Outage Management Process Redesign (SE-109)

Minutes of Meeting

Date held: July 30, 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
Cochrane Power	White, Bruce	TC
Emera Energy	MacDonald, Brad	TC
GDF Suez Canada	Bauder, Donald	TC
Gerdau	Simmons, Dave	A
Goreway Station Partnership	Baroskov, Juri	TC
Great Lakes Power	Alton, Tiana	TC
Hydro One	Chayka, Darin	A
Kingston Generating Station	Donnelly, Keith	TC
Northland Power	Veldhuizen, Jon	A
Ontario Power Generation	Gray, Jim	TC
Portlands Energy Centre	Rouhi, Amir	TC
PowerStream Inc.	Cunningham, Paul	R
PowerStream Inc.	Stackhouse, Chuck	R
IESO	Chow, Clarence	A
IESO	Duru, Josh	A
IESO	Gojmerac, Mark	A
IESO	Johnson, Len	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

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

Item 2 IESO Response to Stakeholder Feedback on the July 3 Meeting Materials

Mark Gojmerac presented feedback received from members and IESO actions resulting from comments on the following: the proposed 1 Day Advance Approval criteria validation, the proposed Final Approval in Advance process and feature, the proposed Conflict Checking feature, and the proposed migration strategy for historical, in progress, and future outage requests.

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 proposed conflict checking feature would take into consideration the timestamps of the conflicting outage requests. An example was provided in the case of a generator submitting an outage that would conflict a transmission line outage and the member asked what would become of the generator's outage request.

The IESO responded yes, the timestamp would be taken into consideration in the conflict checking feature. Since the conflict checking feature is invoked on submission of the outage request, any conflicts that would be presented that time would be default have a higher priority timestamp.

A member asked if the undesirable outage combinations list would be based on system control orders (SCOs).

The IESO responded that SCOs would be used to determine undesirable outage combinations however other circumstances that may not be addressed within SCOs such as pre-contingency and post-contingency thermal limitations could also be used to develop undesirable combinations.

Item 3 Software Design Updates

Mark Gojmerac presented updates on the proposed software design including the outage request linking feature and generator ramping and testing feature.

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

A member asked if outage request links to other outage requests will be visible to market participants, and added that the feature would be of little benefit if the links were not visible to participants.

The IESO responded that it will confirm with the vendor if outage request links are visible to market participants. The IESO agreed with the member but added that the feature could still be beneficial because the information gained from the outage request linking could be communicated by the IESO to the participant through other communication mechanisms on the outage request (i.e. comment fields or validation warnings).

With respect to the enhance feature proposal for shifting non-continuous recurrences on an outage request, a member asked if the outage request periods could be shifted in real time, noting that the proposed shifting feature would be most beneficial if it allowed for shifting in real time, for example when a generator is in the process of ramping its output up or down.

The IESO responded that currently the software design does not allow for changes to the outage time once it is implemented (i.e. in-progress).

Item 4 Overview of Process Redesign

Mark Gojmerac presented an overview of the process redesign with respect to the outage priority sequence, the outage statuses and status transition, the priority date and changes that are considered significant, the quarterly, weekly, 3-day, and 1-day Advanced Approval processes, and the Final Approval in Advance process.

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 August 27.

The meeting then adjourned.