

# Outage Management Process Redesign (SE-109)



## Minutes of Meeting

<b>Date held:</b> June 20, 2013	<b>Time held:</b> 9:00 am – 11:00 am	<b>Location held:</b> IESO
<b>Attended</b>	<b>Company Name</b>	<b>Attendance Status</b> (A)ttended; (R) Registered; (TC) Teleconference
Finnerty, Neil	Brighton Beach Power	TC
Dumoulin, Serge	Brookfield Renewable Power	TC
Lismanis, Brandon	Brookfield Renewable Power	TC
Viswanathan, Samira	Bruce Power	TC
Whitehead, Paul	Bruce Power	TC
Bennett, Chad	Capital Power Corporation	TC
Simmons, Dave	Gerdau	A
Paul, Rob	Goreway Station Partnership	TC
Dejonghe, Rick	Greenfield Energy Centre LP	TC
Chayka, Darin	Hydro One	A
Silverson, Oswald	Iroquois Falls Power	R
Donnelly, Keith	Kingston Generating Station	TC
Veldhuizen, Jon	Northland Power	A
Samant, Sushil	Northland Power	TC
Gray, Jim	Ontario Power Generation	A
Shah, Sushil	Ontario Power Generation	A
Shah, Sushil	Ontario Power Generation	A
Rouhi, Amir	Portlands Energy Centre	TC
Duru, Josh	IESO	A
D'Costa, Candida	IESO	A
Gojmerac, Mark	IESO	A
Harrison, Susan	IESO	A
Maria, Ahmed	IESO	A
Short, Dave	IESO	A
Wright-Hilbig, Rhonda	IESO	A
Scribe: Candida D'Costa, Market Forecasts & Integration, 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/imoweb/consult/consult\\_se109.asp](http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/consult/consult_se109.asp)

## **Item 1 Welcome, Introduction and Opening Remarks**

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

## **Item 2 IESO response to stakeholder feedback on Initial Re-Design Proposal**

Mark Gojmerac presented feedback received from members on the initial re-design proposal and IESO actions resulting from comments.

## **Item 3 Presentation of Revised IESO Outage Management Re-Design Proposal**

Mark Gojmerac presented the revised redesign proposal and revised glossary of terms.

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

Members asked if they would receive reconfirmation during the near-term process of an outage given advance approval in the mid-term process. A member commented that reconfirmation of the mid-term approval (or revocation) at the start of the near-term assessment period (on the Monday) would be beneficial.

*The IESO responded that this would not be necessary given the mid-term outage is still in advanced approval state and has priority over outages assessed in the near-term. (Only a forced outage would have higher priority or a significant change in assumed system conditions closer to real-time). The IESO assess the entire outage picture for that timeframe and believes an early confirmation does not add significant value.*

*As a matter of principle, the IESO will identify an outage conflict as soon as practical. A revocation notice for a mid-term approval could happen at any time during the near-term weekly assessment period and does not have to wait until the end of the assessment period. An additional opportunity for participants to remain informed would be the reports published in the mid and near-term processes. This information will help to identify potential conflicts that may place their outage at risk of revocation. If a participant had any concerns with their advance approval, they should contact the IESO at any time to discuss and gather more information.*

A member asked what period the mid-term report would be for, and how it works with the 18 month outlook.

*The IESO responded that the mid-term report is for the coverage period. It is meant to help participants make scheduling decisions for the upcoming near-term process and the next mid-term cycle. The 18 month outlook will look beyond the coverage period. The methodology will be consistent with the 18 month outlook.*

Looking at the midterm timeline in the presentation, does that mean anything submitted before August 31 would be included, but an outage submitted on September 5 would not.

*The IESO responded that an outage submitted Sept 5 would be looked at in the next mid-term or upcoming near term assessment period, depending on the start date of the outage. (This assumes the outage assessment deadline was August 31<sup>st</sup>.)*

A member asked how a long-term outage that extends beyond the midterm coverage period would be assessed, i.e. an outage for Feb1 – June 1.

*The IESO responded that the midterm process is for outages that start in coverage period, it does not have to end in coverage period.*

A member commented that for an at-risk outage which involves replacement energy, participants are unlikely to do anything before official revocation is received, which could happen only on the Friday.

*The IESO responded that Participants would receive revocation or rejection as soon as a problem is identified, which could be as early as the Monday of the assessment period. Participants will generally not have to wait until the Friday.*

A member asked what time on Friday will the IESO inform participants of revocations.

*The IESO has until the end of business on Friday to make a decision. An attempt is being made to move away from a set time, in order to maintain flexibility and give the IESO adequate time to make an assessment. This will also apply to participant submission deadlines. The details will be finalized during market rule formation and subsequent discussions with these stakeholders.*

A member asked if opportunity outages would include both physical and market opportunities.

*The IESO confirmed that opportunity outages would include looking at the physical connection opportunity, i.e. if a circuit is forced out of service, units connected to the circuit would be able to take advantage of that. It also includes market opportunity outages, i.e. if there is a large capacity margin, generation outages could be considered opportunity outages.*

A member asked if an outage is rejected, revoke, or recalled within what timeframes does it need to be rescheduled to within 5 business days for the purposes of timestamp retention.

*The IESO responded that if the outage is being rescheduled in the near-term process, it must meet the normal submission requirements of the process that it is being subject to. If the outage is rejected, it cannot be rescheduled in the coverage period, but for the week after as long as it is submitted by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Friday prior. Noncritical outages can revert to the daily process. IESO is expected to work with participants to find a suitable outage window.*

A member cautioned that for long-term transmission outages it would be difficult to confirm generation supporting guarantees that far out. Flows are variable and regulatory requirements might constrain units, which will not be known that far in advance.

*The IESO responded that there is a risk of planning outages too far out, but the program is trying to strike balance while accounting for uncertainty. Those types of outages will be assessed on the more conservative side - possibly with little or no generation support or a reduction to current generation flows. Such outages assessed 8 months out*

would likely get an At Risk declaration, however because it is beyond the first three months of the coverage period, it would get re-assessed with more accurate information in the next mid-term cycle.

A member asked if the current SSR/SAA format will change.

*The IESO replied that like the 18 month outlook, changes to this reporting are subject to a larger audience and a separate stakeholder engagement. The outage management redesign project will make recommendations for those reporting processes to be better suited for the purpose of outage management.*

A member expressed concern regarding the effort to produce compensation cost estimates and suggested eliminating this requirement, since compensation costs are just a cap and is not relevant to outage assessments.

*The IESO responded that removal of the requirement is being considered and will be addressed at the next SE-109 meeting. This may also require a market rule change.*

A member asked at what point they would be eligible for compensation if the approved outage is revoked.

*IESO responded that any outage that receives approval is eligible for compensation once it is revoked anywhere along the way; whether in real-time or in the planning timeframe. The existing compensation rules tied to outage confirmation would no longer apply since the requirement to confirm outages will no longer apply.*

A member asked why compensation would not apply to mid-term approvals that were revoked prior to the near-term submission deadline.

*The IESO responded that this question will be further investigated and discussed at the next SE109 meeting.*

Clarification was requested about what costs are considered for compensation.

*The IESO responded that it would be out-of-pocket fixed costs, not opportunity or market costs.*

A member asked if opportunity outages must be applied by T-5? And if so, this might preclude some opportunities.

*The IESO responded that opportunity outages would not be considered after the T-5 deadline as even opportunity outages also need to be assessed for reliability impacts beyond the opportunity that allows for it to take place. The T-5 requirement is to allow time for the IESO to identify any reliability impacts. These rules are a starting point and the process is designed to allow for flexibility. Similarly the Pre-Approval (P/A) outage list will start conservative but expand with time.*

A member asked if opportunity and P/A outages would be eligible for compensation.

*The IESO responded that both P/A and opportunity outages would be eligible for compensation. Any outage with advanced approval is subject to revocation and so is eligible for compensation. The SE109 Draft Revised Redesign Proposal posted on the website indicates that opportunity outages would not be eligible for compensation. This was originally considered, but revised. An updated proposal will be posted online today.*

A member asked how the timestamp would apply within a process and between mid-term and daily approvals.

*The timestamp is used to determine priority within a process, i.e. within the long-term, midterm, or daily process. Revocation in real-time, would first look at the level of approval attained, before looking at timestamp. An outage that received mid-term approval would take precedent over an outage proved in the daily process despite timestamp, the only exception being for forced outages.*

#### **Item 4 Review Action Items and Next Steps**

The next steps are:

- Stakeholders to provide comments on the revised redesign proposal by July 5
- The IESO will request the Technical Panel to warrant consideration for market rule amendment(s) for the outage management process on July 9.
- The IESO will respond to stakeholder comments by July 19
- The next stakeholder meeting will involve a tabletop exercise on the redesign proposal. The IESO will provide details about participation and what will be required.

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

A member asked about the timeframes for implementation

*Considering that this redesign will require a new tool for the IESO and changes to the online outage form, API and possibly a new tool for market participants, the project is expected to take 1-2 years to implement. The IESO is seeking interim changes in Q1 of next year. The IESO is looking for feedback from participants to see when they can accommodate the proposed changes.*

A member asked what form the Market Rules will take.

*IESO is working on the form these changes will take in the Market Rules. One option would be to enable portions of the rules in stages. This will go through stakeholder engagement before it is taken to the Technical Panel. A solid basis for rules is needed before the IESO contacts vendors for tools.*

A member asked what happens after the Technical Panel.

*After the IESO presents draft Market Rules to the Technical Panel (TP), it will be posted for 3 weeks for stakeholder comments and review. At the next TP meeting, the IESO would seek approval for the final rules, before it is taken to the IESO Board of Directors. Finally, there is one month between IESO Board approval and approval by the Ontario Energy Board.*

**Item 5 Other Business**

There was no other business.

<b>Action Item Summary</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	June 20, 2013	IESO to post corrected version of the Draft Revised Redesign Proposal materials to clarify compensation claim entitlement for opportunity outages.	Open	