

# Outage Management Process Redesign (SE-109)



## Minutes of Meeting

<b>Date held:</b> June 4, 2014	<b>Time held:</b> 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	<b>Location held:</b> IESO
<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Attended</b>	<b>Attendance Status</b> (A)ttended; (R) Registered; (S)ubstitute; (TC) Teleconference
Brighton Beach Power	Little, Dave	TC
Brookfield Renewable Power	Dumoulin, Serge	TC
Bruce Power	Hodgson, Rick	TC
Bruce Power	Villegas, Gabriel	TC
Capital Power	Ng, Thomas	TC
Gerdau	Simmons, Dave	A
Goreway Station Partnership	Maddix, Melanie	TC
Great Lakes Power	Alton, Tiana	TC
Hydro One	Waite, Ed	TC
Hydro One	Naveed, Haider	TC
Kingston Generating Station	Donnelly, Keith	TC
Northland Power	Veldhuizen, Jon	TC
Ontario Power Generation	Gray, Jim	TC
Portlands Energy Centre	Rouhi, Amir	TC
TransAlta	Nguyen, Thanh	TC
IESO	Chow, Clarence	A
IESO	Gojmerac, Mark	A
IESO	Harrison, Susan	A
Scribe: Clarence Chow, Operations Change Initiatives, IESO Please report any corrections, additions or deletions to: <a href="mailto:stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca">stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca</a>		

All meeting material is available on the IESO web site at:

<http://www.ieso.ca/Pages/Participate/Stakeholder-Engagement/SE-109.aspx>

### Item 1 Welcome, Introduction and Opening Remarks

Susan Harrison welcomed the attendees to the Outage Management Process Redesign Consultation (SE-109) meeting.

## Item 2 IESO Response to Stakeholder Feedback on the April 23 Meeting Materials

Mark Gojmerac presented feedback received from members and IESO actions resulting from comments on the following: removing 'At Risks' from the 18 Month Outlook, the Quarterly Advance Approval process methodology, and proposed software capabilities.

The following are questions that were asked during the presentation by stakeholders along with the IESO's responses (in italics):

A member raised the concern that the details of the Final Process Redesign are currently spread out over several SE-109 presentations and asked if a single complete process document could be provided.

*The IESO responded that a single process document will be developed and made available prior to the next SE-109 meeting.*

In response to the IESO's proposal of retaining historical outage requests in the new system for five years, a member asked if participants would be provided the capability of retrieving their historical outage requests from the existing system.

*The IESO responded that a mechanism for retrieving historical outage requests is being considered and will be proposed at the next SE-109 meeting.*

An API user member asked if the IESO would consider adding a "parked" outage status to the life cycle of an outage request in the new software. This state is currently used in the API user's own software and allows them to place an advance approved outage into a 'hold' state for future use (i.e. resubmission) if the participant determined that the advance approved outage request could no longer proceed as initially planned.

*The IESO responded that the new software solution does not have such a state; however, in the new software the "Draft" state could perhaps be used for this purpose. The IESO suggested further discussing the details of the "parked" state individually with the API user participant prior to following up with the vendor.*

A member asked if the public/confidential permissions model for comment fields could be extended to apply to interconnections so that participants can view outages relevant to the interconnection.

*The IESO responded that the permissions model could be extended to allow third party participants the ability to view interconnection related outages provided that the neighbouring jurisdiction had no confidentiality issues by doing so.*

In response to the requirement that in-progress Planned and Opportunity outage requests require a new submission to reflect an extension, an API user member asked if the new submission is to be created by the API user participant's software or by the IESO's software solution.

*The IESO responded that details on how the new submission would be processed between the two software solutions needs to be further discussed with the IESO's software vendor. The IESO agreed to follow up with the API user participant individually after the vendor discussion takes place.*

A member asked if Forced outages would have to be submitted after they have already occurred.  
*The IESO responded yes.*

A member expressed difficulties in accessing the IESO's existing Online Outage Request Form (ONLORF) and asked what platforms will be supported by the new software and if it would be easier to support from an IT perspective.

*The IESO responded that an IT representative would need to be contacted to address the question. The IESO agreed to contact the participant individually following the SE-109 meeting to better understand the participant's concerns before following up with the appropriate IESO subject matter expert.*

### **Item 3      Software Design Details**

Mark Gojmerac presented the proposed software design details for the new software solution including the proposed equipment model, proposed outage request attributes, auto advance approval validation and rules, and the 3-day and 1-day advance approval process rules.

The following are questions that were asked during the presentation by stakeholders along with the IESO's responses (in italics):

A member asked why some of the equipment classes shown in the proposed equipment model were not visible on their outage reporting list.

*The IESO responded that the proposed equipment classes capture the reporting requirement for all market participant types (i.e. generator, transmitter, load etc.), whereas an individual market participant's outage reporting list will only be populated with equipment classes that are relevant to the individual participant.*

A member asked if the IESO has considered incorporating the constraint codes into the new software's conflict checking module.

*The IESO responded that the conflict checking module currently considers the proposed constraint codes.*

With respect to the proposed outage request attributes, a member asked if only the Priority codes are configured by the vendor.

*The IESO responded that both Priority and Constraint codes are to be configured by the vendor and that only the Purpose codes are to be IESO-configurable. However, the IESO also noted that vendor software design is still under development and that feedback on the proposed priority and constraint codes should be forwarded to the IESO for consideration.*

A member asked if the list of outage requests eligible for auto advance approval can be expanded.

*The IESO responded that the list can still be expanded or changed before starting software development; however, consideration must be given to developing any new requirements in a timely manner to minimize impact to the software development and implementation schedule.*

A member asked if the auto advance approval process is optional.

*The IESO responded yes.*

A member asked if low voltage buses would be eligible for auto advance approval of distribution equipment.

*The IESO responded yes provided that the bus was deemed to be low impact and no reactive resources were made unavailable due to the bus outage.*

A member then asked if low voltage capacitors would be eligible for auto advance approval.

*The IESO responded that at this time, low voltage capacitors are not being considered due to the complexity associated with developing criteria for auto-approving reactive equipment under different system conditions.*

A member asked if IESO could provide details regarding the vendor's conflict checking module.

*The IESO responded that the conflict checking module considers priority codes, constraint codes and equipment class in its calculation. Furthermore, the software can be configured to use conflict checking to either prevent conflicts or simply issue conflict warnings (e.g. for submission of overlapping outage requests).*

#### **Item 4 Final Process Design Update**

Mark Gojmerac presented an update on the final process design with regards to security and adequacy reporting.

#### **Item 5 Review Action Items and Next Steps**

Mark Gojmerac reviewed next steps which included seeking feedback from stakeholders, IESO's response to stakeholder feedback, and the next meeting date of July 3.

The meeting then adjourned.