

Outage Management Process Redesign (SE-109)



Minutes of Meeting

Date held: May 14, 2013	Time held: 9:00 am – 11:00 am	Location held: IESO
Attended	Company Name	Attendance Status (A)ttended; (TC) Teleconference
Alton, Tiana	Great Lakes Power	TC
Cunningham, Paul	Powerstream	TC
Dejonghe, Rick	Greenfield Energy Centre LP	TC
Donnelly, Keith	Kingston Generating Station	TC
DuMoulin, Serge	Brookfield Renewable Power	TC
Finnerty, Neil	Brighton Beach Power	TC
Gartshore, Janis	Great Lakes Power	TC
Gray, Jim	Ontario Power Generation	A
Kuntz, Margaret	TransCanada	A
LeMesse, Denis	Capital Power Corporation	TC
Lismanis, Brandon	Brookfield Renewable Power	TC
Maddix, Melanie	Goreway Station Partnership	A
Mantha, Marc	H2O Power LP	TC
Matheson, Eric	Pattern Energy	TC
Paul, Rob	Goreway Station Partnership	A
Rouhi, Amir	Portlands Energy Centre	A
Silverson, Oswald	Iroquois Falls Power	TC
Simmons, Dave	Gerdau	A
Veldhuizen, Jon	Northland Power	TC
Waite, Ed	Hydro One	TC
Duru, Josh	IESO	A
Gojmerac, Mark	IESO	A
Harrison, Susan	IESO	A
Maria, Ahmed	IESO	A
Rochester, Dan	IESO	TC
Short, Dave	IESO	A
Wright-Hilbig, Rhonda	IESO	A

Scribe: Ahmed Maria, System Performance, IESO
Please report any corrections, additions or deletions to: stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca

All meeting material is available on the IESO web site at:
http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/consult/consult_se109.asp

Item 1 Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks

Susan Harrison welcomed the attendees of SE-109 and thanked everyone for their comments and feedback on the stakeholder engagement plan and thanked everyone for responding to the survey questions on their outage planning practices.

Item 2 IESO response to stakeholder feedback on the Discussion Paper and Engagement Plan

Mark Gojmerac presented the IESO's response to the feedback received on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and the Discussion Paper. The following comments were made by the IESO and members following that presentation:

1. One member commented that the timelines proposed in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan may be aggressive. The IESO responded that while the schedule has some flexibility the IESO is confident in its ability to respond and incorporate feedback from participants within the noted timelines.
2. One member inquired if new software would be needed to implement these changes. The IESO intends to move forward with new software tools and to re-design the outage management process. The IESO has gathered some preliminary information on existing software solutions and believes sufficient outage management related capabilities exist.
3. Following a request to clarify the term operability in the previous stakeholder meeting, the IESO stated that operability assessments are essentially adequacy and security assessments.

Item 3 Review of key themes from stakeholder feedback on survey questions regarding outage practices

Mark Gojmerac presented the results of the stakeholder survey. The following are the comments that were made by group members and the IESO during the presentation that are not included in the presentation materials.

The IESO mentioned that, today, Ontario has surplus of energy and, therefore, it is likely that a short notice outage submitted by a generator would be approved (unless there are security concerns). However, the IESO mentioned that this is not likely to continue in the future.

Members expressed the following concerns with the current outage management process:

1. The possibility of having to send work crews home if an outage is cancelled.
2. A two-day advance approval reduces options and response time (e.g. getting replacement energy) if the advance approval subsequently gets revoked.
3. Lack of options provided by the IESO when an outage is rejected.
4. A member mentioned that it can be difficult for a generator to obtain replacement energy when an outage is rejected a few days prior to the scheduled start date.

The above comments lead to a discussion about an Market Participant's (MP) ability to obtain replacement energy in the form of an import to support a planned outage that impacts adequacy.

A member asked how often do MPs obtain replacement energy to allow an outage to proceed.
A member answered that they had only obtained replacement energy once to allow an outage to proceed. The IESO agreed that it is has been rarely used. The IESO mentioned that a reference to the applicable section within Chapter 5 of the market rules would be provided in a post-meeting communication so that members could better familiarize themselves with the replacement energy process.

A member mentioned that it is important for market participants to understand how outage assessments are completed.

The IESO responded that the security component of an outage assessment has greater confidentiality implications and is more difficult to understand than the adequacy component. However the system limits used for these assessments are being simplified which may reduce confidentiality barriers and help participants better understand how the security assessments are completed.

A member asked how far in advance are the outage assessments completed?

The IESO responded that assessments are currently completed two days in advance of the outage, unless an outage was specifically requested for a 14 day advance approval.

Item 4 Presentation of high-level process re-design

Mark Gojmerac presented the high-level process re-design. The following are questions that were asked during the presentation and the IESO's responses (in italics).

A member asked if, for example, a Bruce generating unit was forced out of service, would certain breaker outages within the Bruce switchyard be considered a 'pre-approved' outage?

The IESO responded that this situation would be better suited as an opportunity outage – an unexpected system condition that would allow an outage to proceed that would not have normally been able to. The member will provide further questions to attempt to clarify for himself what is meant by an opportunity outage.

A member asked if an outage request to a 200 MVA-rated wind farm forecasted to produce 0 MW would qualify as a pre-approved outage? Also, would a generator not required in the market be able to request an outage to that generator as a pre-approved outage.

The IESO responded that this will be considered when determining the list of pre-approved outages. The IESO also mentioned these situations may be considered as opportunity outages.

A member asked if the elements included in the BES definition are considered "critical".

The IESO responded that BES elements are not necessarily considered "critical".

A member asked will the maximum number of high impact outages submitted by participants depend on the type of participant?

The IESO responded that this question will be answered once "high impact" is defined. However, the rules will attempt to treat all participants equally.

A member asked how would you evaluate a transmission outage that requires support from a generator in the mid-term without knowing the expected output of the generators?

The IESO will consider this question when finalizing the details of the re-designed outage management process.

A member expressed concern that they are not receiving any certainty from the mid-term approval, even though mid-term approval gives their outage the highest priority in the near-term, since the outage can be revoked three days before the outage is scheduled to start.

This member also raised concerned that they are losing the 14 day advanced approval. The 14 day advanced approval gave participants time to mitigate the cost of cancelling outage; a three day approval does not give them enough time. The member does not want to get assessed three month in advance, forgotten about, and then reassessed only three days in advance. In their opinion, with the new process, there is a higher risk of a surprise cancellation three days before the outage is scheduled to start.

The IESO will consider these concerns when finalizing the details of the re-designed outage management process.

The IESO proposed that if an outage is rejected in the mid-term process, the participant can not submit the outage during the near-term process (except as an opportunity outage). A member expressed concern with this business rule.

The IESO mentioned that this rule was put in place to disincen auto-confirming.

A member asked if the IESO would like to know, in advance, if a participant will force an outage that was rejected in the mid-term. For example, there could be a regulatory requirement requiring the participant to take an outage by a specific date.

The IESO responded that they do not expect many outages to be rejected in the mid-term because there will be greater co-ordination in that time frame.

A member asked during the “weekly batch analysis” in the near term will the IESO try to reschedule outages to make it fit?

The IESO responded “yes”.

A member asked that if they confirmed in the mid-term do they have to confirm in the near-term?

The IESO responded that they would not have to confirm in the near-term if they confirmed in the mid-term.

A member asked how are conflicts in the mid-term settled?

The IESO responded that conflicts in the mid term process would be settled based on submission time stamp.

A member asked if an outage that created the opportunity outage is cancelled, will the opportunity outage be cancelled?

The IESO responded that in principle, if an outage that created an opportunity was cancelled, the outage request benefiting from that opportunity would also get cancelled. However further consideration will be given to this question when finalizing the details of the re-designed outage management process.

A member recommended that the IESO have flexibility on what is meant by pre-approved.
The IESO responded that a list of outages that participants believe should be pre-approved would be very helpful in defining the pre-approved outage list. This list could also contain recommended conditions under which outages should be pre-approved (for example, wind forecast for a particular plant is 0 MW).

A member recommended not to have a category of “Emergent/Urgent” outages; especially, if the IESO would like to minimize short notice.
The IESO responded that this category would be considered a subset of a forced outage and is being proposed to help identify whether the IESO has time (e.g. hours or days) to incorporate the outage(s) into the outage plan ahead of real-time

A member mentioned that the definition of “critical” should be expanded beyond those outages critical to security. For example, if the work crews are onsite, the outage should be considered “critical”.
The IESO responded that this possibility needs further investigation.

A member asked will cost recovery be considered for transmitters as well?
The IESO is assuming that transmitters have other mechanisms of recovering cancellation costs and that generators do not. In addition, the cost-recovery mechanisms in place today works well and, therefore, re-designing it is a lower priority in this outage management redesign.

The IESO mentioned that any changes to the 18 month outlook may require a separate stakeholder consultation.

The IESO also noted that outage statistics, provided by participants, would be very useful when re-designing the outage management process.

Item 5 Review Action Items and Next Steps

The IESO requested feedback on the re-design proposal by May 24 and agreed to distribute a set of questions to help guide that feedback.

Item 6 Other Business

Action Item Summary				
#	Date	Action	Status	Comments
1	April 19, 2013	IESO to post survey questions.	Closed	
2	May 15, 2013	IESO to clarify what is meant by “outage submission” in the “Summary of Outage Management Processes within other Independent System Operators” document.	Closed	

3	May 15, 2013	IESO to clarify what is meant by "operability".	Closed	
4		The IESO will send out the market rules related to obtaining replacement energy to allow an outage to proceed.		