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Measuring the policy environment for renewable energy in Ontario

- Research objective
  - Assess private sector views on policy and investment environment for renewable energy in Ontario
  - Use data-driven analysis to identify areas of policy strength and issues for reform

- Surveys of renewable energy firms active in Canada, implemented during Fall 2008
  - 63 wind developers, 12 solar developers, 36 manufacturers
  1. What criteria make a jurisdiction attractive for renewable energy firms?
  2. How does Ontario rate on these criteria?
Motivation

- **Ontario government has adopted explicit green energy policy goals since 2003**
  - Initial targets of 1350 MW (5%) of new renewable power generation capacity by 2007, 2700 MW (10%) by 2010
  - Current ‘green manufacturing’ employment objectives

- **But private sector investment levels in renewable MW and manufacturing have been relatively low in Ontario**
  - 1/3 of annual MW investment rate per capita in U.S. states with Renewable Portfolio Standards
  - Only 60% of 2007 MW target achieved by November 2008
  - Only significant renewable energy manufacturing in Ontario is a wind tower plant in Fort Erie
Survey topics

1. Operational environment
   – E.g. Natural environment conditions, skilled labour cost and availability, size of regional market, proximity to suppliers

2. Regulatory policies
   – E.g. Financial/tax incentives, PPA rates, length of PPAs, availability of transmission capacity

3. Regulatory governance and process
   – E.g. Stability of policy, coordination between government bodies, presence of long-term targets, ease of obtaining permits
## Criteria affecting attractiveness of a jurisdiction for renewable energy investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wind firms (29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Most Important Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural wind conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stability of the policy environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transmission capacity availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Least Important Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Investment / tax subsidies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Availability of engineering and construction expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Proximity to equipment manufacturers / suppliers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria affecting attractiveness of a jurisdiction for renewable energy investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Most Important Criteria</th>
<th>Wind firms (29)</th>
<th>Solar firms (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Natural wind conditions</td>
<td>1. PPA rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Stability of the policy environment</strong></td>
<td>2. PPA length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Transmission capacity availability</td>
<td>3. <strong>Stability of the policy environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Least Important Criteria</td>
<td>13. Investment / tax subsidies</td>
<td>15. Availability of engineering and construction expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Proximity to equipment manufacturers / suppliers</td>
<td>17. Proximity to equipment manufacturers / suppliers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria affecting attractiveness of a jurisdiction for renewable energy investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Most Important Criteria</th>
<th>Wind firms (29)</th>
<th>Solar firms (8)</th>
<th>Technology manufacturers (15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Ontario ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wind firms (29)</th>
<th>Solar firms (8)</th>
<th>Technology manufacturers (15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 highest rated criteria in Ontario</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 lowest rated criteria in Ontario</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 lowest rated criteria in Ontario</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Availability of engineering and construction expertise</td>
<td>15. Coordination between government-related bodies</td>
<td>18. Content of skilled labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Length of PPA</td>
<td>1. Availability of transmission capacity</td>
<td><strong>3 lowest rated criteria in</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ease of obtaining rights to land</td>
<td><strong>3 lowest rated criteria in Ontario</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 lowest rated criteria in Ontario</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transparency of PPA process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key findings from the surveys

1. Renewable energy companies rate regulatory governance aspects as equally important as specific regulatory policies, and more important than operational factors on average, when assessing the attractiveness of jurisdictions for investment.
   - i.e. how policies are made is critical for investors

2. The long-term stability of policy for renewable energy consistently ranks among the most important factors in private sector investment decisions among competing jurisdictions.

3. In Ontario, the stability of renewable energy policy is rated as one of the weakest aspects of the investment environment.
Policy instability in Ontario

• Renewable energy MW capacity targets
  – 2003 – initial targets publicly announced
  – 2005 – targets superseded by IPSP planning process
  – 2008 – IPSP process adjourned
  – Future targets will be reviewed at least every 3 years

• Renewable energy policy instruments
  – 2006 RESOP introduced; 2008 RESOP suspended; 2009 biogas RESOP re-instated
  – Sporadic RES RfPs
    • 2004 RES I; 2005 RES II and III; 2006 RES III postponed; 2007 RES III recommenced; 2009 RES process to be replaced with FIT

• Project approvals and permitting processes
  – Delays reported in obtaining all necessary permits
Developer responses to regulatory risk

1. Lower investment levels and jurisdictional priority for Ontario
   - Ontario is a “U.S. Production Tax Credit hedge”
     - U.S. IPP

2. Higher renewable energy project bid prices
   - “For the first time in RES III, we’ve had to price in these risks…It’s very back of the envelope but it’s definitely priced”
     - Canadian IPP

3. Lobbying and government relations
   - “Their [developers] futures will depend increasingly on political influence rather than business acumen”
     - Senior industry official
Regulatory governance structure in Ontario creates conditions for chronic instability in renewable energy policy

- Overarching power of Minister
  - Authority to initiate directives to OPA to procure new MW (RES RfPs)
  - Authority to direct OPA to revise IPSP supply mix recommendations
  - (Re)Appoints OPA board members to 1-3 year terms
- Revolving ministerial appointments by Premier
  - 4 ministers, 5 deputy ministers in Ministry of E&I since 2003
- Fragmented agency structure and weak coordination in implementing broad green energy policy objectives
Implications for regulatory reform

- Governance of energy sector in need of reform to insulate policy from short term political pressures, creating longer term stability

- Some suggestions for ‘de-politicizing’ regulatory policy
  1. Limit degree of ministerial directive authority
  2. Use legislation to enshrine long-term carbon emissions or renewable MW targets
  3. Appoint agency board members to 5 year, staggered terms

- By reducing regulatory risk, governance reform will enable renewable energy policies to achieve their goals at reasonable cost to consumers and taxpayers