

Stakeholder Consultation Session on the Development of the Proposed New ISO Rule – Section 502.11, *Substation Technical and Operating Requirements* (“Section 502.11”)

Notes from the Stakeholder Consultation Session on the Development of the Proposed New Section 502.11

Location: Meeting Room 6006, 6th floor of the BP Centre located at 240 – 4th Ave SW Calgary, AB T2P 2H8

Date: March 18, 2019

Time: 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Attendees:

No.	Company
1.	Alberta Electric System Operator (“AESO”)
2.	AltaLink Management Ltd. (“AltaLink”)
3.	ATCO Electric Ltd. (“ATCO”)
4.	Capital Power Corporation (“Capital Power”)
5.	Consumers’ Coalition of Alberta (“CCA”)
6.	Cenovus
7.	EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc. (“EDTI”)
8.	ENMAX Power Corporation (“EPC”)
9.	Lanna Consulting
10.	Suncor Energy Inc. (“Suncor”)
11.	TransAlta Corporation (“TransAlta”)

Introduction

- The AESO welcomed attendees to the session.
- Attendees introduced themselves.
- The AESO went through the safety procedures, stakeholder consultation session expectations, reviewed the agenda, and provided an overview of the consultation session.
- The AESO encouraged the attendees to actively participate.

Rules Development Consultation Process Overview

- The AESO reviewed the updated ISO rule development requirements under Alberta Utilities Commission (“AUC”) Rule 017, *Procedures and Process for Development of ISO Rules and Filing of ISO Rules with the Alberta Utilities Commission*, which sets out stakeholder engagement and AUC application requirements.
- The AESO described its past ISO rule development practice and explained that the development of the proposed new Section 502.11 was started under the previous process. The steps that were completed under the previous process included the establishment of a working group and the drafting of the *AESO Discussion Paper*, which was posted on the AESO website.
- The AESO advised that going forward the development of the proposed new Section 502.11 will be completed in accordance with the requirements of AUC Rule 017. In accordance with these requirements, a consultation group was established and the AESO is now consulting with the consultation group on the development of the proposed new Section 502.11.
- The AESO opened the discussion to questions: no questions or comments were asked by the consultation group.
- The AESO indicated that minutes of this session would be posted on the AESO website.
- The AESO highlighted that there can be efficiencies in openly discussing issues during consultation sessions rather than through written comments.

Current Practice and Proposed New Section 502.11

Current Practice

- The AESO described the current AESO practice with respect to substation technical requirements. Some technical requirements are specified on a project-by-project basis in the project functional specifications while other technical requirements are not defined by the AESO and are left to the legal owner of a transmission facility (“TFO”) to define.
- AESO noted that the new market participant choice process allows new parties to design and construct facilities in Alberta and those parties may have different backgrounds and practices than the existing market participants that have experience designing and constructing facilities in Alberta.
- There was a group discussion about the operating temperature requirements outlined in the *AESO Discussion Paper*, specifically related to the demarcation line on the map of Alberta that identifies which facilities need to be built to -40°C/-50°C. The map results in the requirement that substation facilities in Edmonton and south of Edmonton have a temperature rating of -40°C, and facilities north of Edmonton have a temperature rating of -50°C.
 - CCA expressed concerns that the line was apparently drawn arbitrarily and that some facilities located above the line may then be overbuilt.
 - AESO indicated that the map was created by a consultant and presented in a study report that was commissioned by the AESO. The AESO told the consultation group that it would look into posting the study report to its website to allow the consultation group to review it.

Objective/Purpose of the Proposed New Section 502.11

The AESO explained that the purpose of the proposed new Section 502.11 is to set a consistent set of minimum technical requirements, regardless of substation ownership, for the design, construction and operation of any substation with a voltage of 100 kV or higher.

- The AESO stated that the intention is for the proposed new Section 502.11 to apply on a prospective basis.
- There was a group discussion about the applicability of Section 502.11:
 - CCA expressed concern that the proposed new Section 502.11 would apply to refurbishments of existing substations and that, as indicated in the *AESO Discussion Paper*, many substations are over 30-years old. As a result, bringing all substations needing refurbishments up to a higher standard would be costly.
 - The AESO stated that the proposed applicability of the proposed new Section 502.11 applies to new substations and that, for upgrades to existing substations, the substations could be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine how to apply the proposed new Section 502.11 to the substation.
 - The AESO also indicated that the proposed new Section 502.11 requirements would only apply to AESO-initiated substantial substation upgrades and that refurbishment of existing substations are carried out by the TFOs as part of their capital maintenance program and; therefore, would not be subject to the proposed new Section 502.11.
 - EPC, AltaLink, and EDTI all confirmed that like-for-like replacement is carried out by the TFOs as part of their capital maintenance programs.
- The consultation group had concerns about compliance with other codes and standards applicable to substations:
 - Municipal Building Code Energy Efficiency Requirements
 - ATCO expressed concerns about the application of local building code energy efficiency standards to substation control buildings. Specifically, ATCO asked whether the proposed new Section 502.11 would overrule the local building code.
 - The AESO stated that its mandate does not allow it to overrule municipal building codes and recommended that market participants check in with local inspectors regarding compliance with the local building code.
 - EPC stated that the project functional specifications cover substation electrical work, not civil works.
 - Oil Containment Requirements
 - Capital Power asked whether an oil containment requirement will be specified in the proposed new Section 502.11.
 - The CCA questioned if there was a statistical basis (locally or across North America) for the frequency of oil containment failures.
 - The AESO stated that it is not planning to include oil containment requirements in the proposed new Section 502.11 and plans to leave this to the TFOs. The purpose for the proposed new Section 502.11 is to set functional level requirements.
 - The consultation group discussed whether it was appropriate to have oil containment requirements in the proposed new Section 502.11. This included a discussion about whether oil containment was covered under other codes or regulations, the risks associated with oil leaks and considerations from an environmental and design perspective. Some specific points made were:
 - AltaLink stated that there is no code or regulation that specifically addresses oil containment and that this is not just an environmental consideration, but also a design concern. AltaLink also stated their preference that this rule not attempt to prescribe oil containment requirements.
 - Capital Power asked if the AESO should clarify oil containment requirements in the proposed new Section 502.11 as this is a fairly high cost item.
 - ATCO stated that oil containment is a hot topic because of the costs associated with it.
 - EDTI stated that AUC Rule 007 has environmental requirements for proposed transmission facilities that cover substation oil containment.

- The AESO agreed to review its position on this issue given its legislative mandate. It will be discussed further at future sessions.

Rationale for the Proposed New Section 502.11

- The AESO presented the reasons why it is developing a proposed new Section 502.11 to set the minimum technical requirements, which include reducing inconsistencies between project technical specifications and reducing the need for project-specific substation technical requirements.
- The consultation group discussed the pros and cons of standardizing the minimum technical requirements for all substations. There was concern that some of the requirements are already covered under the IEEE (“Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers”) and IEC (“International Electrotechnical Commission”) standards. Specifically:
 - CCA questioned if there was benefit in prescribing standardized technical requirements for substations and asked whether the cost savings of reduced workload to the AESO is worth the significant cost implications that may result. CCA also asked how the minimum technical requirement was established. The CCA noted that it is difficult to identify a bright line in reliability analysis that can help tease out the specific specifications that contribute to enhanced system reliability.
 - Suncor asked if the AESO is going to reference IEEE and IEC standards.
 - AltaLink, EDTI, and EPC spoke in support of setting minimum functional requirements.
 - Capital Power asked for clarification on applicability. The *AESO Discussion Paper* references TFOs not market participants. Capital Power also indicated that some provisions of the proposed new Section 502.11 would have cost impacts for Capital Power and similar market participants, but not for other market participants, like legal owners of aggregated generation facilities.
- The AESO explained that the intention is to set the minimum requirements that are based on functionality, align with past practice, and are applicable to all legal owners of transmission facilities. It stated that substation owners may choose to exceed the requirements with defensible reasons for their own purposes. The AESO also noted that IEEE and IEC standards are non-binding unless they are referenced by an authoritative document, which is what the AESO intends to do. The AESO also stated that the objective is not to reduce the AESO workload; however, this is a consequential benefit.

Scope of the Proposed New Section 502.11

- The AESO indicated that the proposed new Section 502.11 will set minimum technical requirements to address reliability and functional requirements.
- CCA expressed concern that there is a lack of clarity on how far the reliability requirements would go based on the *AESO Discussion Paper*, and asked the AESO what problem it is trying to solve from a reliability perspective. The CCA also asked what economic test was used to determine the requirements to include in the proposed new Section 502.11.
- The AESO explained that the *AESO Discussion Paper* covers the topics that the AESO intends to include in the proposed new Section 502.11 including those items that, in the AESO’s view, are required from a system reliability perspective. The AESO also indicated this it is open to input and that it may determine that the requirements need to change over time.

Out of Scope

- The AESO stated that it will not include requirements around product type, brand names, and vendors, nor will it overlap with topics already covered in other authoritative documents, including Alberta reliability standards, other ISO rules, and other legislation and regulations, in order to avoid “double jeopardy”.

Coffee Break

[10 minutes]

Review of Feedback Received

Stakeholder Comments Review

- The AESO provided an overview of the comments that it received in 2018 from AltaLink, EPC, EDTI, and CCA.
- Capital Power and ATCO indicated that they had made comments that were not reflected in the AESO presentation. It was determined that Capital Power and ATCO were referring to comments the AESO solicited on the *AESO Discussion Paper* in 2016. The AESO noted that these comments will be discussed at a future consultation session.
- The following consultation group discussions centred on questions and comments from the CCA. These discussions, by topic, are summarized below.
- Applicability criteria and substation categorization:
 - AltaLink asked if the applicability can be written to align with the NERC reliability standards. It stated that these standards focus on “system reliability” and industrial and other facilities, which have independent radial connections, are often excluded from the scope of these standards. AltaLink proposed that radial substations or substations that are connected to the transmission system through a tapped transmission line be excluded from the proposed new Section 502.11, unless there are plans for the substation to be part of the bulk electric system (“BES”) in the future. This would help align the rule with the reliability standards.
 - Capital Power and Suncor suggested that the loss of its radially connected facilities do not materially impact the system.
 - TransAlta provided its opinion, stating that “any substation or generation facility or collector substation of aggregated generation facility (where the transformer secondary voltage is less than 100 kV) should not be subject to the [proposed new Section 502.11]”.
 - EPC stated that it takes a different view from AltaLink. Some substations can be “meshed” while operated radially. These radials, if lost, could impact a large number of end-use customers. EPC stated that it would like the proposed new Section 502.11 to consider the impact of the substation loss when defining requirements.
 - CCA asked if having one class of substation that meets the definition of BES and another class of substation that meets the definition of a radial substation would work. CCA explained that setting substation minimum requirements will add unnecessarily to ratepayer cost if applied too broadly. CCA stated that it understood that EPC wants to protect its customers in Calgary, however, the CCA is concerned that an urban standard is completely inappropriate for rural settings and is of the view that it is important to look at reliability from the end use customer’s point of view. In the CCA’s view, the bulk of end use customer outages in rural areas occur because of issues on the distribution side and not the transmission side, and asked the AESO to consider whether it makes sense to further improve the reliability of the transmission system in these areas. In terms of value for dollar invested, there could be more improvement in reliability to rural customers by investing in distribution systems rather than transmission. The CCA raised the possibility of there being a third class of substation, one between a radial class and a bulk system (Type 1) class.
 - The AESO stated that it is currently planning to apply the proposed new Section 502.11 to all substations with equipment energized at 100 kV or higher and not to align with the applicability of Alberta Reliability Standard PRC-005, *Protection System, Automatic Reclosing, and Sudden Pressure Relaying Maintenance*. However, the AESO agreed to look into this further.
 - The AESO also stated the past working group determined that two different classifications of substations were appropriate. It was also indicated that other jurisdictions do not have more than two substation classifications.
 - The AESO stated that rural substations are usually a simple bus configuration; however, the AESO is open to discussion regarding concerns about rural substation designs.
 - The AESO also stated that the consultation group should keep in mind that substations may become connected to the system in a non-radial way in the future.
 - CCA stated that the classification is very vague and is concerned that market participants will use it to drive up their rate base by lobbying the AESO to classify their substations as Type 1, with cost

and reliability implications. The CCA further stated that it is concerned about the application of complete flexibility regarding planning requirements and how many Type 1 substations would result. The CCA also stated that it was concerned about the “six key terminations” criteria for Type 1 substations, of which two can be transformers leaving only four transmission lines. The CCA considers this to be an unacceptably low threshold to become a Type 1 substation.

- CCA also wanted to understand the distinction between Type 1 substations and other substations, how many substations currently meet the Type 1 criteria, and how many would have to be brought up to meet the new requirements.
- The AESO clarified that Type 1 transformers are considered system power transformers and have at least one secondary voltage operating at 100 kV or higher.
- LANA Consulting provided its understanding that the intention is to apply the rule prospectively and that substations that may become Type 1 substations in the future can be built to a lower standard, but must make provision for changes in the future.
- The AESO also advised that there are only 23 existing substations that would meet the proposed Type 1 substation criteria if the definition were applied to the existing system. However, the criteria will only apply on a go forward basis. As a result, it estimates that only 1 or 2 substations a year will meet the criteria. *[Follow up: The AESO checked, and determined that there are now 39 existing substations that meet the proposed Type 1 substation criteria, as opposed to 23 that met the criteria when the AESO Discussion Paper was being developed.]*
- The AESO stated that substations that may become Type 1 substations in the future would be required to have provisions to eventually be built out into a breaker-and-a-half, breaker-and-a-third configuration at some point. This would include the procurement of land to allow for substation expansion. The AESO also stated that many substations are already built to the proposed minimum requirement and that all substations energized to 500 kV or 240 kV already have a breaker-and-a-half configuration.
- The AESO also stated that it is not aware of any existing substations that meet the Type 1 substation criteria but do not meet the proposed Type 1 requirements.
- AltaLink stated that it was aware of 4 or 5 substations that meet the Type 1 classification criteria and do not have breaker-and-a-half or breaker-and-a-third configuration nor do they have provision to expand. Sarcee substation is an example of this.
- AltaLink stated its opinion that outlining a required configuration in ISO rules, such as a breaker-and-a-third configuration, is a legacy issue and that the AESO should consider defining a reliability requirement or criteria in the proposed new Section 502.11 rather than a configuration to allow market participants to design the most efficient and cost effective substation.
- ATCO asked if the project functional specification would clarify whether a substation is required to include provisions for the substation to meet Type 1 substation requirements in the future.
- The AESO stated that the project functional specification would make it clear that the substation could be classified as Type 1 in the future. The AESO also explained that the intention is not to drive incremental costs up front, but to require smart design. There would be some costs that are incurred up front, including the acquisition of land and air brakes for avoiding outages when expanding.
- There was agreement among most attendees that some requirements, such as the proposed battery requirements, are not problematic or costly for Type 1 substations.
- Application of the new proposed substation rule to upgrades to existing substations
 - The CCA was looking for assurances that the proposed substation rule would not be so prescriptive that new parts of a substation are subjected to the ‘higher’ criteria while other parts are not.
 - The AESO stated that it is proposed to provide guidance on the case-by-case scenario, and there likely is some flexibility.
- Cost-Benefit Analysis Related to Outages
 - EPC asked if the AESO looked at cost-benefit analysis for outages at a substation on a dollar-figure basis and asked if there was a benefit to doing so.

- CCA also expressed an interest in cost-benefit analysis for the requirements throughout the session. The CCA recommended minimum facilities be constructed to handle future requirements, such as substation orientation and land and possible pre-install disconnect switches. The CCA stated that a TFO should not put in ground grids and fences for areas required for future development.
- The AESO stated that it had not quantified the customer cost of outage, but may get into the specifics about what the AESO considers to be a “minimum”. Calculations may be very difficult, depending on the circumstances. The AESO indicated that it thinks this would be an appropriate discussion as part of future consultation sessions with accompanying materials for the draft rule discussion.

Lunch

(30 minutes)

- System Average Interruption Duration Index (“SAIDI”), System Average Interruption Frequency Index (“SAIFI”) and its application to transmission facility planning
 - CCA asked why the AESO was moving away from SAIDI and SAIFI.
 - The AESO stated that it has not used SAIDI and SAIFI in the past for transmission planning and thought SAIDI and SAIFI were distribution metrics and included frequency and duration of interruptions. AESO asked the consultation group for their opinion.
 - EPC confirmed that it does not apply SAIDI and SAIFI to transmission facilities, including substations.
- Comparison of Alberta reliability and cost to other utilities
 - CCA asked if the AESO had looked into how Alberta ranks when compared to other jurisdictions with respect to reliability. CCA stated that reliability was too high based on SAIDI and SAIFI Canadian averages, and cost of transmission was too high in Alberta. CCA stated that Alberta results are above normal, which results in concerns to the broader customer base. CCA asked why there is a need for higher reliability in Alberta.
 - CCA stated that, policy-wise, some industrials would like a lower level of reliability, and would like a price break, and asked whether there is room for such an arrangement.
 - EDTI stated that the requirements outlined in the *AESO Discussion Paper* align with existing design practices. They are not new standards.
 - The AESO reiterated that the focus is on the minimum technical requirements for new substations.
- Need for the proposed new Section 502.11
 - Capital Power stated that the *AESO Discussion Paper* proposes a lot of detailed technical requirements for the proposed new Section 502.11 and asked what problem the rule was trying to solve.
 - The AESO stated that there is no existing substation rule and that it is of the view that the proposed new Section 502.11 generally follows current TFO practices. The AESO stated that the proposed new Section 502.11 is meant to set minimum requirements for incoming TFOs. The AESO indicated that it has not seen any issues yet, however, is trying to be proactive.
 - EDTI understood that all of the requirements that will be in the proposed new Section 502.11 are currently being specified in the project functional specification.
 - The AESO explained that some of the technical requirements are currently specified in the functional specification, but others are left to the substation owners to specify.
 - ATCO stated that there are very specific requirements for apparatuses and busses described in the *AESO Discussion Paper* and pointed out that specificity is useful for clarity and standardization, however flexibility is lost.
 - The AESO emphasized that minimum requirements are needed and stated that TFOs are free to exceed the minimum requirements.

- Application of the proposed new Section 502.11
 - The consultation group discussed how replacements and refurbishments are addressed and the impact of the proposed new Section 502.11 on these projects.
 - EDTI stated that replacement and refurbishment is addressed through the tariff applications under capital maintenance and that facilities are replaced or refurbished based on asset health index (age, asset condition, known manufacturer defects).
 - CCA was concerned that an upgrade to an existing substation could result in the entire substation being “brought up” to the technical requirements of the proposed new Section 502.11.
 - The AESO indicated that it does not initiate refurbishment of existing substations. It also confirmed that the proposed new Section 502.11 would not apply to capital maintenance projects. The AESO explained that it typically is not involved in capital maintenance projects, however, has received market participant requests in the past for letters of support for major maintenance projects to ensure coordination and alignment.
 - AltaLink stated that in situations where the TFO plans are not aligned with the AESO’s planning criteria, a system enhancement may be triggered.
- Substation Operating Condition Requirements – Temperature
 - The consultation group discussed the temperature map further and the impact of the temperature ratings on cost of equipment.
 - The AESO indicated that temperature excursions beyond the minimum temperature requirement is possible, but rare and within the risk threshold.
 - CCA asked why -40°C could not be the standard, and ratings beyond that treated as the exception for the market participant to justify.
 - The AESO stated that the requirement used to be -50°C throughout the province. TFOs requested the use of -40°C for southern Alberta to allow them to access more vendors and the AESO granted this request.
 - Capital Power is of the view that the difference is between -30°C and -50°C. Capital Power stated that it doesn’t see a benefit in the design specification taking into account -40°C since it will not impact the facilities chosen. Capital Power explained that the vendor will go with facilities rated to -50°C anyways. Unless the rating requirement drops to -30°C, there will be no material change to the substation design.
 - AltaLink and EDTI are of the opinion that Capital Power is correct for transformers, but not for circuit breakers. Both AltaLink and EDTI agreed that for circuit breakers, -40°C versus -50°C matters.
 - The AESO asked attendees to come back to the next meeting with manufacturers’ data on equipment temperature ratings.
 - ATCO stated that it does not want to keep spare equipment across both -40°C /-50°C, and may continue to keep spare equipment at -50°C throughout its territory. ATCO recommends the AESO consult with manufacturers.
- Substation Operating Condition Requirements – Other Service Conditions
 - The consultation group discussed the other operating conditions that could be covered by the new substation rule, including: fault levels, soil conditions, altitude, contamination levels, wind levels, and ice load.
 - The CCA stated that it was looking for cost-benefit studies to support these requirements.
 - AltaLink stated that currently fault levels are provided in each project functional specification. AltaLink was not sure what AESO’s soil conditions requirements were.
 - The AESO confirmed that the proposed new 502.11 does not go down to such detailed level as soil conditions.
 - CCA stated that there are many examples where TFOs acquire sub-standard land and then had to spend extra money to deal with the sub-standard soil conditions. CCA emphasized that this is a serious issue, and explained that in one example about \$10 Million was spent on site preparation

- including the cost of gravel. They asked if it would be possible for the AESO to include something about the siting of substations on suitable soil in the proposed new Section 502.11.
- Other attendees questioned if soil requirements should be in the proposed new Section 502.11.
 - The AESO stated that at this point, it does not see a means to address TFO site selection to minimize civil works.
 - It was also discussed that contamination should be taken into consideration when designing a substation.
- Salvage
 - The AESO does not intend to address salvage in the proposed new Section 502.11.
 - The consultation group discussed how salvage is a TFO issue that is covered under their GTAs.
 - CCA stated that the *AESO Discussion Paper* points to the aging of substation infrastructure, implying a need to replace facilities over time.
 - Telecom requirements
 - CCA asked if the substations still have different telecom requirements and asked if the proposed new Section 502.11 changes those requirements.
 - The AESO confirmed substations still have different telecom requirements, and gave the example of protection-level requirements for substations that are energized to 240 kV and above. The AESO stated that telecom facilities are used for SCADA, voice into the station, fibre optics, etc. The AESO stated that the proposed new Section 502.11 will be more inclusive in terms of requirements for 500 kV and 240 kV.
 - The AESO stated that a future telecom rule will be developed separately to properly address telecom requirements.
 - The CCA asked if there are drivers beyond reliability for the development of the proposed new Section 502.11 telecom requirements.
 - AESO stated that drivers also include system stability and remedial action scheme (“RAS”) operation.
 - Facility Ratings
 - CCA inquired as to what facility ratings will be specified in the proposed new Section 502.11.
 - The AESO stated that project functional specifications currently specify the minimum emergency ratings for certain transformers. The AESO stated that emergency equipment ratings for certain transmission facilities are consistent with the requirements listed in Alberta Reliability Standard FAC-008, *Facility Ratings*. For each operating season, power transformer emergency ratings must be specified for a 30-minute duration and the next 3.5-hour duration and transmission line emergency ratings must be specified for a 10-minute duration.
 - CCA asked if, instead of rigidly applying a set of criteria, it is possible to use something that is more flexible, like a RAS, to reduce costs.
 - The AESO stated that RAS can be an alternative and is part of the project engineering studies for anticipated reliability needs. The proposed new Section 502.11 is for future facilities, not for existing facilities.
 - Bowmanton Substation
 - CCA stated that Bowmanton substation is large and asked if it is due to changing substation requirements.
 - AltaLink indicated that it may be because it has special characteristics. For example, the Bowmanton substation has both 138 kV and 240 kV facilities.
 - Capital Power acknowledged the unusual characteristics of that substation.
 - EPC stated that the size depends on the final design.
 - EDTI explained that these substation specifications are presented to the AUC in their GTA and their facility applications.

- CCA Recommendation on third-party independent review
 - CCA requested that the proposed new Section 502.11 be reviewed by an impartial, independent reviewer.
 - The AESO explained that it had commissioned a report from CANA High Voltage Ltd. (“CANA report”) as part of the previous consultation process. It plans to review the material to see if it remains relevant or needs to be updated.
- CCA Recommendation on Stakeholder Consultation Sessions
 - The AESO stated this meeting is an example of such a consultation session.
- CCA Recommendation on Making Meeting Minutes Public
 - The AESO explained that it would share draft minutes of today’s session with attendees for comment before they are posted on the AESO website.
 - The AESO also stated it is working on making the minutes from the past working group sessions available, however the terms of reference stated that the minutes would not be made public. As a result, the AESO needs to seek permission from the working group members.

Next Steps

- The AESO stated that draft minutes will be circulated for review to the attendees for review and comment, and then the final minutes will be posted on the AESO website.
- The AESO also explained to participants that all consultation group members will receive emails regarding next steps and future sessions. In addition, this information will be communicated through the AESO Stakeholder Newsletter and the AESO website.
- The AESO and several consultation group attendees stated that they would prefer to have a detailed discussion once a proposed new Section 502.11 is prepared.
- Capital Power and ATCO asked about when there would be additional technical sessions. It sees the value in going into detailed technical discussions.
 - The AESO explained technical discussion would be done with the consultation group as per the AUC Rule 017 process.
- ATCO wondering about the timing given that there have been delays in developing the proposed new Section 502.11.
 - The AESO acknowledged that there have been delays and indicated that there are resourcing constraints due to the capacity market initiative. The AESO stated there is potential to work through the next few steps quite quickly, but it depends on the kind of feedback received throughout the process.
 - The AESO indicated that the next session may be as soon as 6 weeks from that date of the session.