Agenda Item 4.1: ICS Report to NYSRC Executive Committee (EC)
February 4, 2026, ICS Meeting #313
Prepared for: February 12, 2026, EC Meeting #322
Prepared by: Thomas Primrose (PSEGLI)

4.1.1 IRM Milestone Schedule
ICS reviewed and approved the draft IRM milestone schedule for the 2027-2028 IRM study with no objections. The if-necessary alignment study milestone is explicitly noted for January 2027 aligning with past practice and logistical feasibility. There are no revisions (aside from the removal of the "Internal" footer) since last presented at EC 321.

ICS is requesting EC approval of the IRM Milestone Schedule at EC322.

4.1.2 RA 2026 Strategic Plan Proposed Update and Initial Whitepaper Scopes
NYISO reviewed scopes for upcoming white papers with some minor revisions from the initial Whitepaper Scopes presented in January. Revisions are as follows:

- Language shift from "de-prioritizing" Tan45 and ELR whitepapers to "deferral" recognizing ICS and EC feedback that these topics are important.
- Clarification on Parametric Process Improvements to also include identification of drivers of significant gaps between parametric and Tan45 results.
- Clarification on Maintenance Modeling & Output Factor Curves 2026 Q1 deliverable to include overview of NYISO's maintenance outage management practice and comparison with outage modeling in GE MARS simulation.

W. Gunther noted that it would be prudent to investigate the peak and shoulder season basis for planned transmission outages that are currently included in EFORDs (I.E. 9300 codes). He added that it would be interesting to see a peak vs off-peak breakdown in terms of those types of transmission outages impacting generation. NYISO expressed a preference to focus current efforts on generation maintenance with the aforementioned feedback captured in the whitepaper conclusion on discussion of possible need for phase 2.

M. Cadwalader asked when ICS would receive additional information on the Tan45/TSL alignment project. NYISO replied that this presentation was intended to focus on papers and priorities recommended by NYISO, and that the Tan45/TSL effort was driven by the reliability council. NYISO also noted that a kickoff meeting occurred, but that efforts are very preliminary. M. Cadwalader reiterated his interest in additional information on the scope and timing of the working group's efforts. He added that he understands it may take time to get to conclusions, but that he wants a clear understanding of what the project is doing. M. Mager added that he is not part of the effort, but expects the regular update will be discussed at the EC. Relevant updates to the ICS can likely be arranged.

ICS approved the 2026 whitepaper scopes with no objections. The approved scopes incorporated ICS and EC feedback.

4.1.3 Winter Fuel Availability Constraints Modeling Review Update
P. Jain (Manager, NYISO Capacity Accreditation) provided background and a comparison of winter fuel availability constraints in the 2026-2027 IRM study and Firm Fuel Characteristic Elections for the 2026-2027 Capability Year (see attachment for additional details). NYISO presented that Firm Fuel Characteristic Elections for the 2026-2027 Capability Year are equivalent to 15.2 GW on a

UCAP basis for comparison to the winter fuel availability constraints modeling from the 2026-2027 IRM study

	2026-2027 Winter Fuel Availability Constraints Model						2026-2027 Firm Fuel Characteristic Elections		
Tier	NYCA Load Conditions (MW)	Available Gas (MW)	Available Oil (MW)	Total Available Fuel (MW) (Gas + Oil)	Modeled UCAP (MW)	Derate (%)	Elected Firm ICAP (MW)	Elected Firm UCAP (MW)	Derate (%)
1	> 26,000	300		12,000		39%			
2	25,000 - 26,000	600		12,300		38%			
3	24,000 - 25,000	2,550	11,700	14,250	19,720	28%	16,904	15,254	23%
4	23,000 - 24,000	4,200		15,900		19%			
5	22,000 - 23,000	5,575		17,275		12%			
6	< 22,000	No Constraint				No Constraint			

Multiple stakeholders asked if firm elections were higher than anticipated. NYISO noted the importance of comparing elections to modeled constraints on an “apples to apples” basis and that the presented data was an outline of a process to do so. NYISO further commented that the firm fuel characteristic election is based on set rules of how the market will treat the unit based on performance, whereas the model is a probabilistic set of constraints based on a broad range of weather (load) conditions.

G. Jordan noted that fuel elections are theoretically firm regardless of weather conditions, and that it is somewhat reassuring that elections exceed assumed availability for more extreme load bins, but that it is good to be reasonably conservative. M. Mager followed on to acknowledge the general importance of conservatism but cautioned that layering multiple conservative assumptions can lead to an unreasonably conservative model.

M. DeSocio added that it is important for NYISO to provide market guidance on how “firm” may vary with weather conditions and what specific paperwork requirements suffice for proving “firm” status. He further clarified saying a question the NYISO needs to answer is “do generators need prove firm on a cold day or the worst day in the history of the gas system” since pipeline conditions and gas rights change with weather conditions.

W. Gunther stressed the importance of considering infrastructure changes when analyzing the fuel availability constraints model. He gave the example of the Iroquois "Enhancement by Compression" Project scheduled to be in service during the 2027-2028 IRM study period

4.1.4 Parametric Process Improvements and Seasonal Topology Updates

NYISO provided brief updates on Parametric Process Improvements and Seasonal Topology efforts focusing on background for both topics as well as next steps. In the parametric process improvements presentation, NYISO identified load forecast updates, resource updates, and transmission topology updates (especially in Zones J/K) as consistent drivers of divergence from Tan45.

During the parametric presentation M. Mager asked about the possibility of running additional Tan45 studies early in the process when NYISO is less resource constrained. NYISO replied that this would still require waiting for the Tan45 to finish to re-anchor the parametric. NYISO added that the focus of this effort is to improve the parametric as a part its role in the annual process. NYISO also noted that for major model changes, the model updates are typically compared in detail with the prior-FBC, but that for layered changes (I.E. fuel constraints+CHPE) there can be combinatorial effects.

During the seasonal topology presentation M. DeSocio asked if the NYISO believes STE ratings are the right ratings to use for thermal limits in light of shrinking margins. He elaborated that with shrinking margins; resources may not be sufficient to return to normal transfer states. NYISO noted that they can take this back, but current modeling is based on emergency criteria and that this is a bigger picture criteria question. G. Jordan asked if the NYISO has examined if winter risk is due to capacity shortfall or transmission limitations. NYISO replied that visualizations of monthly interface flows vs limits are available from previous years study (ICS 307- Visualization for 2026–2027 IRM Sensitivities).

4.1.5 2027-2028 Assumptions Matrix v0.0

NYISO presented the assumptions matrix template shifting the 2026-2027 values to the prior year's column. Prior years values are updated to match special sensitivity case values.

W. Gunther discussed the recent release of MARS version 5.10 which has improved maintenance reporting that may help facilitate maintenance modeling efforts. NYISO replied that they are currently benchmarking a new version and can bring back details to a future ICS.