

SE 109 Outage Management Process Redesign

Minutes of Meeting

Date held: February 11, 2015	Time held: 10:00 – 11:00 am	Location held: IESO
Invited/Attended	Company Name	Attendance Status (A)ttended; (R)egrets; (S)ubstitute
Brighton Beach Power	Little, Dave	A
Brookfield Renewable Power	Dumoulin, Serge	A
Cardinal Power	Lamesse, Denis	A
Customized Energy Solutions	Chintapalli, Raj	R
Hydro One	Ahmed, Eiman	A
Hydro One	Molyneaux, David	A
Hydro One	Noble, Brian	R
Northland Power	Khan, Shahid	A
Northland Power	Donnelly, Keith	A
Ontario Power Generation	Shek, Alan	A
Ontario Power Generation	Sankreacha, Dilip	A
Ontario Power Generation	Gray, Jim	A
Portlands Energy Centre	Woodward, Tom	A
TransAlta	Nguyen, Thanh	R
WattsWorth Analysis Inc.	Spitters, Richard	A
WattsWorth Analysis Inc.	Gil, Miguel	A
IESO	Gojmerac, Mark	A
IESO	Johnson, Len	A
IESO	Romeo, Rick	A
IESO	Satish, Anuradha	A
IESO	D'Costa, Candida	A
IESO	Short, Rebecca	A
IESO	Vithyananthan, Vithy	A
IESO	Tolton, Cameron	A
Scribe: Anu Satish - Please report any corrections, additions or deletions e-mail to stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca		

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

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

March 6, 2015

Public

Outage Management Process Redesign

IESO Sponsor: Len Johnson

IESO Sponsor email address: len.johnson@ieso.ca

Document output of each agenda item below:

Item 1 Welcome, Introduction and Opening Remarks

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

Item 2 Requirements Summary Document Changes

Mark Gojmerac presented clarification on the change made in Appendix G of the Requirements Summary document. The updated table now shows that Line and Line Sections have the same constraint code applicability.

The Requirements Summary document has also been updated to include the new conflict rationale field. If market participants submit an outage request that is in conflict with another outage, the conflict checking process will display an error message if this field is not populated prior to submission of the outage request. If market participants still wish to submit the request, they may do so by providing a justification in the conflict rationale field. This proposed feature is expected to increase market participant awareness in avoiding discretionary outage conflicts that significantly reduce the likelihood of an advance approval. Furthermore, automating conflict justification increases communication efficiency between the market participant and IESO. This new feature will be available to both web client and API users.

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

A member inquired if and how error and warning messages will be displayed if conflicts occur with facilities owned by other market participants.

The IESO responded yes, the software will display both error and warning messages if the conflict is with any market participant's facility, and show the conflicting outage ID. No further information about the outage request will be shared unless the participant has third-party viewing permissions.

The IESO noted that error messages would be generated on submission and prevent submission if a conflict is present and only if the Conflict Rationale field is not populated. Conversely, warning messages are always generated if a conflict is present and will never prevent submission. However the timing of a warning message is different for API and web client users. While either user must submit the outage request before receiving a warning message, the web client user will be prompted to confirm their submission whereas the API user would not.

A member asked if the mandatory conflict rationale field will be a text field.

The IESO responded yes.

Item 3 Security and Adequacy Reporting Obligations

Mark Gojmerac provided an update on security and adequacy reporting obligations. For the Quarterly process, the IESO proposes updating security and adequacy data for a coverage period of 6 months on quarterly basis. The IESO is still working on finalizing the actual reporting vehicle for this information and will follow up at a future meeting.

The IESO proposes using the existing Security and Adequacy (SAA) reports for the Daily and Weekly Advance Approval processes.

Mark further informed all members of another stakeholder engagement, SE-Adequacy Reporting (SE-AR), which is seeking stakeholder feedback on existing reporting obligations. He encouraged all members to participate as the feedback and outcomes from the SE-AR engagement will be used to further support our Daily and Weekly processes.

Item 4 Market Rules Development Schedule

Mark Gojmerac presented a high-level schedule for the Market Rules development process that starts with Technical Panel introductions in April 2015 and ends with IESO Board approval in September or October 2015. The IESO will keep all SE-109 stakeholders updated on a 5 to 6 week rotation basis.

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 April 1.

The meeting then adjourned.