

Minutes of Meeting

Date held: July 3, 2014	Time held: 9:00 am – 11:00 am	Location held: IESO
Company Name	Attended	Attendance Status (A)ttended; (R) Registered; (S)ubstitute; (TC) Teleconference
Brighton Beach Power	Little, Dave	TC
Emera Energy	MacDonald, Brad	TC
Gerdau	Simmons, Dave	A
Hydro One	Naveed, Haider	TC
Hydro One	Waite, Ed	TC
Ontario Power Generation	Gray, Jim	TC
Portlands Energy Centre	Rouhi, Amir	TC
IESO	Chow, Clarence	A
IESO	Gojmerac, Mark	A
IESO	Harrison, Susan	A
IESO	Romeo, Rick	A
Scribe: Clarence Chow, Operations Change Initiatives, 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/Pages/Participate/Stakeholder-Engagement/SE-109.aspx>

Item 1 Welcome, Introduction and Opening Remarks

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

Item 2 IESO Response to Stakeholder Feedback on the June 4 Meeting Materials

Mark Gojmerac presented feedback received from members and IESO actions resulting from comments on the following functional aspects for the new outage management system: the proposed equipment model, handling of auxiliary equipment outages, the proposed constraint and purpose codes, the proposed auto Advance Approval mechanism, and the proposed lead time validation.

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

With respect to using the “other miscellaneous equipment” class for reporting auxiliary equipment outages, a member asked if outages not meeting the criteria of being a loss of redundancy and having a recall time of ≤ 15 min would be manually reviewed by the IESO for inclusion in the 1 Day Advance Approval process.

The IESO responded that they will not be manually reviewing auxiliary equipment outages for inclusion in the 1 Day Advance Approval process. The software will automatically be checking for LOR and ≤ 15 min recall.

Item 3 Software Design Updates

Mark Gojmerac presented updates on the proposed software design with respect to the 1 Day Advance Approval criteria validation, modifications to Auto Advance Approval, the Final Approval in Advance process, and the conflict checking mechanism.

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 modified Auto Advance Approval rule for AC/DC Station Service equipment requiring outages to have no effect on transformer cooling would also apply to phase-shifters.

The IESO responded yes. This modification is applicable to all station service equipment.

With respect to the Final Approval in Advance (FAA) process, a member asked if there would be a phone call by the IESO to the participant if the FAA flag on an outage request is removed by the IESO.

The IESO responded that they would not be notifying the participant by phone call in the event that the FAA flag is removed. The IESO is proposing that it would be the participant's responsibility to ensure that an outage request is still flagged for FAA on the day that the outage is scheduled to start.

A member asked what would happen if a participant submitted a request that was eligible for Auto Advance Approval and FAA but did not actually meet the criteria. Would there be any error or warning to tell the participant that the outage is not in fact eligible.

The IESO responded that the software would not provide a warning if Auto Advance Approval or FAA were not being met. The outage request would simply be made eligible for manual assessment for Advance Approval in the next available study period (e.g. weekly or daily) as long as lead time validation (i.e. submission deadlines) were being met. However, the software will warn the user if their outage submission did not satisfy lead time validation.

With respect to the proposed conflict checking mechanism for warning against undesirable outage request combinations, a member asked if these combinations would be directly configurable by an IESO administrator.

The IESO responded yes.

A member subsequently asked if a list of the undesirable outage request combinations could be provided.

The IESO responded that consideration will be given to providing market participants with such a list; however, the list would have to take into consideration any confidential information.

A member raised the concern that the warning presented by the conflict checking mechanism does not tell the participant exactly what is in conflict with the submitted outage, therefore the participant would likely have to call the IESO for details.

The IESO responded that that is correct. While the IESO would like for the warning to provide more information, that capability is not available at the time. In the meantime, the IESO would like to take advantage of the conflict checking mechanism as it is an improvement over the existing tool set.

A member asked if the conflict checking mechanism would indicate, to a participant, only conflicts within the participant's system or if it would reveal conflicts between all participants.

The IESO responded that while the conflict checking mechanism has the capability of checking conflicts between all participant outage requests, the majority of the details associated with the conflict will only be seen by the IESO. It is proposed that a market participant will be able to identify that their outage request is in conflict with another participant's outage, however, that certain details of the outage may be censored to maintain confidentiality.

Item 4 Proposed Data Migration Strategy

Mark Gojmerac presented the proposed data migration strategy with respect to migrating historical, in progress, and future outage requests to the new system.

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

In response to the IESO's proposal of migrating future outage requests up to only 3 years in advance, with requests further than 3 years having to be resubmitted, a member raised the concern that those future outage requests should not have their time stamp removed.

The IESO responded that there is the possibility of manually assigning a time stamp after the outage requests are resubmitted, allowing for those future outage requests to retain their priority. The IESO intends to perform a transition test on a sample set of outage requests to evaluate the amount of manual effort required in migrating the outage requests. The IESO requests that participants submit feedback to the IESO for any concerns regarding the proposed data migration strategy.

Item 5 Review Action Items and Next Steps

Mark Gojmerac reviewed next steps which included seeking feedback from stakeholders, IESO's response to stakeholder feedback, and the next meeting date of July 30.

The meeting then adjourned.