

## **IESO Stakeholder Engagement**

---

**From:** IESO Stakeholder Engagement  
**Sent:** May 15, 2013 1:45 PM  
**To:** IESO Stakeholder Engagement  
**Subject:** Feedback Requested on Proposed Outage Management Process Redesign by Friday, May 24

This is being sent to past attendees of Outage Management Process Redesign Meetings

---

---

Thank you for your participation in yesterday's meeting. As noted, your feedback was very much appreciative in the development of a Proposed Redesign of the IESO's Outage Management Process that was presented at the meeting. At this time, we ask that you review the Proposed Redesign which is posted on the SE-109 Web page and provide any input or feedback on the draft document **by Friday, May 24.**

A number of issues/questions arose within the redesigned process proposal in yesterday's discussion. In order to further define those issues, we offer the following questions to consider when providing your input, however, please feel free to comment on any aspect of the Redesign Proposal. Please submit your feedback by email to [stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca](mailto:stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca)

The materials presented or referenced at yesterday's meeting are available on the SE-109 web page at [http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/consult/consult\\_se109.asp](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/consult/consult_se109.asp).

Questions for Input:

1. The coverage periods within the mid-term and near-term processes were influenced by the feedback stakeholders provided on their outage practices. Given the results, are the timelines proposed for the mid-term and near-term process reasonable?
2. The Mid-Term process will provide coordination, assessment and reporting services for 'High-Impact' outages. A threshold for 'High Impact' will limit the volume of outages assessed in the Mid-Term process to those of particular significance to stakeholders and at a level that can be managed by the IESO from a resource perspective. Threshold examples include, but are not limited to minimum outage duration ( $\geq 5$  days), transmission voltage level (500 & 230 kV) and generation capacity (500 MW). How would you prefer to see this term defined?
3. It is recognized that a threshold for High Impact outages may discriminate against outages that do not meet the threshold but are still of particular significance to participants. The IESO will allow a certain number of outages that do not meet the threshold to be assessed in the Mid-Term process on a per facility and per coverage period basis. What is a reasonable number of non 'High Impact' outages that should be considered?
4. Another feature of the Mid-Term process will be to notify participants of outages that may impact their facility once they are confirmed (broader impacts resulting from system constraints). How would you prefer to receive this notification (for example via email, verbally or through your outage software)?

5. Opportunity outage requests will allow participants to take advantage of a scheduling opportunity that would have otherwise been unavailable due to reliability concern or scheduling conflict. For example, several generating units are forced from service presenting an opportunity for a transmission circuit that would have normally bottled that generation to be taken out-of-service. Are you in agreement with this definition and the corresponding submission deadline? If not, please explain.
6. Pre-approved outage requests will give participants scheduling flexibility for maintenance activities that are low impact from a reliability perspective (for example, protections, station service, radial transmission lines, customer load transformers etc.). There may be other restrictions such as minimum duration and minimum recall. Please provide examples of outages that you would prefer to see considered for pre-approval or notification-only.
7. The Mid-Term process will require a reporting vehicle to provide the IESO and participants with assessment results to guide decisions in both the near term process and future mid-term process cycles. What format, content and delivery mechanism would you prefer to see in such a report? Would you prefer it reside within the 18 month outlook or as a separate vehicle?
8. Given the higher priorities of this initiative – the project objectives (enhance reliability, outage services and process efficiency) and a timely outage management software solution replacement, the IESO would prefer to retain the existing cost recovery mechanisms for revoked or recalled outages in the proposed near-term redesign as per [Section 6.7 of the Market Rules](#). Do you support this recommendation? If not, please explain.

Also discussed at the meeting was the topic of supporting outage requests with replacement energy. This process is outlined in Market Rules Chapter 5, Section 6.3.6 and can be found [here](#). Please let us know if you have any follow up questions.

Thank you again for taking the time to provide your feedback. If you have any further questions please contact [stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca](mailto:stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca)

IESO Stakeholder Engagement