



Date of Request for Comment:	January 26, 2021	Contact:	Mark McGillivray
Period of Comment:	January 26, 2021 through February 19, 2021	Phone:	
Comments From:	ENMAX Corporation	Email:	MMcGillivray@enmax.com
Date:	2021/02/11		

Instructions:

1. Please fill out the section above as indicated.
2. Please refer back to the Consultation Letter under the “Attachments” section to view materials related to the proposed new ADM-002-AB-1
3. Please respond to the questions below and provide your specific comments, proposed revisions, and reasons for your position underneath (if any). Blank boxes will be interpreted as favourable comments.
4. Please be advised that general comments do not give the AESO any specific issue to consider and address, and results in a general response.

Alberta Reliability Standard	Stakeholder Comments and/or Alternative Proposal
<p>New</p> <p>1. Are there any requirements contained in the proposed new ADM-002-AB-1 that are not clearly articulated? If yes, please indicate the specific section of the proposed new ADM-002-AB-1, describe the concern and suggest alternative language.</p>	<p>Timeframe for AESO Response</p> <p>Similar to the comments that ENMAX submitted in 2019 regarding Section 103.4, <i>Waivers and Variances</i>, a commitment of time for the AESO to respond to a request should be included in ADM-002-AB-1, for example ~30 days. In order for participants to respond accordingly (based on the AESO’s decision), there could be impacts to maintenance, outages, and business operations at a facility.</p> <p>Transparency of AESO Decisions that Impact Other Participants</p> <p>If a request and resulting decision could assist other participants in their endeavor to comply with certain rules, and in the interest of maintaining operational and market reliability, the AESO should make that information public. However, there would be no benefit or reason of including the participant’s identity in the public notice, but rather just the information related to the request and decision.</p>

	<p>Clarity on the new ARS Category of “ADM”</p> <p>The AESO is introducing a new ARS category referred to as ADM, which appears different in format from the existing ARS. In light of this, ENMAX is of the view that a format similar to CIP-SUPPs (which have requirements, measures and use the same format as ARS) should be applied to this new category. Can the AESO also please confirm that ADM stands for “Administrative” and provide clarity on how it will be used?</p>
2. Do you have any additional comments regarding the proposed new ADM-002-AB-1? If yes, please specify.	