

IESO Stakeholder Engagement

From: Amir Rouhi
Sent: April 30, 2014 3:35 PM
To: IESO Stakeholder Engagement
Subject: RE: Outage Management (SE-109) Update & Request for Feedback

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

For each of the issues in the e-mail below please find comments from Portlands Energy Centre in red.

Amir Rouhi, P. Eng.
Energy Manager
Portlands Energy Centre

From: IESO Stakeholder Engagement
Sent: April-25-14 08:02
To: IESO Stakeholder Engagement
Subject: Outage Management (SE-109) Update & Request for Feedback

Thank you for your participation in our Outage Management Process Redesign meeting on April 23rd. This stakeholder meeting launched the continuation of the Final Process Redesign, introduced the successful Respondent (Vendor) to support the software solution and provided an overview of the proposed solution capabilities as well as the proposed project plan for implementation. The proposed near-term and mid-term process security and adequacy assessment methodologies was also covered.

At this time, we ask that you review the updated materials presented and referenced at this meeting, which is now posted on the SE-109 web page at <http://www.ieso.ca/Documents/consult/se109/se109-20140423-Presentation.pdf>

Please submit your feedback by email to stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca by **Friday May 2, 2014**.

We offer the following for consideration when providing your input, however, please feel free to comment on any aspect.

1. Feedback on the proposed Quarterly Advance Approval Process Capacity Assessment Methodology (slides 16 to 20) with respect to:
 - Removing 'At Risk' notifications from the 18 Month Outlook process (currently issued for outages starting between 2 and 9 months in advance) since the new Quarterly Advance Approval process will provide this service for outages starting 3 to 9 months in advance.
Okay.
 - Using the 18 Month Outlook methodology (assuming 0 MW for future installations, i.e. neither a firm or planned scenario) to assess surplus/shortfall capacity under normal weather conditions and provide Advance Approval in the Quarterly process.
We would like clarification on the methodology. The table pasted below is from the IESO 18 Month Outlook released Feb. 28, 2014, and shows the Planned and Firm scenarios. The proposed methodology assumes 0 MW for future installations and, as stated above, is neither the firm or

planned scenario. Could you provide clarity on the differences between the proposed methodology and the Planned and Firm scenarios?

Table 4.3: Summary of Scenario Assumptions for Resources

		Planned Scenario	Firm Scenario
Over the 18-Month Period	Total Existing Installed Resource Capacity (MW)	32,961	
	New Generation and Capacity Changes (MW)	All Projects	Generator shutdowns or retirements, Commissioning Generators and Generators starting in the first 3 months
		3,306	262

The Firm and Planned Scenarios also differ in their assumptions regarding the amount of demand measures.

- Feedback on the Software Capabilities the IESO proposes to use (slides 7 to 9). If you currently are and/or plan on using the API to communicate with the IESO's new outage management software, please provide an impact assessment each capability would have on your existing software assuming all the capabilities were implemented as mandatory.

The software capabilities look to be an improvement over the current capabilities. In particular being able to retrieve previous revisions of an outage is a good improvement to current capabilities.

It would be beneficial if the "Multiple Recall Times" capability allowed different recall times at different times during the outage. For example if an outage is scheduled to last 7 days, the recall time may be 3 hours for the first day, and then 12 hours from day 2 to day 6 and finally 8 hours on day 7. Having the capability to enter these different times would be very useful.

There is a known problem with ONLORF that after a period of time has passed completed outages are no longer available on the system. Will the new software correct these problems?

- Feedback on the proposed State Control Framework (slides 11 to 14) for Planned, Urgent and Forced outages.

We would like clarification on the "Study State". From the documentation it appears that the Market Participant cannot make changes to an outage while it is in the "Study" State and that this state lasts at least a month under the Quarterly Advanced Approval Process. Is this interpretation correct? If a Market Participant want to make changes to an outage that is in this state what steps do they need to follow?

There was discussion at the meeting on how an outage moves through the various advanced approval (AA) processes namely the: Quarterly AA Process, Weekly AA Process, 3 day AA process and 1 day AA process. It would be useful if an example of how an outage that is not approved in the Quarterly AA process can receive advanced approval in the

subsequent approval processes if the Market Participant chooses not to change the outage start and end dates or times. Specifically does the outage lose its time stamp at any point and does the outage need to be resubmitted?

Our understanding is that an outage (either forced or planned) that is extended beyond its original end time needs to be resubmitted as a new outage. Often an outage slip, with an end time, is submitted shortly after a forced outage occurs. The original end time entered on the slip is only an estimate of when the unit will return to service and could be refined a number of times as the cause of the outage is investigated. Our understanding is that if the outage end time is advanced then a new slip is not required but if it is delayed then a new slip is required. Is this understanding correct?

4. Feedback on the Interim Process to date, including recommendations for change with respect to the 3-Day and 1-Day advance approval processes.

The process has worked well so far. We understand the reasons why short-notice outages are no longer accepted but would still like some flexibility to be built into the process to allow for changes in ramp profiles/testing due to changes in outage end dates/times or emerging work.

If you have any questions, please email stakeholder.engagement@ieso.ca

Regards,
IESO Stakeholder Engagement