Organization of MISO States (OMS)
Resources Work Groups
Response to LOLEWG Feedback Request
Submitted on July 9, 2026

In the June 23, 2026 meeting of the Loss of Load Expectation Working Group (LOLEWG), MISO provided an overview of the load development process and resulting load profiles for the Planning Year 2027-2028 Loss of Load Expectation Model. Two questions were proposed for feedback:

- What additional factors should MISO consider for the training/predicting model, and standardization of extreme analysis?
- Should MISO consider expanding or revising the load-forecast uncertainty assumptions used in the LOLE process? What is the preferred design option and why?

https://www.misoenergy.org/engage/stakeholder-feedback/2026/lolewg-lole-load-modeling-process-and-results/

The OMS Resources Work Group (OMS RWG) provides this feedback to MISO on changes to the LOLE process and analysis. **This feedback is from an OMS work group and does not represent a position of the OMS Board of Directors.**

The OMS RWG appreciates MISO discussing this topic with stakeholders. Our understanding is that the PRM is applied to the coincident peak forecast (CPF) going into the PRA rather than the LOLE model CPF. This would mean that a larger forecast at the time of the PRA would result in a proportionally higher PRMR. The OMS RWG requests that MISO clarify and explain with an illustrative example why a higher PRMR for a greater CPF at the time of the PRA is not a strong enough tool to address differences in the CPF at the time of the LOLE model vs. the PRA.

Additionally, the OMS RWG understands that the confidence band used in the LOLE model is aimed at ensuring a PRM is being produced that can handle an actual CP that differs from the CPF, due to differing economic conditions. If this understanding is correct, we would expect a comparison over time of the PRA CPFs and actual CPs from the corresponding planning years in each season in order to justify a change to the size or distribution of the confidence band due to greater discrepancies in forecasts vs. actual system behavior.