

## RES-501-MRO-02 – Planned Resource Adequacy Assessment

### Unofficial Comment Form

**Please use the Reliability Standards Voting Process (RSVP) application to submit all comments.**

Comments are due by 11:59 pm CST **April 14, 2010**. If you have any questions, please contact the Standards Process Manager at [spm@midwestreliability.org](mailto:spm@midwestreliability.org).

### Background Information

Comments on the second draft of the RES-501-MRO-02 (“Planned Resource Adequacy Assessment”) Regional Reliability Standard were received from industry through June 30, 2009 and were posted previously. Draft 3 of this standard was posted for a comment period but, this standard was prematurely withdrawn from its comment period due to the noteworthy change # 15.

Below, the noteworthy changes are based on stakeholder feedback from the second posting.

#### Noteworthy changes:

1. Definitions were revised or deleted.
2. Footnote #1 was deleted due a definition revision.
3. The applicability section has been revised to no longer include delegated Planning Coordinators. It should be noted that the standard has been revised to refer to Load Serving Entities (LSEs) and Planning Coordinators without delegation. A number of commenters indicated that the standard should be revised to indicate that it is applicable to "LSEs who choose to perform the planned resource adequacy assessment on their own, rather than delegate responsibility to a Planning Coordinator, or how they would meet the requirement if it is applicable to them. Based on the currently approved version of the standard, it seems clear that the original intent was that this requirement should be applicable to individual LSEs, in addition to delegated Planning Coordinators." We have been informed from the director of NERC Regional Standards that it is inappropriate to refer to delegations in regional standards per NERC requirements for regional standards. Therefore, the Clarifications Drafting Team (CDT) has deleted references to the delegation in the standard. The intent is that each Planning Coordinator and each Load Serving Entity need to be able to provide a resource adequacy assessment to cover its load. In the case of the Load Serving Entity, if the LSE does not have its own assessment, the LSE may provide a Planning Coordinator assessment or assessments to cover its load. For example, Midwest ISO Inc. (MISO) may provide an assessment for MISO's responsibility as a Planning Coordinator in the Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO) and MISO members may provide this assessment as meeting their responsibility as LSEs provided that the MISO assessment covers all of the MISO member's load, resources, etc, and provided MISO has agreed to such coverage. Also, a LSE who is not a member of MISO or other parties who intend on self-providing may provide their individual assessment.

4. The effective date has been revised to coordinate with both the Compliance and Standards Committees.
5. Part 1.1 of Requirement R1 has been revised to include a requirement to summarize the review of the system data used in Resource Adequacy assessments and it's concluded in the review that there has been a lack of significant changes in the system data to perform a Resource Adequacy assessment.
6. Part 1.2 of Requirement R1 has been revised to exclude the loss of load expectation and how it relates to the loss of load probability; Plus, the loss of load probability target was revised to ensure meeting a loss of load probability target of no greater than 0.1 day per 1 year and no greater than 1 day per 10 years.
7. The previous sub-part 1.2.2 of requirement R1 has been deleted. Load forecast uncertainty is covered in Section 1.3 and requires documentation on how load was included in the analysis including load diversity, weather and seasonal load variability, etc.
8. The previous sub-part 1.2.4 of requirement R1 has been deleted.
9. The exception "Expected Unserved Energy may be performed as the method to meet R1.2 provided the result of such an assessment is compared with an LOLP analysis and the comparison is documented." was deleted.
10. Requirement R3 was deleted.
11. Section D1.3 has been revised to exclude the text, "along with evidence of plan implementation for five (5) years."
12. In Part 1.3.6, "Assessment" was uncapitalized.
13. In M2, the "One" was uncapitalized.
14. The compliance elements were adjusted accordingly; emphasis was given to only placing documentation Violation Severity Levels (VSLs) into lower and/or moderate VSLs.
15. In December 2009, Draft 3 of this standards was prematurely withdrawn from its comment period since the Clarification Drafting Team recognized that Part 1.2 stated "...no greater than 0.1 day and 1 year" when it should have stated "....no greater than 0.1 day per year". Plus, the phrase "...and no greater than 1 day per 10 years" was added, as well.

**Given these changes, is this standard ready for ballot? If not, what changes would you suggest?**

Yes

No

Comments: