| 1 | Q. | Reference: CA-NLH-059 from the 2012 Hydro Depreciation Application: | |
|----|----|---|--|
| 2 | | Re: C | alculation Procedure: Please state all reasons the Company did not propose a |
| 3 | | chan | ge to the Equal Life Group calculation procedure. To the extent any analyses |
| 4 | | perto | nining to this procedure were performed, provide all such analyses. |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | Reference: CA-NLH-060 from the 2012 Hydro Depreciation Application: | |
| 7 | | Re: IFRS: Please identify, explain, rank and justify the benefits and detriments | |
| 8 | | associated with sinking fund, ASL (and average life group if different than ASL), and | |
| 9 | | ELG depreciation as such relate to compliance with IFRS. Further, provide a complete | |
| 10 | | copy of each IAS of the IFRS referenced in the response (i.e., IAS 16, etc.). | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | Please file, and update as applicable, Hydro's responses to | |
| 13 | | (a) | CA-NLH-59 above. |
| 14 | | (b) | CA-NLH-60 above. |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | A. | This response has been provided by Concentric Advisors. | |
| 18 | | a) | Concentric Advisors note that there is no update required to CA-NLH-59. |
| 19 | | b) | With regard to any updates to information request CA-NLH-60 from the |
| 20 | | | 2012 proceeding, Concentric notes that the proposed plan to implement the |
| 21 | | | ELG procedure on a phased-in basis has resulted in a change in the |
| 22 | | | underlying method and therefore depreciation rates using ELG for all |
| 23 | | | vintages have not been prepared. Further, any comparisons to depreciation |
| 24 | | | rates using ELG for all vintages would not be meaningful to the proposals |
| 25 | | | being made in this depreciation study. |