

Outage Management Process Redesign (SE-109)



Minutes of Meeting

Date held: August 7, 2013	Time held: 9:00 am – 11:00 am	Location held: IESO
Attended	Company Name	Attendance Status (A)ttended; (R) Registered; (S)ubstitute; (TC) Teleconference
Alton, Tiana	Great Lakes Power	TC
Bennett, Chad	Capital Power Corporation	R
Chayka, Darin	Hydro One	TC
Chee-Aloy, Jason	Power Advisory LLC	A
Donnelly, Keith	Kingston Generating Station	TC
Faulds, Sean	Brookfield Renewable Power	TC
Finnerty Neil	Brighton Beach Power	R
Forsyth , Scott	Transalta	TC
Gartshore, Janis	Great Lakes Power	TC
Gray, Jim	Ontario Power Generation	A
Kuntz, Margaret	TransCanada	TC
Matthiesen, Erick	Pattern Energy	A
Paul, Rob	Goreway Station Partnership	TC
Rouhi, Amir	Portlands Energy Centre	A
Simmons, Dave	Gerdau	R
Duru, Josh	IESO	A
Gojmerac, Mark	IESO	A
Harrison, Susan	IESO	A
Maria, Ahmed	IESO	A
Matos, Griselda	IESO	A
Wright-Hilbig, Rhonda	IESO	A
Xu, Long	IESO	A
Scribe: Griselda Matos, Market Forecasts & Integration, 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, Introduction and Opening Remarks

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

Item 2 IESO response to stakeholder feedback on Transition Plan for Interim & Final Processes

Mark Gojmerac presented feedback received from members on the implementation plan for the final re-design proposal and IESO actions resulting from comments. The decision to transition to a final process under a one-time or staged implementation will be discussed with stakeholders once a software solution has been designed and a potential vendor has been selected.

Item 3 IESO Response to Stakeholder Feedback on Revised Re-Design Proposal

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

Item 4 Interim Process Proposal

Mark Gojmerac presented the interim process proposal.

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

A member asked if the current compensation rules would stay as is in the interim process.
The IESO responded that this is correct; the only thing that would change is removing the requirement to submit cancellation costs in advance.

A member asked if pre-approved outages will be eligible for compensation.
The IESO responded that pre-approved outages will be eligible for compensation.

A member asked if Market Participants are still restricted to the number of 14 day advance approval outages per facility.
The IESO confirmed that restrictions to the number of 14 day advance approvals would remain unchanged, however there would no longer be a restriction on how early a Market Participants could request a 14 day advanced approval.

A member asked if a Market Participant reschedules an outage on their own accord and then the IESO recommends a further reschedule, would the Market Participant retain their timestamp.
The IESO responded that under the Interim Process there are no repositioning options that would retain timestamp unless it was a result of a rejection, revocation or recall. New software capabilities would be required to support business rules associated with timestamp retention as a result of coordination. There will be opportunity for coordination in the final process, specifically in the midterm and near term weekly processes.

A member commented that for pre-approved outages, there needs to be a way to differentiate between a pre-approved outage and a normal advanced approved outage. The member expressed concerns that without the capability to differentiate the two types of outages in their tools, operators will not know if they have to request final approval or not.

The IESO agreed that this is a valid concern and will work together with Market Participants to develop a process to differentiate between these two types of approvals.

Item 5 Market Rule Changes and Schedule

Mark Gojmerac presented the draft Market Rule Changes with respect to the interim process.

A member asked if the IESO is expecting to work through any capabilities issues on the existing software solution.

The IESO responded that potential software changes to support the interim process have already been considered and are expected to be minor in nature (i.e. validation rules for submission deadlines). Actual changes will be discussed with SE109 in September or October.

Item 6 Table-Top Session on Final Re-Design Proposal

Mark Gojmerac presented a table-top session on final process redesign using various outage scenarios to demonstrate the features of the mid-term and near-term processes.

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

A member asked if the IESO would provide the outage matrices and if the IESO would still assess an outage if it did not meet the matrix requirement.

The IESO responded that the outage matrices are planning guidelines that allow or prevent certain outage combinations. Outages not meeting the matrix would still be assessed if the conflict could not be identified by the applicant due to confidentiality barriers. For example, one generator may submit an outage that conflicts with an outage submission from a different generator.

A member asked if changes made to outage matrices with respect to methodology would be subject to stakeholder input; and if Market Participants would get an opportunity to provide input on what the matrix would look like.

The IESO responded that stakeholder input on the development of the matrix would be considered where there is flexibility from a system reliability perspective.

Members commented that the outage matrices might need to change depending on the season or changes in the system.

The IESO agreed with the member comment and responded that these changes will be considered when developing the outage matrix.

A member commented that changes in adequacy assessment methodology in the mid-term process needs to consider stakeholder input because it will impact how Market Participants assess risk. The member also commented that the IESO should be careful with the at-risk declaration as it is used in the 18 Month Outlook process as well.

The IESO responded that stakeholder input will be considered when developing assessment methodology. The IESO also agreed that the At-Risk declaration could create confusion and will address this concern at a future meeting.

A member asked if the IESO would further assess an outage in the mid-term process even if the outage violates the matrix.

The IESO responded that mid-term assessments beyond that of an outage matrix would be unlikely given the limited amount of IESO resources available to execute both a mid-term and near-term process. The IESO also mentioned that a high level assessment approach in the form of a matrix is in line with how other reliability coordinators perform longer-term outage assessments with limited resources.

A member asked if the Market Participants will be provided with a list of critical elements and at what point would this list be provided.

The IESO responded that communicating critical elements to participants will be considered and that the form of communication would be available prior to implementing the final process redesign.

During the near term process examples, a member asked if a generator outage gets assessed as part of the near term weekly process and a different non-critical outage is assessed in the near term daily process with a better time stamp then how is this treated if a conflict occurs.

The IESO responded that because the generator submitted into the weekly process, it has a higher priority than the outage submitted in the near term daily process. This is one advantage of participating in the near term weekly process.

Following a Near-Term Daily example a member asked how quickly a non-critical outage could be rescheduled after revocation.

The IESO replied that a non-critical outage would have 5 business days to reschedule following revocation.

A member asked if a Market Participant's outage was not approved because of a transmission constraint and then the transmission constraint was no longer there, how would the Market Participant take advantage of an opportunity outage if there is no report that the Market Participant can check.

The IESO responded although there is no obligation for the IESO to make the Market Participants aware of these opportunities, the IESO would do so on a best effort basis. Another way of identifying an opportunity would be to notify participants when an impactful outage is no longer proceeding - a capability the IESO will explore in a new software solution.

A member asked if the IESO would provide feedback on additional scenario examples associated with the final process redesign.

The IESO replied that additional scenarios identified by Market Participants are welcome and a response would be provided in future SE-109 meetings.

Item 7 Review Action Items and Next Steps

Mark Gojmerac reviewed next steps.

The following question was asked by a stakeholder along with the IESO's response (in italics):

A member asked if Market Participants are precluded from submitting outages of any duration in any of the time periods associated with the Final Process Redesign.

The IESO responded that an outage of any duration may be submitted into any of the timeframes of the final process redesign except for the pre-approval timeframe as the criteria may impose maximum outage duration.