

## **Presentation Outline**

### **I. Background**

### **II. Overview of Existing Process**

#### ***a. Load Serving Entity perspective***

- i. Traditional RA Requirements
- ii. Replacement Requirement
  1. Base RA Fleet
  2. Outage Data
  3. LSE-Specific curtailment values
  4. Evaluate Specified Replacements
  5. Replacement Requirement Determination
    - a. Determine total system operationally available capacity
    - b. Determine LSE operationally available capacity
    - c. Replacement Decision Logic

#### ***iii. LSE Timeline***

#### ***b. Supplier perspective***

- i. Firm vs. Non-Firm
- ii. Supplier Responsibilities
- iii. Providing Replacement Capacity
- iv. Supplier Timeline

#### ***c. Overlap of responsibilities and Timelines***

#### ***d. Committed Capacity***

### **III. Issues**

- a. Process Complexity
  - i. Overlapping cure periods for traditional LSE RA requirements and LSE replacement requirements
  - ii. Overlapping cure periods for LSE requirements and supplier replacement requirements
  - iii. Tracking of outage replacement responsibility across multiple functional entities
  - iv. Multiple LSE replacement responsibility for a single outage
- b. ISO dual processes and associated incentives
- c. Contract Complexity
- d. Inefficient RA commitment and procurement
  - i. Use of load forecasts in both planning and operating horizons
  - ii. Overlapping cure periods
  - iii. Immobile RA commitment established in the planning horizon
  - iv. Timing of outage assessment
- e. Risks related to cancelling or moving planned outages
  - i. ISO asks suppliers to move planned outages after T-45
  - ii. Suppliers cancel or moved planned outages

- f. Unnecessary standard capacity product incentive mechanism risk
  - i. Local area capacity commitment
  - ii. Suppliers cancel or move planned outages
- g. Outage information sharing
  - i. ISO shares information to aid in cure process