

MRP Energy Detailed Design

Design Document: OFFERS, BIDS AND DATA INPUTS

Stakeholder Feedback Form

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Date Submitted: YYYY/MM/DD | Feedback provided by: |
| Feedback Due: July 24, 2020 | Company Name: __Northland Power Inc. _____ |
| | Contact Name: __Michael Zajmalowski_____ |
| | Phone: _____ |
| | Email: _____ |

The IESO is posting a series of detailed design documents which together comprise the detailed design of the MRP energy stream.

This design document is posted to the following engagement webpage: <http://ieso.ca/en/Market-Renewal/Energy-Stream-Designs/Detailed-Design>.

Stakeholder feedback for this design document is due on **July 24, 2020** to engagement@ieso.ca.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

IESO Engagement

General feedback on the Detailed Design Document (please expand this section if required)

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| Design Document: Section | Detailed Comments (Areas of Support or Concern) |
|--|--|
| 1. Introduction | |
| 2. Summary of Current and Future State | <p>The design document states “For NQS generation facilities, registered market participants will submit new daily dispatch data parameters to express lead time data associated with their specific thermal states. This data will be submitted as daily dispatch data prior to the first calculation engine run of the day-ahead market and will represent a lead time curve for hot, warm and cold states of the generation unit. Existing parameters, such as minimum generation block down time will also need to be updated to include multiple values for hot, warm and cold in order to properly evaluate lead time data.”</p> <p>Question – Will resources be able to register different hot, warm and cold leadtimes for summer and winter? Winter conditions may impact lead times.</p> |

| Design Document: Section | Detailed Comments (Areas of Support or Concern) |
|--------------------------|---|
| | |
| 3. Functional Design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the “Lead Time” section it states “Each lead time value (hot, warm and cold) submitted as dispatch data must be a whole number that is greater than or equal to zero value and less than or equal to 24” <p>Where does the basis for 24 hours originate from? There are some conditions where a lead time may be greater than 24 hours. Will the IESO consider lead times greater than 24 hours if it can be justified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the “Lead Time” section it states “The sum of the lead time values (hot, warm and cold) must be less than or equal to the sum of the registered reference level values for lead time (hot, warm and cold) plus 6 hours.” <p>What’s the basis for the 6 hours? Some facilities are very different when compared to others not only technically but also based on the types of gas services they have procured? How has the IESO already landed on 6 hours without first defining the reference values?</p> |

| Design Document: Section | Detailed Comments (Areas of Support or Concern) |
|---|--|
| 4. Market Rule Requirements | <p>Related to section Chapter 7 Section 3.5 – section on Lead Time</p> <p>Northland made a recommendation for the IESO to consider adopting a fourth state besides Hot, Warm and Cold in previous discussions with the IESO and would just like to reiterate the value of having a 4th state as “Very Cold” to identify the periods of time where a facility may be offline for an extended period of time. For e.g. if a cold start is one where a resource is offline for 60 hours in the summer, but it’s generally expected that the facility may operate shortly after 60 hours, the time to bring that resource backonline is very different than if a resource hasn’t been online for 60 days and it’s in the winter time. The IESO should at least recognize this difference.</p> |
| 5. Procedural Requirements | |
| 6. Business Process and Information Flow Overview | |

| Design Document: Section | Detailed Comments (Areas of Support or Concern) |
|--------------------------|---|
| | |