Meeting Notes
ATC/TTC/CBM/TRM Standard Drafting Team

April 8, 2008 | 10 a.m.–5 p.m.
April 9–10, 2008 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m.
Entergy
New Orleans, LA

1. **Administration**

   a. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

   Andy Rodriquez reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines with the meeting participants.

   b. Introduction of Attendees

   The following members and guests were in attendance:

   - Larry Middleton, Chair
   - Laura Lee, Vice Chair
   - Daryn Barker
   - Bob Birch
   - Tom Burns
   - Ron Carlsen
   - DuShaune Carter
   - Roman Carter
   - Mike Colby
   - Chuck Falls
   - Jim Hartwell
   - Nick Henery
   - Tony Hunziker
   - Ray Kershaw
   - Butch Kimble
   - Dennis Kimm
   - Ross Kovacs
   - Be Li
   - Cheryl Mendrala
   - Mike Riley
   - Narinder Saini

- Joel Segal
- Jerry Smith
- Aaron Staley
- Don Williams
- Kun Zhu
- Andy Rodriquez

c. Approval of Agenda

The drafting team reviewed the agenda. DuShaune Carter moved that the agenda be approved. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

2. Functional Model Working Group Consultation

The FMWG discussed the role of the Transmission Operator with regard to modeling of the transmission system. The FMWG suggested that the drafting team make the Transmission Operator responsible for having a model meeting the criteria specified and using that model to calculate TTC. The drafting team agreed with this approach, and noted that the requirements are already written in this fashion. The drafting team agreed to verify that the measures match this approach. The FMWG agreed to draft a letter clarifying this approach.

3. NAESB Update

Dennis Kimm provided an update on NAESB issues. Barry Green expressed concern that MOD-008 was a "fill-in-the-blank" standard. The drafting team talked about whether or not a SAR should be submitted by the group to address the details of TRM or not. Ross Kovacs suggested that the discussion of TRM be tabled, and that if individual members wanted to draft a TRM SAR, they should do so.

Barry Green also expressed concern regarding the differences in timings between MOD-028, MOD-029, and MOD-030, and the use of the word "update."

4. Standards Work

The drafting team reviewed the requirements related to SPS'es in MOD-029. It was agreed that the requirements as written were acceptable.

Andy reviewed the other in-line comments from NERC staff regarding the standards. The drafting team also discussed the concerns with "meeting 100% criteria," and agreed in some cases to redraft the requirements to explicitly identify any margins for error.

Three NAESB topics were discussed:

- Did we consider increased posting frequency for constrained paths? Yes, the drafting team discussed this, but believes this is already covered in the

definition of posted path — all posted paths are constrained, so they all have to be calculated on the same frequency.

- Do we need to be clearer on the difference between "establish," "update," "calculate," and "recalculate?" The drafting team doesn't want to define these terms, as their use may be prolific. However, the team has tried to make sure their use is more consistent throughout the documents.

- Does AFC/ATC/TTC Calculation Frequency need to be increased for Reliability? (AFC = hourly once per day, MOD-001 ATC = hourly once per hour). The drafting team modified the standards to require more frequent recalculation of AFC.

Chuck Falls redrafted the R6 and R7 VSLs from MOD-001, as well as others, to be more easily readable.

Andy was tasked with revising the comment forms to include "no preference" checkboxes; to ask for justification if people disagreed with the VRFs, and to copy the VRF definitions into the questions.

The drafting team discussed the VRFs in the five standards and agreed that they should remain lower, and developed a more detailed justification for this change. Andy was tasked with replacing this reasoning in the comment responses.

The drafting team discussed the CBM standard and how to approach the problem. Four approaches were considered:

1. An updated MOD-004 and press for delegation,
2. Updated MOD-004,
3. A new MOD-005 to deal with regional entities, or
4. A more generic MOD-004; and a hybrid of these approaches.

The drafting team elected to explore the updated MOD-004 with the press for delegation, but eventually decided to use the more generic MOD-004. Some changes were developed regarding the requirements. It was agreed a volunteer would be sought via e-mail to work on the VSLs for MOD-004. The drafting team agreed to set up contingency calls for May 5, 6, and 7 in case additional issues related to CBM needed to be addressed.

5. Future Meetings

- April 29–May 1 — 8a.m.–5 p.m. all three days at the TVA Offices in Chattanooga, TN. This meeting will be to discuss CBM.
- May 5–7 — 1–4 EDT. These calls are optional and set up only if needed to discuss CBM

Meetings Not Yet Confirmed — Dates in red changed from previous meeting

- May 28–29 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. both days at the SRP Offices in Phoenix, AZ. This meeting is to respond to comments on MOD standards 1, 8, 28, 29, and 30.
- June 3–5 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days at the SoCo Offices in Atlanta, GA. This meeting is to respond to comments on MOD standards 1, 8, 28, 29, and 30.

Pencil in June meeting

- July 15–17 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days at the Midwest ISO Offices in Carmel, IN. This meeting is to respond to comments on CBM.
- August 5–7 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days at the BPA Offices in Portland, OR. The purpose of this meeting is to respond to ballots on MOD standards 1, 8, 28, 29, and 30.
- August 12–14 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days at the MISO Offices in Minneapolis. Still need to check with Larry about this meeting. The meeting will be to respond to comments on CBM.
- October 14–16 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days at either the GTC or SOCO Offices in Atlanta, GA. This meeting is to respond to ballots on CBM.

6. Adjourn

The drafting team adjourned on Thursday, April 10th.