

Minutes of Meeting EDAC - Operations Design Working Group

| Date held: May 7, 2009 | Time held: 8:30 pm to 13:40 pm | Location: Clarkson Viewing Gallery |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Invited/Attended | Company Name | Attendance Status (A)ttended; (R)egrets; (S)ubstitute |
| McLeod, Ron | Abitibi Bowater | A |
| Cormier, Pascal | Brookfield Power | R |
| Laurin, Marc-Andre | Brookfield Power | R |
| Somerville, Stephen | Competitive Power Ventures Inc | A |
| Forsyth, Dave | Gera AmeriSteel Corporation | R |
| Oberholster, Henry | Greater Toronto Airports Authority | R |
| Baldwin, Ted | Greenfield Energy Centre | A |
| Windsor, John | Greenfield Energy Centre | A |
| Penn, Richard | Greenfield Energy Centre | A |
| Abdelnour, Francois | Ivaco Rolling Mills | R |
| Samant, Sushil | Northland Power Incorporated | A |
| Covelli, Lucille | Ontario Power Generation | A |
| Fok, Danny (IT) | Ontario Power Generation | A |
| Kelly, Martin | Ontario Power Generation | A |
| Peterson, David | Ontario Power Generation | A |
| Shah, Sushil | Ontario Power Generation | A |
| Yee, Wah - IT Alternate | Ontario Power Generation | A |
| Kerr, Paul | Shell Energy | R |
| Cary, Rob | Sithe Global | A (Part-Time) |
| Harwood, Shane | Sithe Global | A |
| Kraayenbrink, Ron | St. Clair Energy | R |
| Goldstein, Michael | St. Clair Energy | R |
| Heaton, Randy | TransCanada Energy | A |
| Kuntz, Margaret | TransCanada Energy | A |
| Abid, Tiberiu | IESO | A |
| Briggs, Jeannette | IESO | A (Part-Time) |
| Doran, Pat | IESO | A |
| Lodyga, Martin | IESO | A |
| McIntosh, Grant | IESO | A |
| Sandilands, Wade | IESO | A |
| Williams, Ralph | IESO | A |

The meeting minutes when finalized will be posted on the IESO web site at:
http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/consult/consult_ODWG.asp

Summary of Meeting Discussion

Item 1 Introduction and Review of Agenda

Pat Doran welcomed the members to the EDAC Operations Design Working Group meeting and invited the attendees to introduce themselves. This was followed by a review of the meeting agenda.

There were no comments submitted regarding the minutes from the April 16, EDAC Operations Design Working Group meeting and the minutes were posted to the portal as final on May 1, 2009.

Item 2 Review of Action Items

Pat Doran reviewed the action items from the last meeting and provided status updates. The action item table in these minutes reflects the current status of all action items.

Review of Action #3

For action #3, it was clarified that any updates to the Daily Generator Data made by a generator, would become the default data used for any subsequent EDAC runs. The update would be carried over to all future EDAC days and be used as the default data until it is over written by a future update. This clarification has been added to the presentation from the last meeting, and is available on the portal for review.

A generator asked whether there would be a report to view the active set of Daily Generator Data that would be used by EDAC. The IESO explained that there will be a mechanism to access updated default Daily Generator Data through a report similar to the valid bid report used on the OPGUI. This detail will be captured in the business requirements document.

Review of Action #4

Several participants raised questions regarding how a change to their MLP in the Daily Generator Data would be treated in real time when it differs from the registered MLP.

The IESO clarified that any changes in MLP would be used for the EDAC day, and would be carried over as default data for future EDAC days. Commitments resulting from EDAC would

be at the MLP specified in the Daily Generator Data. However, any schedule in real-time beyond the EDAC commitment schedule would be based on the registered MLP. As a result, a generator will need to inform the control room in real-time of the MLP update. Where the new MLP is higher than the registered MLP, the IESO will apply a constraint to respect the new MLP until such time as the generator can update their dispatch data to reflect the new MLP. Any changes made to MLP in both EDAC and real-time will be open to after the fact compliance scrutiny.

The proposed Market Rules on self-induced CMSC have been identified as warranting consideration by the Technical Panel, pending an effort to revise the proposed rules to incorporate generator concerns. The IESO cannot definitely say what the impact of possible rule amendments will be on real-time CMSC relating to elevated Minimum Loading Points at this time.

Action: A generator asked that the IESO notify participants where to address any opinions and concerns related to the pending market rules on self-induced CMSC.

Editorial Note: *The pending market rule amendment for self-induced CMSC can be tracked by Market Participants by monitoring the TP meeting website:*

http://www.ieso.ca/imoweb/amendments/tp_meetings.asp

MR-00252 is still a work in progress and before this market rule amendment comes back to the Technical Panel for review the IESO needs to resolve some issues with the generator reps on the panel in order to re-draft the amendment submission and bring it back to the panel for review and discussion. At this time it is not clear when that work will occur due to resource issues at the IESO.

When the rule amendment comes back to the TP there will likely be a few separate discussions at a number of TP meetings before any "draft" rule amendments are posted for comments. The request for comments would be published so that all market participants would have a chance to provide comments. MPs who are interested in this issue can follow things through the TP materials page (link provided above) and also the generator in question can always contact its representatives on the panel for updates.

Review of Action #11

A definition of Eligible Energy Limited Resource (EELR) was presented. Supplemental power point slides were posted on the web portal for reference.

A generator inquired why an EELR resource needs to have a cascading relationship. The IESO clarified that in order to be eligible to resubmit offers in EDAC, a hydroelectric resource needs to establish a water flow dependency with another hydroelectric resource operated by the same Registered Market Participant. Because of this operational relationship, submissions can be

revised to ensure the scheduling of dependant resources in a way that reflects the physical limitations of water flow.

A generator asked whether requests for segregated mode of operation (SMO) can be excluded from the EDAC time frame, and be submitted in real time only. The IESO confirmed that SMO, like any other export can still be scheduled in real-time. SMO submissions will only be included in EDAC if the participant wants their units to be considered as being in SMO in the EDAC time frame.

Action: An ODWG member requested that updates to EDAC documents, clearly identify where the document has changed from the previous version (i.e. redlined, etc).

Editorial Note: All documents on the portal are under version control. Any changes to these documents are identified by a new version number and in addition, the IESO will implement a process where changes to posted documents are clearly identified.

A generator inquired about a request made at the last ODWG meeting to provide further clarification and rewording of the 4th criteria for PCG eligibility.

Action: The IESO will review whether the clarification of the 4th criteria for PCG eligibility has been addressed in the previous power point presentations. If not, clarification of the statement will be made.

Editorial Note: The 4th criteria for PCG eligibility is:

- have a need to initiate start up sequences greater than 1 hour in advance of the hour in which they first receive a schedule, in order to respond to a dispatch associated with their constrained schedules

This was further clarified in the minutes of the April 16th meeting where it was clarified that initiation of start-up sequence is typically from first fire. The criteria for PCG eligibility then applies where the time from first fire to MLP is greater than 1 hour.

A participant asked for a link to the market rules that are developed during the EDAC detailed design phase. The IESO responded that the Technical Panel webpage shows all revisions and amendments that are in front of the panel. [Current Market Rule Amendments](#)

[MR-00348 - Enhanced Day-Ahead Commitment Process \(EDAC\): 24 Hour Optimization and 3-part Offers](#)

Item 3 Real-Time Issues Outside the Scope of EDAC

Jeanette Briggs provided a power point presentation on real-time issues that are outside the scope of EDAC. The presentation was in response to the real-time issues raised and summarized in the minutes of the last ODWG meeting. These real-time issues that are outside the scope of EDAC will be prioritized and addressed through Stakeholder Engagement SE-61.

A generator voiced concern that SE-61, like other stakeholder initiatives, may not provide resolution to the issues even after spending a significant amount of time on it by the IESO and participants. This concern was further supported by another generator. Specifically, the example was identified that following substantial effort in the form of discussions, comment submissions and a cost benefit analysis, the peak versus average demand forecast initiative was not implemented and no benefit was realized.

A comment was received that the prioritization and assessment of real time issues needs to be streamlined to avoid the misuse of resources. Additionally, the IESO needs to repair its credibility by preventing the cancelation or delay of initiatives deemed important to participants.

Real-time issues will be discussed at the June 3rd Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting. A participant invited members in attendance to appear in front to the SAC to voice support for outstanding real-time issues and support a need for the IESO to commit the resources necessary to address the issues that have been identified.

A participant noted that although real-time issues will be presented to the SAC, no resolution will be immediate. As a result, intermediate solutions should be put in place during the time it takes to address the real-time issues. One intermediate solution mentioned was to give participants a larger compliance dead-band. Such a solution could be quickly delivered, and would provide flexibility to participants while other items are worked on. Another solution brought up was plant aggregation for combined cycle plants, but it was thought that such a solution would take longer to implement.

Participants were invited to take part in the prioritization and definition of SE-61, by attending the Settlements Design Working Group (SDWG) meeting on May 13 where a discussion on real-time issues will take place from 2-5 p.m. Attendees are welcome to bring forth solutions for real-time operation issues that can be quickly deployed while longer implementations are worked on.

A generator asked about the status of the SGOL and DA-GCG amendment that is being presented to the Technical Panel on May 26. The IESO provided an update on the status of the amendment by stating that the changes to market rules are intended to address some of the concerns raised in the current scheduling and settlement of DACP and SGOL. The current amendment addresses these concerns and will be implemented in September.

***Editorial Note:** It has been identified that the changes associated with SGOL must follow one of the four baseline calendar dates for changes to technical interfaces agreed to between the IESO and market participants. As the Board of Director's will not be voting on this amendment until mid September plus the 22 day period of comment, the September 9th baseline date cannot be targeted. Therefore, the implementation date is now scheduled for December 9th.*

A generator stated that the IESO should first resolve the real-time issues generators are experiencing, and improve on the scheduling difficulties related to combined cycle plants under SGOL before proceeding with the SGOL and DA-GCG amendment.

Item 4 Issue Log

Pat Doran reviewed the detailed design issues log and provided updates.

Members were advised that the issues log does not necessarily include the action items raised in the ODWG. The issue log is meant to keep track of long term items.

A generator inquired about the proposed restrictions to increases in the offer price for the minimum loading point. The IESO stated that this issue is being addressed at the May 13th Settlements Design Working Group meeting.

Participants discussed the market impacts of real-time offer price reductions where a generator has an EDAC constraint and wants to match their real-time schedule to their EDAC schedule. A Generator stated that if enough participants engage in such action, energy prices will be lowered thereby affecting the revenue of participants that are dependent on the market clearing price.

Another Generator asked why a resource would offer in this manner when the incremental energy above MLP is scheduled economically in real time.

The IESO clarified that generators eligible for a DA-PCG's are constrained during EDAC for the duration of their EDAC schedule, but only up to their MLP. Although generators are constrained to their MLP amount, they are eligible for a DA-PCG to their total EDAC scheduled amount.

Participants commented that if capacity is over scheduled in EDAC, generators will be forced to lower offers to meet their day-ahead schedule in order to use their purchased amount of gas. This will result in a distorted offer curve, causing price suppression and affecting revenues in the market.

A generator inquired whether the IESO is over committing resources in the day-ahead time frame. The IESO stated that there is no over commitment of resources under DACP, given that commitments in the day-ahead are based on primary demand requirements, and that no exports participate in the DACP.

Action: The IESO is to assess the downward pressure on price due to guarantees (both DACP/EDAC and OPA), and the impact of restricting MLP pricing.

Editorial Note: This issue was discussed at the Settlements Design Working Group meeting on May 13, 2009. It was agreed that this is an existing issue and while EDAC does exacerbate the issue, it will be addressed as part of work associated with real-time issues outside the scope of EDAC.

Item 5 EDAC Schedule – Optimization Timeline

- Data Revision During EDAC
- Notifications Required for EDAC
- Offers Submission into Real-time

Ralph Williams provided a presentation on the EDAC Optimization process which stepped through the EDAC timeline, associated reporting, notification and optimization.

A generator inquired as to why the initial run of EDAC occurred at 10:00 and was not earlier. The IESO explained that start time was established as a compromise between hydroelectric generator needs, gas generator and IESO needs. A generator clarified that an earlier submission requirement would lower the accuracy of collected data that determines the day-ahead schedules of hydroelectric resources.

A generator asked whether the EDAC results available around 13:00 would be the final representation of day-ahead schedules. The IESO clarified that the 13:00 EDAC results would be

final if there were no further changes that resulted in a re-run of EDAC. If there was a change meeting the EDAC re-run criteria subsequent EDAC run would be performed to reschedule resources according to the newly identified day-ahead conditions.

A generator asked whether the 400MW criteria for EDAC re-run criteria, could be adjusted in the future. The IESO referenced the current market rules for SSR material changes, which do not specify the exact numeric magnitude for a material change. A similar rule will be used for EDAC, which will allow fine tuning of the criteria, if required in the future.

A generator inquired how participants will be notified whether the 13:00 EDAC run is final. The IESO explained that any requirement for a subsequent EDAC run would be published in a SSR. Therefore unless a SSR, with a system advisory indicating the requirement to re-run, is issued, the results of the 13:00 EDAC run could be used for the EDAC schedule of Record.

A generator asked whether the cumulative effect of demand and generation changes would be taken into account for determining if the EDAC re-run criteria is met. The IESO explained that the EDAC re-run criteria is based on a single incident and not a cumulative effect of changes. (I.e. it would not be as a result of 250MW demand increase plus the loss of two 100MW generators, but a single 400MW event.)

Participants voiced that there would be a benefit in a standard communication protocol that would declare that the most recent EDAC result is official (EDAC schedule of record).

Action: The IESO will investigate ways of developing a report that would identify when EDAC results are final, and can be issued at a specific time each day. Example: A report that is populated at 14:00 when the EDAC results are final is identified as the EDAC Schedule of Record.

A generator asked whether the EDAC constrained run generates shadow prices that could be available to participants for all nodes. The IESO responded that EDAC produces shadow prices and that requirements will be addressed at the May 27th meeting when publication and reporting is discussed.

A generator asked how varying wind forecasts would be accounted for in subsequent EDAC runs. Any changes to forecasts would require forecast inputs to be updated so that subsequent EDAC runs result in accurate shadow prices and schedules.

Action: The IESO will look at ongoing developments that are underway in wind forecasting, under SE #57 and ensure that it is coordinated with EDAC.

Editorial Note: A central wind forecasting service is under consideration through SE #57. The IESO sponsor for SE #57 was notified of the EDAC timeline and coordination requirements. Wind forecasts are required before the first run of EDAC at 10:00.

A generator questioned the validity of additional EDAC runs for an over-generation scenario, since it is unlikely that a Surplus Baseload Generation (SBG) condition could be resolved day-ahead. The IESO agreed that it is unlikely that SBG could be resolved, but opening the window to accept new/revised dispatch data allows for exports and reduced offer quantities that could lower the anticipated surplus.

A generator made a request for a report showing a breakdown of the quantity of offers that are changed between EDAC runs as a result of accepted changes that are separate from EELR revisions. A further request was made that a list of resources be made available to market participants, listing the resources that qualify for EELR status.

Action: The IESO will investigate publishing a report listing the hourly quantity of offers accepted between EDAC runs outside of EELRs.

Editorial Note: The Current Adequacy report tracks totals offers and schedules for each hour.

Action: The IESO will investigate publishing a listing all resources that qualify for EELR status and are eligible for EDAC re-submission, subject to confidentiality concerns.

A generator asked what type of notification will be made if the EDAC process fails. The IESO stated that as soon as it is apparent that the EDAC process fails, a notification will be sent to participants through an SSR.

A generator inquired whether it would be possible to run the pre-dispatch in place of EDAC if it fails. The IESO noted that no decision has been made on whether pre-dispatch can be run as a replacement upon a failure of EDAC. Only one successful run is required in order to declare EDAC successful as opposed to two runs with the current DACP.

A generator asked whether there would be an opportunity for a generator to submit their dispatch data if they miss the 10:00 EDAC deadline when their ADE is initially established. The IESO stated that if a generator misses the submission window, they would only be allowed to

submit new dispatch data to resolve resulting energy or capacity shortfalls or for the valid reason that have been noted (i.e. early return from outage, safety, environment etc.). Capability is available for a participant to mitigate this problem through the use of having standing offers in place.

A generator asked for a clarification on daily generator data. The IESO stated that in the EDAC time frame, the last submitted value for daily generated data would be used by the EDAC calculation engine. As a result, any EDAC schedules and constraints would respect submitted daily generator data. However any schedules in real-time that are outside the commitments made during EDAC would utilize the registration data submitted through Market Entry. As a result, if a generator is scheduled in real-time outside of the EDAC schedule, the generator needs to communicate any changes in MLP to the control room if the daily generator data MLP is any different than the registered MLP.

A generator asked that the IESO provide a written description of the treatment and consequences of changes made to MLP in either EDAC or real-time. The description should include the submission and approval process, duration for which the data is applicable, as well as the treatment by settlements and compliance.

Action: The IESO review the impacts of MLP changes during the EDAC to real-time transition. Contents will include the submission and approval process, duration for which the data is applicable, as well as the treatment by settlements and compliance.

Item 6 Pseudo Unit Status Update

Tiberiu Abid presented the historical sequence of events related to pseudo unit development and updated the group on its current status.

A generator stated that they have been unable to decide whether they would use the pseudo unit model, and would like to put any decisions on hold. They expressed a preference for physical aggregation for combined cycle plants and would like to use that in place of the pseudo unit to successfully schedule combined cycle resources. A question was posed to the IESO on whether they would make a decision regarding the pseudo unit implementation even if some participants declare that they will not use it.

The IESO stated that a decision has not yet been made on whether to implement the pseudo unit model. The IESO was waiting on the submissions from combined cycle plant owners, stating

whether they will use the pseudo-unit model. Based on feedback, the IESO will make a decision by May 13th, in order to avoid delays to the EDAC project.

A generator asked whether they could swap between the physical and pseudo model. The IESO confirmed that this would not be possible on a daily basis. A generator would have to change their registration data to swap between the physical and pseudo unit model. Any changes received through the registration process would require 6 business days to implement. The participant must use the physical model during real-time regardless of whether the pseudo unit model is used in day-ahead.

A generator voiced their concern with the real-time DSO tool, by stating the opinion that the IESO's real-time scheduling tool should be designed to resolve scheduling issues, instead of requiring market participants to take action to account for the tools deficiencies. Another generator voiced support for this concern, and suggested that the IESO implement a bigger compliance deadband in order to provide more flexibility in dealing with the DSO limitations. The IESO indicated that these discussions related to real time issues and solutions should be raised under SE#61.

Item 7 Pseudo Unit Registration Data

Tiberiu Abid presented registration requirements for pseudo-unit resources.

A generator inquired as to the difference between compliance and physical aggregation. The IESO explained that with physical aggregation, all aggregated generators are treated as a single resource. As a result only a single set of dispatch data is submitted into the IESO, which generates a single energy dispatch instruction. With compliance aggregation, each resource submits dispatch data, and receives an individual dispatch instruction. Compliance aggregation only established a deadband for the net output and the output of each individual unit that allows for added operational flexibility.

A generator asked how derates get submitted on pseudo units. The IESO stated that there are two options for derating a pseudo unit. One option would be to submit a derate on the physical unit through the outage system. The submitted derate would be automatically accounted for in the pseudo unit capacity calculation for the duration of the outage submission. The second option would be to revise the capacity in the registration data, which would be a more permanent solution, but would only take effect 6 days after the revision.

A generator provided advice that the IESO should have a central electronic portal that would allow entry for all registration data. The IESO will follow up with Market Entry in regards to what improvements are possible in the transition from the current form based submissions.

Editorial Note: This information was provided to the IESO's Market Entry Department for their consideration. The changes to the Market Entry tools and processes as a result of EDAC are incremental in nature and do not require large scale changes to infrastructure or technology.

A generator asked for the definition of the MLP Limit variable. The IESO defined the MLP Limit value as the maximum MLP range a generator would normally experience. The MLP Limit variable will be utilized to validate any MLP revisions, as long as the MLP revision is lower than the MLP Limit, it will be automatically accepted for use in EDAC.

A generator stated that their MLP Limit could be as high as their full operating range, as this allows the participant to offer their duct burner capacity for the operating reserve market (duct burners would not be able to respond until the CT is operating at its full capacity). The IESO argued against such a high MLP Limit, as it would essentially remove any dispatchable portion on the resource. Another generator suggested that the generator could achieve the same outcome by managing their offers.

A generator asked for clarification in regards to the number of pseudo units that a participant can offer. The IESO explained that the pseudo model that is under consideration is the unit model, which limits the number of pseudo units to the number of combustion turbines at the plant.

A generator inquired how to best account for the varying baseload generation amount that a combined cycle plant will have due to varying external conditions. The IESO restated that such information can be revised for EDAC on a daily basis through updates to the daily generator data. Although any such information will also need to be communicated to the control room during real-time.

A participant noted that if a combustion turbine is derated and is unable to reach full output, then the steam turbine will be unable to reach the duct firing range. However, the tool would be unable to recognize this, and would schedule any economic portion of the duct firing range. The IESO stated that in this circumstance, the participant would have to remove any offers associated with duct firing, since the participant is unable to physically deliver the offered energy.

Item 8 Review Next Meeting Agenda

Pat Doran reviewed the meeting agenda for the next EDAC Operations Design Working Group meeting. The next meeting will cover the following topics:

- De-Commitment and Withdrawal
- Peak and Average Demand Forecasts
- SSR/SAA Report Changes
- EDAC Reporting Requirements

The next meeting will be on May 27th in the Clarkson Viewing Gallery.

Action Item Summary

| # | Date | Action | Status | Comments |
|---|----------------|---|--------|---|
| 1 | April 16, 2009 | The IESO will check to see if the Portal User Guide covers subscribing and if not will revise it appropriately. A link to the portal user guide will be provided to the DWG. | Closed | The Portal User Guide was updated and posted on April 30 |
| 2 | April 16, 2009 | The IESO will determine the process to handle identified Real Time issues and identify the process for tracking and assigning these issues. The process will be discussed at the next DWG meeting. Al Miller will identify how long it will take to determine if an issue is in scope of EDAC or not as part of this process. | Closed | The IESO plan for addressing real-time issues was presented to the Operations Design Working Group on May 7, 2009 |
| 3 | April 16, 2009 | The IESO will determine if the requirement for Daily Generator Data to default to the last submitted value has a significant impact on the EDAC project (cost or schedule). | Closed | The IESO has determined that using the last submitted value as the default value for Daily Generator Data will not have a significant impact on the EDAC project. This will be adopted in the detailed design and slides from the April 16 th ODWG meeting were updated accordingly. |
| 4 | April 16, 2009 | IESO will provide clarification on how changes to MLP are handled in real time (for non EDAC scheduled hours) and how this relates to the new rules on self induced CMSC. (What happens in the example where the MLP post EDAC > | Closed | The IESO presented the process for managing changes to MLP in real-time at the May 7, 2009 ODWG meeting. Supplemental slides were posted to provide additional detail. The proposed Market Rules on |

Enhanced Day-Ahead Commitment Detailed Design (SE-73)

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|---|--------|---|
| | | registered MLP) | | self-induced CMSC have been identified as warranting consideration by the Technical Panel, pending an effort to revise the proposed rules to incorporate generator concerns. The IESO cannot definitely say what the impact will be on real-time CMSC relating to elevated Minimum Loading Points at this time. |
| 5 | April 16, 2009 | IESO will review the DET validation rule ($0 \leq (\text{Minimum Run Time} - \text{MGBRT}) \leq \text{DET}$) to determine if it works for minimum MRT situations. | Closed | This validation rule will be removed. Revised slide deck posted on portal on April 20, 2009. |
| 6 | | The IESO will post the presentation on ramping consideration for the ODWG which describes the rationale behind the 30% ramping MW assumption. | Closed | Slide deck from November 26, 2008 TSG meeting posted on portal on April 20, 2009. |
| 7 | April 16, 2009 | The IESO will update the startup cost slide to change the number format to \$/start and not \$/hr. | Closed | Revised slide deck posted on portal April 20, 2009. |
| 8 | April 16, 2009 | The IESO will provide further detail regarding how ramp rates will be utilized in the EDAC calculation engine to participants in writing. At that time, participants will be requested to identify any issues with this approach. | Closed | Additional detail provided as an editorial note in the meeting minutes. |
| 9 | April 16, 2009 | DWG members to identify any issues with using the first hour ramp rates for all hours of EDAC before the next DWG Meeting. | Closed | No issues raised by ODWG Participants before or during the May 7, 2009 ODWG meeting. |
| 10 | April 16, 2009 | IESO will update slide #14 of the EDAC data submission slide deck to reflect that "accepted" offers will | Closed | Revised slide deck posted on April 20, 2009. |

Enhanced Day-Ahead Commitment Detailed Design (SE-73)

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|---|-------------------|---|
| | | be used by both EDAC and pre-dispatch. | | |
| 11 | April 16, 2009 | The definition of “eligible ELR resource” will be developed and provided to the group. | Closed | The IESO presented the definition of Eligible Energy Limited Resources at the May 7, 2009 ODWG meeting. Supplemental slides were posted to provide additional detail. |
| 12 | May 7, 2009 | A generator asked that the IESO provide information on where to address any comments related to the pending market rule amendment for self-induced CMSC. | Closed | Information provided as an editorial note in the meeting minutes |
| 13 | May 7, 2009 | An ODWG member requested that updates to EDAC documents, clearly identify where the document has changed from the previous version (i.e. redlined, etc). | Closed | Information provided as an editorial note in the meeting minutes |
| 14 | May 7, 2009 | The IESO will review whether the clarification of the 4 th bullet has been addressed in the April 16th power point presentation. If not clarification and improvements to the statement will be made. | Closed | Clarification provided as an editorial note in the meeting minutes |
| 15 | May 7, 2009 | The IESO is to assess the concern expressed that guarantees (both DACP/EDAC and OPA), and the impact of restricting MLP pricing will cause downward pressure on price. | Closed | Additional detail provided as an editorial note in the meeting minutes. |
| 16 | May 7, 2009 | The IESO will investigate providing a report that would identify when EDAC results are final, and can be used as the official EDAC results. Example: A report that is populated with final results at a specific time each day. | Open | To be discussed at the May 27 th meeting of the ODWG |

Deleted: Open

Enhanced Day-Ahead Commitment Detailed Design (SE-73)

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--|--------|--|
| 17 | May 7, 2009 | The IESO will investigate ongoing developments that are underway in wind forecasting, under SE #57 and ensure that EDAC is in line with current efforts. | Closed | Information provided as an editorial note in the meeting minutes |
| 18 | May 7, 2009 | The IESO will investigate publishing a report listing the hourly quantity of offers revised between EDAC runs in addition to ELRs. | Closed | Information provided as an editorial note in the meeting minutes |
| 19 | May 7, 2009 | The IESO will investigate publishing a report listing all resources that qualify for EELR status and are eligible for EDAC re-submission, subject to confidentiality concerns. | Open | To be discussed at the May 27 th meeting of the ODWG |
| 20 | May 7, 2009 | The IESO will provide a description of the impacts of MLP changes during the EDAC to real-time transition. Contents will include the submission and approval process, duration for which the data is applicable, as well as the treatment by settlements and compliance. | Open | |