

Outage Management Process Redesign (SE-109)



Draft Minutes of Meeting

Date Held: October 9, 2013	Time Held: 9:00am-11:00am	Location Held: IESO
Attended	Company Name	Attendance Status (A)ttended, (TC) teleconference
Brookfield Renewable Power	Dumoulin, Serge	TC
Capital Power Corporation	Bennett, Chad	TC
Cardinal Power	Lamesse, Denis	TC
Emera Energy	Cook, Michael	TC
GDF Suez Canada	Goodhand, Jason	TC
Goreway Station Partnership	Maddix, Melanie	TC
Goreway Station Partnership	Paul, Rob	TC
Great Lakes Power	Gartshore, Janis	TC
Great Lakes Power	Alton, Tiana	TC
Ontario Power Generation	Shah, Sushil	TC
Portlands Energy Centre	Rouhi, Amir	TC
TransAlta	Nguyen, Thanh	TC
Gerda	Simmons, Dave	A
Hydro One	Waite, Ed	A
Hydro One	Boudreau, Ryan	A
Hydro One	Karjanmaa, Ginette	A
Darin Chayka	Hydro One	TC
Northland Power	Veldhuizen, Jon	A
Ontario Power Generation	Gray, Jim	A
Pattern Energy	Matthiesen, Erick	TC
Rob Cary & Associates	Cary, Rob	A
IESO	Balabanowicz, Julia	A
IESO	Duru, Josh	A
IESO	Gojmerac, Mark	A
IESO	Johnson, Len	A
IESO	Wright-Hilbig, Rhonda	A

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

Julia Balabanowicz welcomed everyone to the sixth meeting of the Outage Management Process Redesign Consultation (SE-109).

Item 2: IESO response to stakeholder feedback received since the Sept 4 meeting

Mark Gojmerac presented the IESO's response to the feedback received from members.

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

A member asked what benefit there is to market participants regarding the change that prevents requesting short notice outages to allowing forced outages with time-limited scheduling flexibility to be coordinated with the IESO.

The IESO responded that the IESO currently has no firm obligation to assess short notice requests and has a concern with short notice requests not showing the appropriate level of urgency associated with a forced outage with limited scheduling flexibility. As a result, the benefit of communicating these outages as forced places a firm obligation on the IESO to assess the impact of the forced outage against the overall outage plan. This also allows the IESO and the market participant to reposition the outage to start at a time that is least impactful to system reliability and other market participants.

A member flagged the commercial impact that this change could have for Non-Utility Generators (NUGs). The classification of a 'forced outage' for what used to be considered 'short notice' impacts their contract terms with respect to being given approval.

Another member agreed that there could be commercial impacts and explained that the NUG contracts require an approval. It was suggested that exploring the option to introduce a different term such as an 'approved forced outage' could solve the commercial issue.

IESO responded that, in the past, the IESO has provided supporting evidence to market participants that the IESO was involved in coordinating and approving outage requests with contractual implications. The IESO would consider providing similar evidence for coordinating and approving forced outages with time-sensitively on a case by case basis.

A member agreed that from a generator perspective the benefit may not be apparent, but from a transmitter perspective there is obvious benefit. For example, if there is a problem with a piece of equipment that will require it to be forced from service in a couple of days, the interim process allows for the ability to coordinate with the IESO and understand how the outage will affect other Market Participants. It provides an opportunity for both sides to work together to find a solution that works best and makes the outage fit.

Another member agreed that there is significant benefit in the improved ability to coordinate.

The discussion then shifted to aspects of the Final Process redesign and a member asked if the IESO had a sense of the timelines of when final approval would be granted for pre-approved outages and if the onus would be on the Market Participant or the IESO to communicate if the approval is not granted.

The IESO responded that providing final approval in the day ahead timeframe is still being considered for pre-approved outages in the Final Process redesign; however the Control Room always has the ability to revoke or reject outages for reliability purposes based on changing system conditions. The Market Participant would not be expected to request final approval in real-time, and the onus would be on the IESO to notify the market participant if final approval required revocation.

A member suggested that if the requirement for final approval was removed for some types of outages that there would be a higher risk that Market Participants would make mistakes and face compliance issues.

The IESO answered that it anticipates developing an automated way for the Control Room and Market Participants to be made aware of which outages require a request for final approval in real-time and which do not. This functionality is being pursued in a new software solution for the Final Process redesign.

A member asked if the 14:00 deadline only applies to pre-approvals and if so, had the IESO thought about keeping 14:00 consistent for all approval and submission deadlines.

The IESO confirmed that it is looking for consistency and that is why all other approval deadlines have been switched to 16:00 except for pre-approvals. Pre-approvals require 14:00 to provide Market Participants sufficient time to mitigate the impacts of a rejection on the day prior to the outage starting.

In response to one piece of feedback received from a member that suggested the Interim Process should not be implemented, another member indicated that their organization is in strong support of the benefits that the Interim Process presents: (1) Improved coordination, communication, and conflict resolution (2) Greater certainty with 3-day advance approvals and (3) IESO obligation to assess a subset of outages on shorter notice.

A member asked what the level of commitment is from the IESO for the Final Process redesign which requires replacement of the IOMS.

The IESO assured that it is a high priority project and explained that it has strong support from the senior management team. The Interim Process is the first step in a complete outage management process review.

A member asked if there is any risk that the IESO will not be able to find a software solution to handle all the requirements being discussed for the Final Process redesign or if there is a risk that the cost could be too high.

IESO responded that it would be risky if only one software solution was being anticipated for procurement. The IESO intends to find more than one compatible solution or to procure a solution that is partially an off the shelf solution and partially custom built to manage the software risk.

A member asked when the IESO plans to issue the RFP for the software solution.

IESO responded that they expect the RFP would be issued prior to the New Year. The RFP will likely be issued for a six-week period and the IESO anticipates going to the Board with a proposed business case by mid-next year.

A member requested that the IESO sit down with each Market Participant to go over eligibility for the pre-approval process. There was uncertainty from this member's perspective regarding which equipment would meet the criteria for the pre-approval process.

The IESO responded that the aim is to improve the clarity of the pre-approval criteria within the proposed Market Manual. However, IESO staff will work with Market Participants to clarify any uncertainty. All Market Participants always have the option to contact their IESO Account Manager or email customer.relations@ieso.ca for answers to any questions.

Regarding the use of the confirmation flag as the pre-approval notification flag, one member asked how all other planned outages would be confirmed.

IESO responded that the traditional "confirmation" has been removed from the outage process. Submission of an outage requesting 3-day advance approval would be considered a Market Participant's intent to proceed with the outage.

Item 3: Review Revised Proposal on Criteria for Pre-Approval

Mark Gojmerac presented the draft re-write of Market Manual 7:3, Appendix B: Outage Reporting Requirements and noted that the document circulated is still in draft form with the intent that feedback from Market Participants will inform the next draft.

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

A member asked if the transmission and distribution limits (i.e. the 50 kV vs 100 kV) is defined somewhere (OEB definition, for example)? If so, it was suggested that it might be best to align with the established definitions.

IESO responded that it would further investigate any potential issues with the proposed definition.

In reference to the language 'adversely affect generation or dispatchable load' in the Market Manual with respect to reporting requirements for transmission less than 100 kV, a member asked if it refers solely to Market Participant loads.

The IESO answered that this is the case in most instances. If there is an embedded load that is not a Market Participant, it is expected that the LDC would communicate any impacts to the IESO.

A member asked what the definition of 'adversely' is.

IESO indicated that it is not currently defined in the Market Manual, but that it would look at past practices in order to provide more clarification to the term.

A member asked for clarification around security limits as it relates to the impact of various system conditions, for example removing a 500/230 kV autotransformer vs. removing a tie-line with a neighbouring jurisdiction.

The IESO answered that it is a broad term that could mean either stability, thermal or voltage decline limits depending on the area and conditions of the power system.

A member asked if reactive resources need to be identified as transmission or distribution.

The IESO responded that they should be identified as transmission and distribution to align with the existing reporting requirements

A member asked if reactive resources that are rated below the thresholds listed in the Market Manual would not be reportable.

IESO confirmed that it would not be reportable.

A member suggested that it would make sense to provide an allowance for a block of reactive resources to be eligible for pre-approval (for example, up to 500 MVARs in Southern Ontario).

IESO committed to consider it and follow-up.

A member asked whether duplicated AVRs and SPSs would be considered for pre-approval if there was a loss of redundancy and the recall was less than 15 minutes.

IESO agreed to change the draft rewrite of Appendix B to include these circumstances in the pre-approval criteria.

A member asked if non-redundant transformers gas protections would be considered for pre-approval if the transformer would remain in-service and the protection had a 15 min recall.

IESO answered that this situation is likely not reportable, but further discussion would be needed to make a final determination.

A few members brought up other scenarios that were specific to their equipment.

IESO indicated that further discussion with Market Participants about their individual circumstances would be required to determine if the scenarios would be reportable.

A member asked if the reporting requirements and pre-approval criteria for wind and solar generators would apply to embedded facilities that are offsetting the load on a LDC transformer. The member also indicated that this is routine daily operation and does not want it to be captured under an outage reporting requirement.

After a group discussion, the IESO concluded that reporting requirement would not apply to embedded facilities or the LDC facility owner. As an outcome of the renewable integration initiative, the majority of embedded variable generation over 5 MW has to provide telemetry data (some of the older facilities are not being captured). As a result, the production impact of these facilities on LDCs is already captured in the IESO's adequacy assessments.

A member asked if plant auxiliary outages that could result in multiple generating units being removed from service after 48 hours of a contingency required a Market Participant to inform the IESO.

The IESO responded that this is reportable, but it is only a request for information and does not require IESO approval, which isn't a change from the current requirement.

The member suggested that IESO should consider if there is still value in getting this information.

A member asked if the IESO would address the concern relating to the submission of generator outages that have a 15 min recalls but are reported as a 30 min recall to ensure inclusion in the IESO dispatch software. This practice could unnecessarily preclude generators from receiving pre-approval even though they are in fact eligible.

IESO indicated that this is likely a practice adopted since market open which requires further discussion with the member to come up with a solution that would not preclude these outages from being eligible for pre-approval.

Item 4: Discuss Proposal for Interim Process Implementation Plan

Mark Gojmerac reviewed the implementation plan at a high-level and invited stakeholder feedback on training needs. It was also indicated that the IESO would be available to work with Market Participants on a 1-on-1 basis to facilitate a successful implementation process.

Item 5: Review Action Items and Next Steps

Mark Gojmerac reviewed next steps.

A member asked if the Technical Panel wanted to see the Pre-Approval Criteria finalized on October 22.

IESO responded that the Technical Panel is interested in a draft version that provides a framework and that IESO would work with SE-109 members over the next couple of months to finalize Market Manual 7.3: Outage Management.

Item 6: Adjourn

There was no other business raised. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.