

## Minutes of the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Forecasts and Assessments Sub-Committee

October 15, 2003, 1:15 to 4:00pm  
Clarkson System Control Centre, Room 216

### Attendees:

Peter Gruttke	Ontario Power Generation
Greg Hine	Independent Electricity Market Operator
Norm Jary	Hydro One Networks
Craig Lemon	Union Gas
Peter Lo	Toronto Hydro Electric System
Dan Rochester	Independent Electricity Market Operator (chair)
Richard Rogacki	Ministry of Energy
Mel Waselovich	Stelco

by phone:

David Brown	Ontario Energy Board
Margaret Duzy	TransCanada Energy

### Agenda Item 1: Outage Process Working Group

Mark Wilson, Section Head, Market Forecasts and Integration, made a presentation on the work of the Subcommittee, specifically its June 10 meeting where several issues were identified:

1. Two-day ahead advance approval – can the advance approval date be extended to a week or weeks?
2. Generator testing – flexibility regarding outages and submission of dispatch data
3. Categorizing equipment for outage notice – can certain outage types be submitted with less notice?
4. Market rules to provide for Generator/Transmitter coordination
5. Maintaining timestamp precedence for rejected outages
6. Compensation for transmitter outages
7. Better definition of reportable equipment e.g. multi-redundant station auxiliary equipment
8. IMO to provide impact assessments to participants e.g. potential G/R or L/R requirements
9. Notification of at risk – can this include a statement of relative time stamp precedence?
10. Develop criteria for allowing flexibility in adequacy assessments e.g. estimated imports (700 MW); reserve margin
11. Stakeholdering requirements for changes to market facing tools
12. Tool improvements e.g. outage interface for market participants

The Subcommittee is working on issues and recommendations that are expected to be presented before the Market Operations Standing Committee by year-end.

## **Agenda Item 2: Review of minutes: Meeting #6 (June 25th, 2003)**

Minutes were approved.

## **Agenda Item 3: Outstanding action items**

Dan Rochester reviewed Action Items from the June 25th meeting:

**Action 6-1:** Dan Rochester was asked to investigate a possible ownership discrepancy identified in the Generator Disclosure Reports; no further details or follow-up were provided by the person asking for such investigation and no action was taken. COMPLETE

**Action 6-2:** IMO Sr. Management asked for an assessment of the adequacy of fuel gas supply for this winter; a contact from Union gas was sought to make a presentation. DEFERRED

**Action 6-3:** Dan Rochester was asked to request the Long-Term Forecasts And Assessments Department to investigate the feasibility of providing data on where outages stand in the priority stack. LTFA will integrate this reporting with similar aspects resulting from the work of the Outage Planning Subcommittee. Details will be provided when the necessary reports become available. COMPLETE

## **Agenda Item 4: Niagara 25 Hz Working Group**

This working group has been organized with full stakeholder representation, and has had 2 meetings. Terms of reference have been set to look at alternatives for reducing congestion payments, or for reduction of the 25 Hz system. The economics of load conversion or addition of frequency changers are being analyzed. The working group is developing a consensus position to take to the IMO Board of Directors. Although the status quo was used as a reference against which to measure the benefits of alternatives, it is not being considered as an option.

## **Agenda Item 5: Transmission Planning Working Group**

At the July 3, 2003 meeting of the IMO Board, the Market Surveillance Panel presented its report entitled: "[Constrained Off Payments and Other Issues in the Management of Congestion](#)". The Board discussed the report, endorsed the recommendations and asked IMO Management to take action to implement them in on-going consultation with the Board. With respect to the elimination of constrained off payments, the Board agreed to address this issue if the Panel brings it forward at a later date.

The Transmission Planning Working group, chaired by the OEB, has met 3 times, completed its terms of reference, and expects to have a report ready by year end that will identify efficiency enhancing programs, and changes to the planning and approval process.

**Question:** Why will public consultation take place after the report and recommendations are published?

**Answer:** At present, that parties involved the IMO, OPG, Hydro One, the OEB and GLP. This concern about timing of public consultation will be taken under advisement.

**Information:** The relevant legislation in the Ontario Energy Board Act -

### **Leave to construct, etc., electricity transmission or distribution line**

**92. (1)** No person shall construct, expand or reinforce an electricity transmission line or an electricity distribution line or make an interconnection without first obtaining from the

Board an order granting leave to construct, expand or reinforce such line or interconnection. 1998, c. 15, Sched. B, s. 92 (1).

### **Exception**

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to the relocation or reconstruction of an existing electricity transmission line or electricity distribution line or interconnection where no expansion or reinforcement is involved unless the acquisition of additional land or authority to use additional land is necessary. 1998, c. 15, Sched. B, s. 92 (2).

**Question:** Is Location Marginal Pricing part of the discussion?

**Answer:** There is a lot of talk about it, but the IMO is not offering any comments at this time.

**Question:** Why are there no local distributors participating in this working group?

**Answer:** The initial MSP proposal was limited to the larger entities, and the process has included only those.

### **Agenda Item 6: Q3 2003 18-Month Outlook**

The webcast was posted, hence there was no need to walk through it step-by-step. Specific issues discussed for future Outlooks dealt with the possibility of changing to a single resource scenario due to lack of new construction under way, and the status of Pickering A.

The treatment of the three remaining shutdown Pickering A units (Units 1, 2, and 3) in future Outlooks was discussed. With the uncertainties associated with completing the reactivation of these units, the question was raised whether the units' capacities should continue to be included in the Existing Installed Generation Resources Table but subsequently removed in the calculation of "Total Reductions in Resources". The discussion was further expanded to consider the re-classification of any existing generation having been shutdown for an extended length of time (e.g. 2 to 3 years) in such a manner as to remove such capacity from the Existing Installed Generation Resources Table.

**Action 7-1:** Dan Rochester to review the treatment of the last three shutdown Pickering A Units in future Outlooks.

### **Agenda Item 7: 2004 10-Year Outlook**

Inclusion of multiple scenarios was discussed, with more input from LDCs and customers. The IMO has the authority to obtain detailed forecast information from market participants if it chooses to enforce current rules.

### **Agenda Item 8: Next Meetings**

January 14, 2004

April 7, 2004

June 24, 2004

October 6, 2004