				
	the issue.				
	Alternative Proposal:				
	Comments:				

Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Ontario	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	Based on the comments
_icensed	Rule 2-000 a), amended	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	received, this Ontario
Generator	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.	Amendment proposal has
Ontario	Oppose removal of generator exemption from the OESC Code Rule		been revised.
ower	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been	
Generation)	The OESC focuses on Residential, Commercial and Industrial applications.	considered by the ESA and have been discussed	View 2024-OA-001
omment 1	Installations for Generation, Transmission and Distribution have not historically	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee	
	contributed to the content in the Code because they are exempt, however, OPG has	(OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes	
	used the OESC as the design standard or followed or exceeded the intent of the Code	have been made based on the submitted	
	where possible. As written, the concern is the Code will lead to technical debate over	comments.	
	the applicability to installations used exclusively for generation. Considerable		
	amendments to the Code will be required to apply to unique generation installations	Bulletin 2-28-*, published in Ontario since 2021,	
	and systems previously exempted and to further recognize standards on electric utility	clarifies that authorization to connect is required	
	workplace electrical safety absent from the current edition.	for licensed generators by the Ontario Energy	
	Suggestion for Improvement:	Board Act and its regulations. Electrical	
	Modify current Ontario Amendment to Rule 2-000 a) and modify Subrule a) iii).	installations (as defined in the OESC) in	



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	 2-000 Scope (see Appendix B) This Code does not apply to a) electrical equipment and electrical installations used exclusively in the generation, transmission, or distribution of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public as specified in Item i), or ii), or iii), except where the Ontario Energy Board requires an authorization to connect from the Electrical Safety Authority in accordance with Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998: i) the distributor is licensed to own or operate the distribution system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or ii) the transmitter is licensed to own or operate the transmission system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or iii) the generator is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to provide ancillary services for sale through IESO-administered markets-or directly to another person, under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; No changes in Subrules b), c), d), e), f), g) and h Alternative Proposal: Allow representation from generators to join OESC review committees/sub-committees and provide feedback to amend the Code with generators utility input. Until such time the exemption should remain. Comments: 	generation facilities are required to follow all OESC requirements, including but not limited to notifications, plan review submissions, ground potential rise (GPR) studies, etc. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the years, coupled with their service programs with specific generators, has played a pivotal role in ensuring safe electrical installations at these facilities.	



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Ontario Licensed Generator (Ontario Power Generation) Comment 2	 OESC Code Rule: Rule 2-000 a), amended Support/Oppose: Oppose removal of generator exemption from the OESC Code Rule Rationale: The description of change suggests the ESA's concern is focused on Distributed Energy Resources. While the Appendix B Note to Rule 2-000 a) is modified to acknowledge equipment under Federal or Provincial jurisdictions for safety and nuclear, there is no acknowledgement of the challenges this rule change will create for generators to comply with other Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) over the reliability and design of the electricity system. Suggestion for Improvement: Modify current Ontario Amendment to Rule 2-000 a) and modify Subrule a) iii). 2-000 Scope (see Appendix B) This Code does not apply to a) electrical equipment and electrical installations used exclusively in the generation, transmission, or distribution of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public as specified in Item i), or iii), or iii), except where the Ontario Energy Board requires an authorization to connect from the Electrical Safety Authority in accordance with Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998: i) the distributor is licensed to own or operate the distribution system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or ii) the transmitter is licensed to own or operate the transmission system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or iii) the generator is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to provide ancillary services for sale through IESO-administered markets-or directly to another person, under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; 	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments. Bulletin 2-28-*, published in Ontario since 2021, clarifies that authorization to connect is required for licensed generators by the Ontario Energy Board Act and its regulations. Electrical installations (as defined in the OESC) in generation facilities are required to follow all OESC requirements, including but not limited to notifications, plan review submissions, ground potential rise (GPR) studies, etc. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the years, coupled with their service programs with specific generators, has played a pivotal role in ensuring safe electrical installations at these facilities. 	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-001</u>



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	No changes in Subrules b), c), d), e), f), g) and h Alternative Proposal: Licensed generators connected to Bulk Electric System or Bulk Power System facilities remain exempt from the code and/or are not required to obtain Connection Authorization. (i.e. a tiered system for licensed generators)		
	Or		
	Establish a set of principles that can be used to identify electrical systems that are integral and a direct part of the electricity generation process that are excluded from the scope of the Code Comments:		

2024-OA-001: Rule 2-000 a), amended Description of Change: Amend existing Ontario Amendment to add licensed generators in the Scope of OESC.				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
by				
Ontario	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	Based on the comments	
Licensed	Rule 2-000 a), amended	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code;	received, this Ontario	
Generator	Support/Oppose:	the code is better with your participation.	Amendment proposal has been	
(Ontario	Oppose removal of generator exemption from the OESC Code Rule		revised.	
Power	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been		
Generation)	The proposed amendments to Rule 2-000 a) do not provide rationale for the continued	considered by the ESA and have been	View 2024-OA-001	
Comment 3	exemption of transmitters and distributers of electrical power. The concern is	discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code		
	transmitters and distributers are permitted to be self regulating when generators, who	Committee (OPCC). After this discussion,		



mitted Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
 operate and maintain similar electrical equipment, are regulated by the ESA. It is unclear how the Transmission System Code and Distribution System Code are regarded as safety regulations and/or supercedes the OESC. Suggestion for Improvement: Modify current Ontario Amendment to Rule 2-000 a) and modify Subrule a) iii). 2-000 Scope (see Appendix B) This Code does not apply to a) electrical equipment and electrical installations used exclusively in the generation, transmission, or distribution of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public as specified in Item i), or ii), or iii), except where the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998: i) the distributor is licensed to own or operate the distribution system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or ii) the transmitter is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to another person, under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; No changes in Subrules b), c), d), e), f), g) and h Alternative Proposal: Ensure regulatory symmetry between generators, transmitters and distributers 	 selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments. Bulletin 2-28-*, published in Ontario since 2021, clarifies that authorization to connect is required for licensed generators by the Ontario Energy Board Act and its regulations. Electrical installations (as defined in the OESC) in generation facilities are required to follow all OESC requirements, including but not limited to notifications, plan review submissions, ground potential rise (GPR) studies, etc. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the 	



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Dotario Licensed Generator Ontario Power Generation) Comment 4	 OESC Code Rule: Rule 2-000 a), amended Support/Oppose: Oppose removal of generator exemption from the OESC Code Rule Rationale: In parallel with the establishment of OPG, the ESA was established on April 1, 1999 with the replacement of the Power Corporation Act by the Electricity Act 1998. Prior to the establishment of the ESA, the Electrical Inspection function of the former Ontario Hydro fulfilled many of the roles and responsibilities which are now the mandate of the ESA. It is recognized that electrical safety is of utmost importance and must not be compromised in the operation of OPG facilities, and therefore the OESC is used as the design standard for electrical installations whenever applicable. However, existing nuclear and non-nuclear OPG facilities were built to Ontario Hydro Standards. Upon establishment of OPG and the ESA, it was recognized that applications used exclusively for generating electricity did not align with the Electrical Safety Code. It is understood that the Code is not retroactive to installed equipment and systems, however the proposed amendments will require new installations and modifications to existing facilities to comply with the Code. Historically exempted grounding, generator protections, station service, cable management, and emergency standby systems would require significant infrastructure modifications. Considering recently announced projects such as the Pickering and Sir Adam Back 2 refurbishment projects, the impact to the ratepayers of Ontario is substantial. Without a generator exemption, the concern is varied interpretation of the Code will introduce delay to project schedules as there is no defined process for managing deviations to the Code and special permission from the ESA is required prior to commencement of work. 	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments. Bulletin 2-28-*, published in Ontario since 2021, clarifies that authorization to connect is required for licensed generators by the Ontario Energy Board Act and its regulations. Electrical installations (as defined in the OESC) in generation facilities are required to follow all OESC requirements, including but not limited to notifications, plan review submissions, ground potential rise (GPR) studies, etc. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the years, coupled with their service programs with specific generators, has played a pivotal role in ensuring safe electrical installations at these facilities. 	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. View 2024-OA-001



ubmitted /	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	Suggestion for Improvement:		
	Modify current Ontario Amendment to Rule 2-000 a) and modify Subrule a) iii).		
	2-000 Scope (see Appendix B) This Code does not apply to		
	a) electrical equipment and electrical installations used exclusively in the		
	generation, transmission, or distribution of electrical power or energy intended		
	for sale or distribution to the public as specified in Item i), or ii), or iii), except where the Ontario Energy Board requires an authorization to connect from the		
	Electrical Safety Authority in accordance with Part V of the Ontario Energy		
	Board Act, 1998: i) the distributor is licensed to own or operate the distribution		
	system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or ii) the transmitter		
	is licensed to own or operate the transmission system under Part V of the		
	Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or iii) the generator is licensed to own or operate the generation system and or is licensed to provide ancillary services		
	for sale through IESO-administered markets-or directly to another person,		
	under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998;		
	No changes in Subrules b), c), d), e), f), g) and h		
	Alternative Proposal:		
	Establish a set of principles that can be used to identify electrical systems that are integral and a direct part of the electricity generation process that are excluded from		
	the scope of the Code or excluded from connection authorization to the IESO		
	controlled grid by the ESA.		
	Comments:		



	2024-OA-001: Rule 2-000 a), amended				
Description of Submitted by	Change: Amend existing Ontario Amendment to add licensed generators in the Scope of Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change		
Ontario Licensed Generator (Bruce Power) Comment 1	 OESC Code Rule: Rule 2-000 a), amended Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: The OESC focuses on Residential and Commercial and industrial applications. Large Generators, Transmitters and Distributors have not historically contributed to the content in the code because they are exempt. The rule of the code should not change without generator/utility representation contributing/providing feedback/amending the code to ensure applicability to utilities as opposed to industry. Suggestion for Improvement: Maintain generator exemption and remove connection authorization requirement for generators that comply with legacy Ontario Hydro or other legacy design and electrical standards. Alternative Proposal: Allow generators to join OESC review committees/sub-committees and provide feedback to amend the code with generators utility input. Until such time the exemption should remain. Comments: 	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments. Bulletin 2-28-*, published in Ontario since 2021, clarifies that authorization to connect is required for licensed generators by the Ontario Energy Board Act and its regulations. Electrical installations (as defined in the OESC) in generation facilities are required to follow all OESC requirements, including but not limited to notifications, plan review submissions, ground potential rise (GPR) studies, etc. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the years, coupled with their service programs with specific generators, has played a pivotal role in ensuring safe electrical installations at these facilities. 	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-001</u>		



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Ontario Licensed Generator (Bruce Power) Comment 2	 OESC Code Rule: Rule 2-000 a), amended Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: Legacy Ontario Hydro Stations were built to our Ontario Hydro Standards at the time and plants designed to these standards have demonstrated 40+ years of safe operation. These Ontario Hydro standards do not align with the modern electrical safety code and full compliance will have technical feasibility issues and financial impacts. Oppose Suggestion for Improvement: Modify current Ontario Amendment to Rule 2-000 a) and modify Subrule a) iii). 2-000 Scope (see Appendix B) This Code does not apply to a. electrical equipment and electrical installations used exclusively in the generation, transmission, or distribution of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public as specified in Item i), or iii), or iii), except where the Ontario Energy Board requires an authorization to connect from the Electrical Safety Authority in accordance with Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998: i) the distributor is licensed to own or operate the distribution system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Actc, 1998; or ii) the transmitter is licensed to own or operate the transmission system under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or iii) the generator is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to provide ancillary services for sale through IESO-administered markets-or directly to another person, under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or iii) the ontario Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or iii) the ontario person, under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; or iii) the generator is licensed to own or operate the generation system and er is licensed to provide ancillary services for sale through IESO-administered markets-or directly to another person, under Part V of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998; 	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments. Bulletin 2-28-*, published in Ontario since 2021, clarifies that authorization to connect is required for licensed generators by the Ontario Energy Board Act and its regulations. Electrical installations (as defined in the OESC) in generation facilities are required to follow all OESC requirements, including but not limited to notifications, plan review submissions, ground potential rise (GPR) studies, etc. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the years, coupled with their service programs with specific generators, has played a pivotal role in ensuring safe electrical installations at these facilities. 	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-001</u>



ubmitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
1			
	No changes in Subrules b), c), d), e), f), g) and h		
	Remove the amendment to Appendix B in relation to generating stations under federal regulation.		
	This Code applies to electrical equipment and electrical installations used in the generation of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public. Where electrical equipment and associated systems of the generating stations are under Federal or other Provincial jurisdictions (such as Technical Standard and Safety Authority "TSSA", Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission "CNSC", etc.), these electrical equipment and associated control systems are outside of the Scope of this Code.		
	Alternative Proposal: Generators connected to Bulk Electric System or Bulk Power System facilities remain exempt. (i.e. a tiered system for licensed generators)		
	Or		
	Establish defined determinations where connection authorization is required or exempted and establish where ESA requires inspection vs. engineering sign off by customer		
	Comments:		



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Ontario Licensed Generator (Bruce Power) Comment 3	OESC Code Rule: Rule 2-000 a), amended Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: Oppose Proposal Number 2024-OA-001 Bruce Power has a service contract with the ESA to perform inspections on new electrical construction. The arrangement has been in place for many years and has led to safe and reliable electrical power generation.	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-001</u>
	Based on this, there is no apparent reason to change the ESA's responsibilities in relation to enforcement of the OESC at generation facilities. Suggestion for Improvement: Remove the amendment to Appendix B in relation to generating stations under federal regulation. Alternative Proposal: This Code applies to electrical equipment and electrical installations used in the generation of electrical power or energy intended for sale or distribution to the public. Where electrical equipment and associated systems of the generating stations are under Federal or other Provincial jurisdictions (such as Technical Standard and Safety Authority "TSSA", Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission "CNSC", etc.), these electrical equipment and associated control systems are outside of the Scope of this Code. Comments:	Bulletin 2-28-*, published in Ontario since 2021, clarifies that authorization to connect is required for licensed generators by the Ontario Energy Board Act and its regulations. Electrical installations (as defined in the OESC) in generation facilities are required to follow all OESC requirements, including but not limited to notifications, plan review submissions, ground potential rise (GPR) studies, etc. ESA's presence at generation facilities over the years, coupled with their service programs with specific generators, has played a pivotal role in ensuring safe electrical installations at these facilities.	



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Dntario Government Ainistry MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: Rule 2-000 a), amended Support/Oppose: No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: MLITSD focus is on worker safety during installation of electrical system. and not on compliance of the installation with OESC technical standards for electrical installations, products and equipment. MLITSD does not enforce OESC ESA permit requirements nor authorizations for connection of a system to the grid. We focus on who is doing the work and protecting workers from exposure to energized hazards. Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-001</u>



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-004 1), amended Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: Good afternoon, after reading the proposed amendment to the rule, requiring 48 hours to apply for electrical permit, should remain in the system to allow us contractors doing service work who do not have access to a phone or online planning during a customer visit for a permit application (phone calls up to 30 minutes wait, out of range or slow internet access, etc) With the amount of service calls taken care of in the course of 8 to 10 hour workday, adding a permit to every small service call would only create more problems and delays for some contractors and their service employees, and could result in more underground work. I do not understand why this rule cannot remain as is at 48 hours after the work has commenced or bare minimum 24 hours to allow contractors to file for permits the day after such service calls have been taken care of. Please reconsider leaving this rule for service calls. Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this recommendation.	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by Licensed	OESC Code Rule:	Thenk you for your angegement and yolughle	ESA decided not to proceed
Electrical	2-004 1)	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	with the proposal.
Contractor	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.	
Contractor	Completely oppose		
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been	
	We don't always fully know what the job entails until we get there so we won't know	considered by the ESA and have been discussed	
	what to take the permit out for. The customer may also change the scope of work once	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee	
	we're there. We will then be the ones to spend the extra time to amend permits. We	(OPCC). At this time, based on comments	
	had to call in to amend a permit since we couldn't do that on-line. Also, it's hard to take	received, ESA has decided not to proceed with	
	out a permit on jobs that last for more than a few days as again, we don't know the full	the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this	
	scope of the work.	recommendation.	
	The customer may postpone or even cancel the job the day or night before or even the		
	morning of the scheduled work. We will then end up having to reschedule or pay for		
	the inspection even though the work will not be completed since there's no way our		
	customer will pay if they're not having the work done.		
	We are a small business as are the majority of electrical contractors & we will be the		
	ones that have to spend the extra time amending permits, trying to contact the		
	inspector to cancel a scheduled inspection or end up paying for permits for work that		
	has been cancelled. We don't see how this will catch & cut down on contractors who are working		
	underground. They could be using unmarked vehicles so how will anyone know they're		
	doing work. This just causes more work for the contractors who are doing the work		
	legally.		
	Suggestion for Improvement:		
	Don't change the 48 hour window. Not sure what can be done to cut down on the		
	underground economy but it doesn't seem right to put it on the back of contractors who		
	are following the rules. It's just more red tape to deal with.		
	Alternative Proposal:		



2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted Stakeholder Comment ESA response Proposed change by				
 Comments:				

2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
by				
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-004 1) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: Online system for notifications is not always intuitive and still requires phone calls in some instances. ESA rationale also refers to wanting to criminalize more people. Suggestion for Improvement: Leave the 48 hour window in place Alternative Proposal: Move to a universal "Electrical Work" notification Comments:	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this recommendation. 	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.	



	2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change		
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-004 1) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: We as contractors need and use the 48hr often. I acknowledge the added difficulty to investigate but we as good contractors need not bear extra burdens because it's harder and more work for the ESA inspector to investigate. The primary goal is to get the work performed safely, and inspected. Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this recommendation.	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.		

2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted Stakeholder Comment Proposed Proposed				
by				
Licensed	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	ESA decided not to proceed	
Electrical	2-004 1)	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	with the proposal.	
Contractor	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.		
	Oppose			
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been		
	Removing 48hrs would be yet another Burden placed on	considered by the ESA and have been discussed		



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
	Contractors, don't fix what isn't broken has nothing to do under ground economy if someone is abusing use AMPS Suggestion for Improvement: Leave 2-004 as is Alternative Proposal: Leave as is Comments:	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this recommendation.	

Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-004 1) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: During emergency service calls (after hours), the focus should be on correcting/repairing the issue and not on clerical/administrative work prior to commencing work. Clerical/administrative work, such as filing for a permit, can be completed during the next business day, eliminating potential safety hazards due to fatigue caused by dealing with the situation longer than necessary due to added clerical/administrative work. Suggestion for Improvement:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this recommendation.	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
	Allow the 48 hour rule to remain in the code. Further clarify the rule, such as permit prior to commencement of work for new construction, renovation, or any other pre- planned construction work, while allowing 48 hours during unplanned work. Occupancy Permit require submission of a Certificate of Acceptance from the ESA. Alternative Proposal: New law that requires electrical permits to be submitted as part of the building permit process. Less focus on LEC, as new construction and renovations that require building permits also require the submission of a Certificate of Acceptance from the ESA to receive Occupancy Permits. More focus on enforcement of work being performed by non-licensed contractors. Comments:		

Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
Licensed	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	ESA decided not to proceed
Electrical	2-004 1)	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	with the proposal.
Contractor	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.	
	Oppose		
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been	
	Will increase burden on compliant contractors	considered by the ESA and have been discussed	
	Suggestion for Improvement:	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee	
		(OPCC). At this time, based on comments	
	Alternative Proposal:	received, ESA has decided not to proceed with	



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	Leave as is	the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this	
	Comments:	recommendation.	
	I am opposing the proposed change to rule 2-004 1), commonly know by LEC's as the		
	48 hour rule. It is my understanding that the reason for removing this 48 hour rule is to		
	help eliminate the underground economy. Changing this rule will do very little to		
	change the underground economy, but what it will do is increase the burden on many small LEC's.		
	The current notification system in place has its limitations as we all know, one of which		
	is the inability to edit permits. If the 48 hour rule were to be eliminated, this would		
	require LEC's to file for a notification before getting to site, which can be very difficult		
	using the on line system if you are in an area with poor cell service. There are many		
	instances where we do not know the full scope of the work involved, this is especially		
	true in the service sector. Having the proposed system would require us to take out a		
	notification based on what the customer has told us, which may not be what is really		
	required. Since we only know what the customer has told us, we use that information,		
	should we need to change the details of the notification number later we must call into		
	the call center which can be time consuming and is one reason that many LEC's wait		
	for small jobs and service calls to be completed before applying for the notification		
	number. This has no bearing on how the work is done as compliant contractors will		
	always do their best to do quality and compliant work.		
	With the majority of LEC's in the province being smaller (less than 5 man) shops, they		
	do not have the administration available to get all these notifications taken out before		
	the work is done. The most important part of a job is to take care of your customer and		
	get their situation resolved. In my opinion, the administration portion is secondary.		
	Should ESA inspectors come across a LEC that appears to be "gaming" the system,		
	then put that LEC on 100% inspection as that is probably where they should be.		
	Changing this rule will just make more work for compliant LEC's, I hope that you		
	reconsider changing this rule and leave it as it is		



oy Contractor Association ECAO)	OESC Code Rule: 2-004 1) Support/Oppose:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	ESA decided not to proceed
			ia a la
ECAO)	Support/Oppose:		with the proposal.
		code is better with your participation.	
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed	
	Suggestion for Improvement:	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments	
	Alternative Proposal:	received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this	
	Comments:	recommendation.	
	I am writing on behalf of the Electrical Contractors' Association of Ontario (ECAO) to		
	express our strong objection to the proposed deletion of the 48-hour easement for filing		
	electrical work notification. While we understand the ESA's stated desire to improve		
	efficiency and address the underground economy, we believe this proposal creates		
	unnecessary hardship for small contractors and service sector businesses without effectively tackling the intended issue.		
	Firstly, the ability to file a notification within 48 hours of starting work provides valuable		
	flexibility for smaller businesses and, more particularly, electrical contractors		
	performing service and maintenance work. Unexpected scheduling changes, last-		
	minute service calls, and emergency repairs are a reality in the electrical service		
	industry. Removal of this 48-hour notification easement could lead to situations where		
	qualified contractors are forced to choose between non-compliance and turning down		
	legitimate work.		
	Secondly, the assumption that a 48-hour filing window directly contributes to the underground economy lacks evidence. Unlicensed and uninsured electrical work is		



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	 often a deliberate effort to avoid regulations altogether, not a consequence of a minor administrative delay. Respectfully, the ESA's resources would be better directed towards improved detection and enforcement strategies for these bad actors. We firmly believe that a collaborative approach, combined with targeted enforcement efforts, will be far more effective in addressing the underground economy than placing undue burdens on legitimate businesses. Thank you for considering our concerns. I would be happy to discuss this matter further and explore potential solutions that ensure both public safety and a fair operating environment for all electrical contractors. 		

2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-004 1) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: The rationale for this proposal is not believable. Or, more accurately, the importance of this change in the context of the rationale is not believable. This is not about curtailing the underground economy, nor is it about safety: it's about taking away grey zones to make inspector lives easier. This is another example over-bureaucratization. The proposed change treats LECs like children. To equate an LEC with an unlicensed contractor for failing to be 100% timely in taking permits is insulting and it undermines respect for the ESA and the	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this recommendation.	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.	



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
	code. This is a common thread in recent changes: LECs (and inspectors) have less and less opportunity to exercise good judgement. If you take away all such opportunity you will scare away the best contractors and the best inspectors. Nobody wants to be a robot and people with good brains and the desire to use them will be attracted to other fields instead. Suggestion for Improvement: If the problem is *abuse* of the 48 hour grace period, then tackle the abuse, not the grace period Alternative Proposal:		
	Comments:		

2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted	itted Stakeholder Comment ESA response			
by				
Licensed	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	ESA decided not to proceed	
Electrical	2-004 1), amended	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	with the proposal.	
Contractor	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.		
	Oppose			
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been		
	48 hours is required to accurately report on work performed. Removing the 48 hours	considered by the ESA and have been discussed		
	for a notification will lead to much more administrative time correcting work performed	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee		
	specifically for those in the service call sectors. Often a service call is performed and	(OPCC). At this time, based on comments		
	leads to extra work not mentioned by customers. This would lead to mandatory calls to	received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the		



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	 ESA customer service to change the work listed on the notification and will require more customer service representatives to handle much higher volume of calls. Suggestion for Improvement: Keep rule 2-004 1) as written Alternative Proposal: If we must lose the ability to keep this rule intact, an alternative quick notification must be applied. Something simple like on the app or a quick solution from ESA to say LEC performing (insert residential, commercial or industrial) work at this address" Alternatively, allow us to modify our notifications online so we can accurately list the work performed. DO NOT rely on the ESA mobile app, we have areas where this app does not work at all in Northern Ontario, and in addition, at times we work where there is also no available cell signal to call out to customer service, further exasperating this instant notification amendment. It's not fair for rural workers and smaller contractors that do not have administration staff like ourselves. Comments: 		

2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.					
Submitted	omitted Stakeholder Comment Proposed change				
by					
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-004 1) Support/Oppose:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation.	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.		
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed			



2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
by				
	Suggestion for Improvement:	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, based on comments		
	Alternative Proposal:	received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this		
	Comments:	recommendation.		
	The largest issue, and I'm sure you will get lots of feedback, is the elimination of the 48			
	hours for a work notification. This is the single most disruptive amendment for the			
	collection of LECs. This will not help finding those participating in the underground			
	economy, it will only add pressure to LECs and small business owners alike with a			
	heavier administrative burden. We still operate in a province where there is no phone			
	signals, no internet available, and where the ESA mobile app does not work. There are			
	off grid specializing LECs who have to fly in or boat in to the work site and have zero			
	communication. The workers may not even know the entire scope of the work and the			
	scope of the work changes regularly. This 48 hours must remain intact.			

2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	Proposed change		
by				
Ontario	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	ESA decided not to proceed	
Government	2-004 1)	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	with the proposal.	
Ministry	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.		
(MLITSD)	No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements			
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been		
	MLITSD requirement for notice of project is not specifically triggered by electrical	considered by the ESA and have been discussed		
	installations. Consequently, ESA notice requirements have no effect on MLITSD	with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee		
	enforcement of NOP requirements	(OPCC). At this time, based on comments		



2024-OA-002: 2-004 1), amended Description of Change: Amend Ontario amendment to delete the 48 hour easement for filing a notification.				
Submitted	ted Stakeholder Comment Proposed change			
by				
	Suggestion for Improvement:	received, ESA has decided not to proceed with the proposal and the OPCC has endorsed this		
	Alternative Proposal:	recommendation.		
	Comments:			

Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-010 Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: The addition of EVSEs to residential settings will have more of an effect on the grid than adding a few to commercial/industrial establishments Suggestion for Improvement: Follow normal existing procedures for planning and approving electrical work Alternative Proposal: Comments:	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, the requirements for plan review for "two electrical vehicle supply equipment" has been deleted and the threshold for plan review submission remains at 20% of the rating of the service equipment. 	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-003</u>



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Municipal Government (City of Pickering)	OESC Code Rule: 2-010 1)f)i) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: The current rationale does not support why the installation of more than two EVSE is relevant and should be a limiting factor. All of the examples provided exceed two EVSE but are below the 20% of service rating threshold, and are identified as not requiring a plan submission. In fact, a greater number of lower-nameplate rating EVSE rather than a single (or two) larger EVSE increases diversity and reduces the likelihood of all EVSE being at 100% load at once. This proposed item unnecessarily impedes installation of multiple Level 2 (lower nameplate rating) EVSE. Suggestion for Improvement: Delete proposed item 2-010 1)f)i). Retain proposed item 2-010 1)f)ii) Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, the requirements for plan review for "two electrical vehicle supply equipment" has been deleted and the threshold for plan review submission remains at 20% of the rating of the service equipment.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-003</u>



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-010 Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: I agree for larger EVSE installations, plan review is appropriate, however, eliminate the i) proposal of the installation involves more than 2 EVSE. Keep the 20% of the service, that is a good target, however, I would add to that: Load shared across all EVSE is equal to or greater than 20% of the service that supplies it. Load sharing is in place and easily implemented, we should not be looking at nameplate versus it's use and actual power consumed if we are to apply plan review. The field inspection can ask for proof of the load sharing settings applied to the EVSE if this is a concern. Load sharing within a single dwelling is ideal for multiple EVSEs to share the equivalent of one EVSE circuit or offer multiple charging locations, while not changing the actual load to the service. This needs to be added here, much the same way a device can be used to eliminate an EVSE from load calculation by monitoring the service's draw, load sharing should be permitted to only have the total ACTUAL load as added to the service. Suggestion for Improvement: I believe 20% may be too low, I would raise that bar to 30% of actual load, not nameplate. There are expandable power modules on the market whose nameplate may say 120 kW for example, but they are actually set, loaded, and breaker sized for	Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, the requirements for plan review for "two electrical vehicle supply equipment" has been deleted and the threshold for plan review submission remains at 20% of the rating of the service equipment.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-003</u>



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
	80 kW. We have to look at this differently or the OESC will constantly fall behind and		
	play catch up.		
	Alternative Proposal:		
	Defining the kW totals that would trigger plan review, while also defining the service		
	sizes as viewed as appropriate from the committees would be acceptable in my view.		
	There is too much generalization in the OESC as there is, which would lead to		
	additional bulletins. Let's avoid that and write a well defined rule versus a catch all.		
	ESA is viewed as anti EV and anti green energy by many in the public due to		
	extremely strict code rules. If we start triggering plan review at every EVSE install		
	outside of a single dwelling, this only adds costs to a project and adds to that		
	reputation.		
	Comments:		

2024-OA-003: Rule 2-010, new Description of Change: Add Plan Review requirements for the installation of electric vehicle supply equipment in other than a single dwelling unit.					
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change		
by					
EV Charger	OESC Code Rule:	Ontario Electrical Safety Code: the code is	Based on the comments		
Retailer	2-010 f)	better with your participation.	received, this Ontario		
	Support/Oppose:		Amendment proposal has been		
	Oppose	The comments and suggestions have been	revised.		
	Rationale:	considered by the ESA and have been			
	While we appreciate the addition of the provision in 2-010(f), we are concerned that the proposed threshold set for which installations would be exempt from having to submit	discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, the	View 2024-OA-003		



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
	 plans before any electrical installation can commence, may cause delays in the deployment of smaller EV charging infrastructure deployment sites under certain threshold of power at a critical time when infrastructure is needed to be deployed in a timely and efficient manner. For larger projects EV charging or projects with higher capacity, we understand the need for the submission of plans; however, believe that for smaller projects, both residential and commercial, such requirements could cause delays to project deployment. Suggestion for Improvement: Suggest that the exemptions in section (f) are expanded to all charging use cases, not just single-family dwelling and changing the threshold for exemptions from two electric vehicle supply equipment, to a threshold of 50kW. Alternative Proposal: f) any installation of electrical vehicle supply equipment, with the exception of a single dwelling unit, where: i) the installation involves more than two electrical vehicle supply equipment 50kW of new load; or ii) the total nameplate rating(s) of the electrical vehicle supply equipment including both existing and new is greater than 20% of the rating of the service equipment; or Comments: 	requirements for plan review for "two electrical vehicle supply equipment" has been deleted and the threshold for plan review submission remains at 20% of the rating of the service equipment.	



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Dntario Government Ministry MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: 2-010 Support/Oppose: No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: MLITSD construction regulation focuses on safety of workers during installation electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE). Calculations about system capacity to handle the extra load once the EVSE is up and running would be done during design phase and not construction phase. Any requirements for work planning would pertain to risk assessment and hazard mitigation plan associated with the job related tasks required to install EVSE Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Ontario Electrical Safety Code: the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, the requirements for plan review for "two electrical vehicle supply equipment" has been deleted and the threshold for plan review submission remains at 20% of the rating of the service equipment.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has bee revised. <u>View 2024-OA-003</u>



Description o 1. Amend installat 2. Delete t	existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for elections. ions. The reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electional electional electional	tric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electri	c-power-generating equipment.
Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-010 1) e), Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: ESA rationale is in response to hypothetical changes made by others in the future and not to an actual need. Change for change sake Suggestion for Improvement: Make no change Alternative Proposal: Create a liability waiver for off grid work so the ESA doesn't get bogged down dealing with hunt, fish and sugar shacks Comments:	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). Off-grid installations are some of the installations ESA is wanting to capture with the removal of "operating in parallel" as noted in rationale and are viewed by ESA as an increase to safety. 	No change in the proposal. View 2024-OA-004



 2024-OA-004: Rule 2-010 1) e), amended Description of Change: Amend existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electric-power-generating equipment and energy storage systems for off-grid installations. Delete the reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric-power-generating equipment. 				
Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 2-010 1) e) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: Capacity of system may be too low, and wording is too vague which may cause undue financial hardship from costs incurred for engineering and ESA Plan Review processes for residential customers. Please note: a 100A, 240V, single phase AC residential service is only 24KW. You are proposing plan review for the equivalent of 41.6A at 240V, single phase AC. Is that really necessary? Suggestion for Improvement: Review capacity requirements and raise minimum KW rating. Further clarify if such plan review requirements are necessary for stand-alone and off-grid systems that do not feed back into the electricity grid. Clarify requirements for off-grid and stand-alone systems as well as grid feed-in systems. Alternative Proposal: I don't need plan review to put in a 600A single phase service (which at 240V is 144KW) but I need plan review for 41.6A at 240V single phase generating system? Limit should be increased to no less than 24KW. Comments:	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). A 10 kW system is not much different than a 20 kW therefore the related safety concerns still exist at the 10 kW rating. These systems are becoming more complex with more sources being interconnected and not just at larger facilities, but now at single dwellings. As such, ESA will keep the current "in excess of 10 kW" rating. 	No change in the proposal. View 2024-OA-004	



 2024-OA-004: Rule 2-010 1) e), amended Description of Change: Amend existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electric-power-generating equipment and energy storage systems for off-grid installations. Delete the reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric-power-generating equipment. 				
Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
Licensed Electrical Contractor	 OESC Code Rule: 2-010 1) e) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: I agree with the elimination of the OEB references, however, the 10 kW limit is too low. ESS and solar are modernizing and that 10 kW limit is dated. Tesla, to use as an example, has bi directional EVSE at 11.5 kW in their Gen3 wall connectors (thousands already installed), and Powerwall 3 base nameplate rating is 11.5 kW for home backup capabilities. These are not high risk installations as they are approved energy storage assemblies only installed by certified installers and not available to the general public. Plan review will see a very large increase to their workload, while the benefits are very minimal. Keep in mind this plan review would be triggered by the equivalent of one single loaded 15 amp circuit. A huge cost for very little reward other than monetary gain for ESA. Suggestion for Improvement: Ideally I would like to see plan review for ESS and renewables moved to 20 kW. I can see how ESA would not like that number, however with the growing energy needs of the province, such a number would be beneficial and I think we can agree a 10 kW system is not much different than a 20 kW this day and age. Much has changed in the industry with safe solutions to integrate solar and ESS technologies that do not involve tying into panel bus bars at the residential level (a limiting factor). With the use of backup interfaces at the residential level, integration of these systems are simple and typically are installed at the line side of the customer's panel. There would be export 	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). A 10 kW system is not much different than a 20 kW therefore the related safety concerns still exist at the 10 kW rating. These systems are becoming more complex with more sources being interconnected and not just at larger facilities, but now at single dwellings. As such, ESA will keep the current "in excess of 10 kW" rating. 	No change in the proposal. View 2024-OA-004	



fully support and invite plan review to that.

Comments:

2024-OA-004: Rule 2-010 1) e), amended **Description of Change:** 1. Amend existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electric-power-generating equipment and energy storage systems for off-grid installations. 2. Delete the reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric-power-generating equipment. **Stakeholder Comment Proposed change ESA** response Submitted by limitations required since Hydro One still limits net metering, but every manufacturer I used or trained for have this option programmable only for certified installers. Maybe adding a % of nameplate deviation would be wise rather than a hard set kW rating as well-committee discussion. **Alternative Proposal:** Add in bi directional EVSE as a defined ESS when connected to bi directional capable equipment. This I would limit to that 11.5 kW level as that is a safe L2 EVSE limit with the cable sizes and typical EVSE supplied circuits (2P60 breaker, 48 amps max). Should there be both EVSE bi directional charging AND ESS/solar intergrated, I would



2024-OA-004	Rule 2-010 1) e), amended					
Description of	of Change:					
1. Amend	existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electrical	ctric-power-generating equipment and energy sto	rage systems for off-grid			
installat	installations.					
2. Delete	the reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional elec	tric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric	-power-generating equipment.			
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change			
by						
Licensed Electrical Contractor	 OESC Code Rule: 2-010 1) e) Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: The 10kW threshold for 'micro-scale' was created at a time when 10kW was an enormous installation, which only a handful of customers would want in the province. Now it is not only routine, but an unwelcome constraint for a large proportion of clients. Equipment is routine and installations are comprehensively covered by existing code sections. The definition of micro-scale should be increased to 20kW or 30kW, which aligns with leading jurisdictions. Further, the amendment rationale states that risk is increased owing to home-owner installation: This is an unfair assessment for clean energy systems: homeowners are permitted to do any electrical work – calling out off-grid technology is unjustified. If you want to target home-owner installations, then make the home-owners submit. Installation of common residential fossil fuel generators does not require plan approval, without size constraints. Lastly: Low Voltage Reports vary wildly based on the plans examiner, and the content is usually completely useless, consisting mainly of re-stating the code. In general, it's a 	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). A 10 kW system is not much different than a 20 kW therefore the related safety concerns still exist at the 10 kW rating. These systems are becoming more complex with more sources being interconnected and not just at larger facilities, but now at single dwellings. As such, ESA will keep the current "in excess of 10 kW" rating. 	No change in the proposal. View 2024-OA-004			



 2024-OA-004:
 Rule 2-010 1) e), amended

 Description of Change:
 1. Amend existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electric-power-generating equipment and energy storage systems for off-grid installations.

 2.
 Delete treference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric-power-generating equipment.

 Submitted by
 Stakeholder Comment

 Proposed change

 OR
 OR

Raise the threshold for Plan Approval from 10kW to 30kW.	
OR	
 Target the risk factors directly: set the threshold at 10kW UNLESS the work is being done by an LEC, in which case the threshold is 30kW. Alternative Proposal: e) any installations within the scope of Section 64 or bi-directional electrical vehicle supply equipment with an output rating in excess of 30 kW; or Comments: 	

 2024-OA-004: Rule 2-010 1) e), amended

 Description of Change:

 1. Amend existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electric-power-generating equipment and energy storage systems for off-grid installations.

 2. Delete the reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric-power-generating equipment.

 Submitted by
 Stakeholder Comment

 Vicensed
 CSC Code Rule:

Licensed
Electrical
ContractorOESC Code Rule:
2-010 1) e)
Support/Oppose:Thank you for your engagement and valuable
insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the
code is better with your participation.No change in the proposal.View 2024-OA-004



 2024-OA-004: Rule 2-010 1) e), amended Description of Change: Amend existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electric-power-generating equipment and energy storage systems for off-grid installations. Delete the reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric-power-generating equipment. 				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
by	Rationale: Suggestion for Improvement:	The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee		
	Alternative Proposal:	(OPCC). A 10 kW system is not much different than a 20		
	Comments: Good proposals on the most part, I feel ESA is missing the mark a bit on EVSE and ESS in regard to plan review limits, but also understand the importance of the safety of the industry. I would really like to see that 10 kW micro generation and ESS limit get increased, and realize it's based on a dead microfit standard that is acknowledged within the amendments. I feel it would be a mistake not to look at increasing that 10 kW threshold, just as it would be a mistake to not look at load shared EVSE and their actual loads versus nameplate at 100%. Both of these issues I raised are dated, and removes the agility that manufacturers give us with their product options, which leaves us further behind and much more costly to the customer in North America.	kW therefore the related safety concerns still exist at the 10 kW rating. These systems are becoming more complex with more sources being interconnected and not just at larger facilities, but now at single dwellings. As such, ESA will keep the current "in excess of 10 kW" rating. The Ontario Energy Board's (OEB) Distribution System Code still references 10 kW as "microsize."		



2024-OA-004: Rule 2-010 1) e), amended **Description of Change:** 1. Amend existing Ontario amendment to require submission of the electrical design for electric-power-generating equipment and energy storage systems for off-grid installations. 2. Delete the reference to Ontario Energy Board (OEB) definition and add bi-directional electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as electric-power-generating equipment. **Stakeholder Comment Proposed change ESA** response Submitted by No change in the proposal. Thank you for your engagement and valuable Ontario **OESC Code Rule:** Government 2-010 1) e) insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. View 2024-OA-004 Ministry Support/Oppose: (MLITSD) No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements The comments and suggestions have been Rationale: considered by the ESA and have been This amendment pertains to d calculations and design of the system to ensure it meets discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code technical standards of the OESC. This is beyond MLITSD CHSP worker safety Committee (OPCC). mandate. Any engineered design drawings for the EVSE that pertain to safety of workers during the EVSE installation must be complied with on the project. **Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal:** Comments:

2024-OA-005: Rule 6-100 and 6-200, new Description of Change: Add Ontario amendment to permit the use of meter-mounted transfer switches.				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment ESA response Proposed change			
by				
Licensed	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	ESA decided not to proceed	
Electrical	6-100 and 6-200	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code;	with the proposal.	
Contractor	Support/Oppose:	the code is better with your participation.		



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
ру			
	Support		
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been	
	This will greatly increase the ease of installing backup power	considered by the ESA and discussed with the	
	Suggestion for Improvement:	Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At	
		this time, the OPCC has rejected the proposal,	
	Alternative Proposal:	and based on this decision, the ESA has	
	•	decided not to proceed with it. ESA will keep	
	Comments:	monitoring how this proposal is progressing on	
		the National level.	

Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Licensed Electrical Contractor	OESC Code Rule: 6-100 and 6-200 Support/Oppose: Support Rationale: Excellent addition to the OESC, there are other meter mounted transfer switches in the pipeline and approved in the US coming our way. Limiting to 200 amps is also wise. Good move! Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, the OPCC has rejected the proposal, and based on this decision, the ESA has decided not to proceed with it. ESA will keep	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.



	2024-OA-005: Rule 6-100 and 6-200, new				
Description d	Description of Change: Add Ontario amendment to permit the use of meter-mounted transfer switches.				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment ESA response Proposed change				
by					
	Comments:	monitoring how this proposal is progressing on			
		the National level.			

Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
Local	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	ESA decided not to proceed
Distribution	6-100 and 6-200	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code;	with the proposal.
Company	Support/Oppose:	the code is better with your participation.	
(Hydro One	Support		
Networks Inc)	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been	
	It's important to keep all relevant information together in the same clause and not force	considered by the ESA and discussed with the	
	the user to hunt for all relevant information scattered throughout the book.	Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At	
	Suggestion for Improvement:	this time, the OPCC has rejected the proposal,	
	Add new subrule 5) to rule 6-200: "In accordance with the requirement of the supply	and based on this decision, the ESA has	
	authority."		
	Alternative Proposal:	decided not to proceed with it. ESA will keep	
		monitoring how this proposal is progressing on	
	Comments:	the National level.	



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
Ontario Government Ministry (MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule:6-100 and 6-200Support/Oppose:SupportNo conflict with reg 213/91 requirementsRationale:Agree with amendments for homeowner meter-mounted transfer switches on the lineside to prevent back up power sources from backfeeding to the utility's grid and riskingthe safety of utility workersSuggestion for Improvement:Alternative Proposal:Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). At this time, the OPCC has rejected the proposal, and based on this decision, the ESA has decided not to proceed with it. ESA will keep monitoring how this proposal is progressing on the National level.	ESA decided not to proceed with the proposal.

2024-OA-006: Rule 8-002; 8-106; Appendix B to Rule 8-106 10); and 8-500, amended Description of Change: Add Ontario Amendment to permit the use of other types of energy management systems in addition to electric vehicle energy management system (EVEMS).				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
by				
Licensed	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	No change in the proposal.	
Electrical	8-106	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the		
Contractor	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.	View 2024-OA-006	
	Support			
	Rationale:			



	2024-OA-006: Rule 8-002; 8-106; Appendix B to Rule 8-106 10); and 8-500, amended Description of Change: Add Ontario Amendment to permit the use of other types of energy management systems in addition to electric vehicle energy management system (EVEMS).			
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
by				
	Great update to include other loads of the home to fit in a smaller service. We often get requests of customers with 100 amp services wanting 200 amps, but the utility charges upwards of \$15,000 for their end of the upgrade and is not financially viable, while the customer has energy needs that would exceed a load calculation. Suggestion for Improvement:	The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC).		
	Alternative Proposal:			
	Comments:			

Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
Licensed Electrical	OESC Code Rule: Rule 8-002; 8-106; Appendix B to Rule 8-106 10); and 8-500, amended	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	No change in the proposa
Contractor	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.	View 2024-OA-006
	Support		
	Rationale:	The comments and suggestions have been	
	This is excellent and must be applied to *generation* as well. The wording supports	considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee	
	this. This permits generic bus-bar loading management systems, consistent with the UL1741PCS equipment standard.	(OPCC).	



2024-OA-006: Rule 8-002; 8-106; Appendix B to Rule 8-106 10); and 8-500, amended Description of Change: Add Ontario Amendment to permit the use of other types of energy management systems in addition to electric vehicle energy management system (EVEMS).			
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
	Specifically, this change should permit energy management system (EMS) to satisfy 64-112 g) ie using an EMS to reduce the operating characteristics of connected generation to allow connecting that generation on a breaker compliant with sections e) or f). Suggestion for Improvement:		
	Alternative Proposal:		
	Comments:		

2024-OA-006: Rule 8-002; 8-106; Appendix B to Rule 8-106 10); and 8-500, amended Description of Change: Add Ontario Amendment to permit the use of other types of energy management systems in addition to electric vehicle energy management system (EVEMS).				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
by				
Ontario Government Ministry (MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: Rule 8-002; 8-106; Appendix B to Rule 8-106 10); and 8-500, amended Support/Oppose: Support No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: Agree with amendments to permit the use of newer technology for other types of energy management systems in addition to electric vehicle energy management system (EVEMS)	 Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). 	No change in the proposal.	



	: Rule 8-002; 8-106; Appendix B to Rule 8-106 10); and 8-500, amended of Change: Add Ontario Amendment to permit the use of other types of energy matrix	anagement systems in addition to electric vehicle	energy management system		
Submitted	mitted Stakeholder Comment Proposed change Proposed change				
by					
	Suggestion for Improvement:				
	Alternative Proposal:				
	Comments:				

2024-OA-007: Rule 8-202 3) d), new Description of Change: Add Ontario amendment to require the addition of electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) loads that are supplied from a panelboard within a dwelling unit.			
Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Ontario Government Ministry (MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: Rule 8-202 3) d), new Support/Oppose: No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: Load calculations to determine the size of a panelboard inside a dwelling that supplies an EVSE are not within the jurisdiction of the MLITSD CHSP legislation. Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation.	No change in the proposal.



2024-OA-008	: Rule 10-004 and 10-116 6) and Definition, delete		
Description of	of Change: Delete Ontario Amendment (OA) special terminology for "Effectively g	rounded metal structural frame of a building" in R	ule 10-004 and delete OA to
Rule 10-116 6	and associated Appendix B note.		
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
Ontario Government Ministry (MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: Rule 10-004 and 10-116 6) and Definition, delete Support/Oppose: No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: Change in terminology to broaden the scope of adequate grounding does not affect grounding requirements under O .Reg 213/91 Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation.	No change in the proposal. <u>View 2024-OA-008</u>

	Rule 36-200, new f Change: Add Ontario amendment to permit Supply Authority owned primary me	etering equipment installed ahead of the consume	ers service equipment.
Submitted Stakeholder Comment Proposed change			
by			
Local	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	Based on the comments
Distribution	36-200	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the	received, this Ontario
Company	Support/Oppose:	code is better with your participation.	Amendment proposal has
(Utilities	Oppose		been revised.
Standards	Rationale:		



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Forum, Ontario Electricity Distributors)	 There is a difference between ownership of equipment and where the equipment and is located. There are various scenarios where the supply authority may be the owner, or controller of the equipment, and in each case where the equipment is located is another matter. To clarify, the Suggestion for Improvement is to replace the word owner with controlled in 2) of the amendment, as shown in blue I have spoken to a few LDCs. I hope this helps understand what LDCs are facing: The PME contains LDC measurement instrumentation. The PME is owned by the customer as it is installed specifically for the customer vs generic for the system and owned by the LDC (and going into rate based). The PME sits on the supply side of demarcation as the LDCs need to access the LDC's measurement instrumentation. Rationale for having the PME located on the supply side of the customer service entrance is as follows: Improves ease of access for us Eliminates risk of PME failure causing damage to customers switchgear Eliminates risk of Customer switchgear equipment failure resulting in damage to our PME Improves safety for our employees, they do not have to enter switchgear which would be maintained by the customer (it is unknown if it meets LDCs maintenance standards) This diagram along with the above shows the purpose of the amendment to 6-402 (2), allowing this installation. 	The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). A new Appendix B note with the suggested diagram has been added based on the submitted comments.	<u>View 2024-OA-009</u>



ubmitted V	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	Demarcation Customer's Service Entrance		
	PME OT		
	This explains what the reality is and what we want to ensure is possible going forward.		
	A goal is not always meant to be reached, it often serves simply as something to aim		
	at		
	Suggestion for Improvement:		
	Service equipment and metering location 1) Service equipment shall be installed in a location that complies with the		
	requirements of the supply authority and, in the case of a building, shall be at the point		
	of service entrance.		
	2) Metering equipment shall be connected on the load side of the service equipment,		
	except that it shall be permitted on the supply side when the metering equipment is		
	owned controlled by the supply authority.		
	Alternative Proposal:		
	2) Metering equipment shall be connected on the load side of the service		
	equipment, except that it shall be permitted on the supply side when the		
	equipment contains the supply authority's revenue metering equipment is		
	owned by.		
	Comments:		



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
Ontario Government Ministry (MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: Rule 36-200, new Support/Oppose: No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: Amendment to Service equipment and metering location and respective responsibility for connection to load side by homeowner's electrician and to the line side by utility owner is in line with current MLITSD enforcement of sections 182 and 181 respectively Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestions have been considered by the ESA and have been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). After this discussion, selected changes have been made based on the submitted comments.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has beer revised. <u>View 2024-OA-009</u>

Description of Change: Delete CE code Section 56, Optical Fiber Cables from the Scope of the OESC.				
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change	
ру				
Ontario	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	No change in the proposal.	
overnment	Section 56, delete	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code;		
inistry	Support/Oppose:	the code is better with your participation.	View 2024-OA-010	
//LITSD)	No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements			
	Rationale:			
	Removal of this section does not affect MLITSD CHSP compliance requirements for			
	communications employers and optical fiber installers (Network Cabling Specialists)			



2024-OA-010: Section 56, delete Description of Change: Delete CE code Section 56, Optical Fiber Cables from the Scope of the OESC.				
Submitted	bmitted Stakeholder Comment Proposed change Proposed change			
by				
	Suggestion for Improvement:			
	Alternative Proposal:			
	Comments:			

	2024-OA-011: Rule 68-072, delete				
Description (of Change: Delete Ontario Amendment about maintenance disconnecting means Stakeholder Comment	E FOR POOLS and associated Appendix B note.	Proposed change		
by					
Ontario	OESC Code Rule:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable	No change in the proposal.		
Government	Rule 68-072, delete	insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code;			
Ministry	Support/Oppose:	the code is better with your participation.	View 2024-OA-011		
(MLITSD)	No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements				
	Rationale:				
	The deleted section of the code pertains to technical installation requirements not worker safety. Deletion of section for maintenance disconnecting means for pool pumps, spas, and hot tubs does not affect Reg213/91 GFCI requirements for when a portable electrical tool is used outdoors or in wet locations including near pools, spas hot tubs				
	Suggestion for Improvement:				
	Alternative Proposal:				
	Comments:				



2024-OA-011: Rule 68-072, delete			
Description of Change: Delete Ontario Amendment about maintenance disconnecting means for pools and associated Appendix B note.			
Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			

Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by			
Ontario Government Ministry (MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: Table 104, amended Support/Oppose: No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: Amendment to table 4 - Depth of setting of poles in soil -does not affect MLITSD CHSP enforcement of EUSR requirements for utility poles nor safety requirements for the use of digger derrick/telehandler and operator training. Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation.	No change in the proposal.



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
Local Distribution Company (Hydro One Networks Inc)	 OESC Code Rule: Rule 75-814, amended Support/Oppose: Oppose Rationale: We disagree with the removal of the 10 volts NEV limit from section 75-814 from private primary lines as it removes a commonality between customer owned and distributor owned lines. As these neutral systems are interconnected, putting a limit on one and not the other is both not reasonable and not practical. Removing the limit from privately owned lines may lead to an increase in the number and/or severity of stray voltage incidents. The following points provide additional rationale against the proposed change. It is typical for a distributer to limit neutral to earth voltage to 10 volts and it is a common historical practice amongst distributors. The proposed change does not align with the statement in the amendment "Neither distributor standards nor industry standards contain any acceptable thresholds for maximum allowed neutral voltage." As an electrical distributer we agree and confirm that the elimination of voltage and current over the neutral conductor is not possible. Because it is not possible to reduce voltage and current over the neutral conductor to zero, a voltage threshold is necessary. The removal of the existing 10-volt limit may have the unintended effect of actually increasing public shock hazard. We are looking for clarification on the statement from Appendix B Note 75-814 3 "The neutral voltage (measured between two separate reference points) should be reduced to achieve safety and prevent potential shock hazard". This statement is unclear whether this is referring to Neutral to Earth voltage (NEV), or the potential difference between two contact points. Consumer grounding and bonding is critical to the utility with respect to NEV levels during fault 	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation. The comments and suggestion have been considered by the ESA and has been discussed with the Ontario Provincial Code Committee (OPCC). A new Appendix B note to the Rule has been added based on the submitted comments.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has bee revised. <u>View 2024-OA-013</u>



Submitted by	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
	 conditions. If there is a concern regarding points of contact, ensuring that those points are appropriately bonded would greatly reduce or eliminate the public shock hazard. We disagree with the addition of "Other jurisdictions and authorities may have codes and standards with threshold requirements for stray voltage and currents that can be related to other applications, such as animal contacts". to appendix B Note 75-814 3) The ambiguity of the statement may cause inappropriate application of codes and standards to situations they were not designed for. The code and manufacturers' requirements for bonding around animal contact points differ significantly from bonding in a residential home - a direct comparison in testing would be inappropriate. Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: 		



Submitted	Stakeholder Comment	ESA response	Proposed change
by Ontario Government Ministry (MLITSD)	OESC Code Rule: Rule 75-814, amended Support/Oppose: Support No conflict with reg 213/91 requirements Rationale: MLITSD jurisdiction covers worker safety during installation of electrical systems. This amendment pertains to technical installation parameters and multiple grounding of neutral conductors. Although this goes beyond MLITSD jurisdiction the Ministry supports the intent to reduce stray voltage that may pose a risk to workers and the public. Suggestion for Improvement: Alternative Proposal: Comments:	Thank you for your engagement and valuable insight into the Ontario Electrical Safety Code; the code is better with your participation.	Based on the comments received, this Ontario Amendment proposal has been revised. <u>View 2024-OA-013</u>