

List of complaints

CUSTOMER	DATE OF FILING WITH THE RÉGIE DE L'ÉNERGIE DU QUÉBEC	NATURE OF THE COMPLAINT	DECISION
<i>NRG Power Marketing Inc. and PG&E National Energy Group Inc.</i>	February 22, 2002	TransÉnergie allegedly violated the terms of its OATT and its code of conduct by granting Hydro-Québec certain firm point-to-point transmission rights notwithstanding the fact that NRG had previously filed applications on OASIS for the same firm transmission rights in a timely manner.	Complaint dismissed by the Régie de l'énergie, Décision D-2002-260.
<i>Énergie Brookfield Marketing Inc. (formerly known as Brascan Energy Marketing Inc.)</i>	February 17, 2006	<i>Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.</i> complained more specifically of TransÉnergie's practice as Transmission Provider of giving preference to transmission applications made by Hydro-Québec Production for imports into Quebec as a non-designated resource to supply the Native Load within the meaning of the OATT.	<i>Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.</i> withdrew its complaint on May 16, 2006.
<i>Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (P-110-1566)</i>	January 11, 2008	Contestation of Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's interpretation of its OATT and its decision to consider certain amendments to an application for firm point-to-point transmission service as a "substantial change".	Further to filing by the Transmission Provider of a motion in declinatory exception and for dismissal, the Régie granted the motion and discontinued its examination of this complaint, Decision D-2009-025.

CLIENT	DATE DE DÉPÔT À LA RÉGIE DE L'ÉNERGIE DU QUÉBEC	NATURE DE LA PLAINTÉ	DÉCISION
<p><i>Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (P-110-1565)</i></p>	<p>January 11, 2008</p>	<p>Contestation of Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's interpretation of its OATT and its decision relating to determination of the available transmission capability on Lines 7051, 7052 and 7053 between the Churchill Falls generating station and Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's transmission system, the failure to post the available transmission capability on the said lines on OASIS and the Distributor's priority for use of the said line to supply the Native Load under Part IV of the OATT.</p>	<p>Complaint dismissed by the Régie de l'énergie, Decision D-2010-053.</p> <p>An application for administrative review of this decision was made in file P-130-002. Administrative review dismissed by the Regie. Decision D-2011-040.</p>
<p><i>Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (P-110-1597)</i></p>	<p>April 4, 2008</p>	<p>Contestation of final character of system impact studies relating to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's transmission service applications for purposes of computing the 45-day deadline specified in para 19.3 of Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's OATT.</p> <p>Further to the filing by the Transmission Provider of a motion in declinatory exception and for dismissal, the Régie noted Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's withdrawal of one of its conclusions, struck one conclusion and maintained the remaining conclusions for examination on the merits, Decision D-2009-026.</p>	<p>Complaint dismissed by the Régie de l'énergie, Decision D-2010-053.</p> <p>An application for administrative review of this decision was made in file P-130-002. Administrative review dismissed by the Regie. Decision D-2011-040.</p>

CLIENT	DATE DE DÉPÔT À LA RÉGIE DE L'ÉNERGIE DU QUÉBEC	NATURE DE LA PLAINTÉ	DÉCISION
<i>Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (P-110-1678)</i>	October 31, 2008	<p>Contestation of Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's interpretation of its OATT and its decision to consider Newfoundland and Labrador's request, following receipt of the system impact study relative to its transmission service application, to commence negotiations to enter transmission service agreements for certain segments of the transmission service originally applied for, as a new transmission service application that was deficient in view of the failure to specify all the information required by section 17 of the OATT.</p> <p>Following filing by the Transmission Provider of a motion in declinatory exception, the Régie noted Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's withdrawal of one of its conclusions, struck one conclusion and maintained the remaining conclusions for examination on the merits, Decision D-2009-027.</p>	<p>Complaint dismissed by the Régie de l'énergie, Decision D-2010-053.</p> <p>An application for administrative review of this decision was made in file P-130-002. Administrative review dismissed by the Regie. Decision D-2011-040.</p>
<i>Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (P-110-1692)</i>	November 24, 2008	<p>Contestation of Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's interpretation of its OATT and its decision to declare that a transmission service application was deficient in view of the failure to specify all the information required by section 17 of the OATT.</p> <p>Following filing by the Transmission Provider of a motion in declinatory exception, the Régie noted Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's withdrawal of one of its conclusions, struck one conclusion and maintained the remaining conclusions for examination on the merits, Decision D-2009-027.</p>	<p>Complaint withdrawn by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro during the hearings on complaints P-110-1565; P-110-1597 and P-110-1678 in January and February 2010.</p>

CLIENT	DATE DE DÉPÔT À LA RÉGIE DE L'ÉNERGIE DU QUÉBEC	NATURE DE LA PLAINTÉ	DÉCISION
<i>Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.</i> (P-130-001)	March 15, 2010	<i>Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.</i> is complaining of Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's refusal, as Transmission Provider, to renew annual firm point-to-point transmission service on the MATI-HQT-NE path for the period commencing April 1, 2010.	The Regie granted the right of renewal to the plaintiff, Decision D-2010-160.
<i>Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.</i> (P-130-003)	June 10, 2010	<i>Brookfield Energy Marketing Inc.</i> is complaining of Hydro-Québec TransÉnergie's refusal, as Transmission Provider, to renew annual firm point-to-point transmission service on the ON-HQT-NE path for the period commencing October 22, 2010.	The Regie granted the right of renewal to the plaintiff, Decision D-2010-160.