



NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL

Princeton Forrestal Village, 116-390 Village Boulevard, Princeton, New Jersey 08540-5731

Distribution Factor Working Group (DFWG)

February 3–4, 2003
Orlando, Florida

Meeting Minutes

Administrative Matters

Vice-Chairman Robert Rhodes called the Distribution Factor Working Group (DFWG) meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. on February 3, 2003. Attendance is listed in **Attachment A**. Due to the absence of several DFWG members, including Chairman Pat Shanahan and NERC Staff Coordinator Brian Nolan, attempts were made to establish a conference call for members to call in and join the meeting. Those attempts were unsuccessful on the afternoon of February 3. A conference call was successfully established on the morning of February 4.

The minutes from the January 8, 2003 conference call were approved with modifications.

IDC Base Case Status

February Case Status

The February base case was loaded into the IDC on Friday night, January 31.

Julie Novacek, IDCWG Chair, forwarded a concern from OATI to DFWG regarding the exchange of base case files during model updates and difficulties OATI has experienced in receiving the files in a timely manner. Julie asked that DFWG explore the possibility of developing an ftp site to eliminate e-mailing these large files, thus streamlining the update process. Recognizing that the existing DFWG site could not be used for this “work in progress”, DFWG decided to ask NERC (Brian and Lynn Costantini) to investigate establishing such an ftp site.

Future Case Schedule

In looking toward the need for model updates in March and April, DFWG concluded that the only significant change presently scheduled for March would be the CLECO RC shift from SPP to Entergy. EPKC has decided to not join MISO at this time, eliminating the need for a near-term RC change. Other RC changes will not occur until April or beyond. Chi Tang volunteered to ask Nelson Muller at OATI if OATI could make the required CLECO changes without a total BOF update. With the RC changes anticipated for April, DFWG decided to perform a total base case and BOF update for April with an implementation date of March 31.

Summer Case Update

Chi Tang indicated he would check with OATI on case formatting changes between PSS/E Rev 26 and Rev 28. The summer base case was developed using Rev 28. At the February IDCWG meeting Jim

Busbin indicated he would talk to Nelson Muller about the upcoming formatting changes. It was suggested that Chi contact Jim prior to talking to Nelson.

The VEM/MEN cases are about two weeks behind schedule. VEM/MEN hopes to release them shortly. Depending upon availability, Chi hopes to release Trial 0 for the summer case update by March 1 with a May 1 target upload date. Jon Riley told the group that the upcoming VEM/MEN case was not as robust as cases in the past, requiring the use of VAR switching on the first iteration for all but the simplest of changes in cases if using a flat start.

MMWG Liaison

With this being Jon's last meeting on the DFWG and the prospect of Nelson Burks dropping off the WG in the fall, the DFWG will lose its informal contact with the VEM/MEN Working Group. The DFWG uses the VEM/MEN-modified MMWG cases as a starting point for the IDC base cases. The loss of this liaison would somewhat hinder development of the IDC base cases. Dave Marby agreed to provide the liaison to the VEM/MEN Study Group. Although he has no direct contact with that group, PJM does have representation on the group and Dave would maintain contact with the group through that representation.

Flowgate Administration

January FG Administration

Pat forwarded the January Flowgate Administration package to Larry Kezele on January 31, 2003. This was for the January 2003 BOF update.

February FG Administration

Pat had also sent a draft of the February FG Administration package to DFWG on January 31 for review at this meeting. The majority of the changes were brought about by RC changes with CAs moving from EMSC and MAIN to MISO and PJM. There were also numerous Flowgate deletions due to several CAs joining PJM. Since some of these Flowgates were interconnections between CAs, it points to the need for close coordination among all the parties involved when deleting or adding Flowgates. Also, it pointed to the possibility that deleted Flowgate numbers could be reused in the future when new Flowgates are created. Chi was asked if IMO could insert a check in their Flowgate creation process to make sure this could not happen.

A conference call was requested for Friday, February 7, 2003 at 10:00 a.m. EST to approve a revised, final FG Administration package for February.

Base Case Update History

Robert continues to maintain the base case update history file. He will send it to Chi for confirmation and filling in some missing information. It will then be forwarded to the WG.

Management of FIST/CRC System Flows Flowgates

At the last ORS meeting, Pat raised the issue of maintenance of other NERC Flowgate listings, especially the CRC list, which is coordinated with the FIST listing, and the MRD list. The ORS asked that Pat and the DFWG provide a proposal for maintenance of these two Flowgate listings. When Pat approached several DFWG members about this proposal, there appeared to be general agreement that the DFWG should not submit such a proposal. If the ORS assigns the DFWG the responsibility for maintaining these Flowgate lists, DFWG will develop the needed procedures at that time.

Posting

Status

Since Brian was unable to attend the meeting he could not update the WG on the status of the January base case, BOF, MUST, and subsystem file postings. Brian had asked the WG to develop a naming convention for base cases, the BOF and MUST download files. DFWG approved the following naming conventions:

Base cases

IDCSPmmddyy.raw	for summer cases
IDCWPmmddyy.raw	for winter cases

BOF

IDCBOFmmddyy.xls

MUST

IDCSPMUSTmmddyy.txt or mon	for summer cases
IDCWPMUSTmmddyy.txt or mon	for winter cases

Where mmmddyy represents the date of file development. For example, an mmmddyy of JAN1703 indicates the case was developed on January 17, 2003.

DFTFFG Messages

The DFTFFG list server continues to experience problems distributing the temporary flowgate details when a temporary flowgate is created. During the DFWG meeting, the messages reappeared after Pat contacted OATI about the problem on the afternoon of February 3.

An issue still exists with NERC posting the temporary flowgate information as required in the Flowgate Administration process. A RITS form has been submitted to get the temporary flowgate information automatically posted to the NERC CRC site.

Temporary Flowgate Listing

The listing of temporary flowgates was last updated in November 2002. Scott Hoberg will be asked to request updates to the listing.

Status of Change Orders

PAR Change Order 38i

There appears to be some confusion about the approval status for the PAR modeling change order, CO-38i. Some are of the opinion that the ORS approved the CO at its December meeting. Others feel that the ORS told IDCWG not to implement the CO until certain unresolved issues presented at the December ORS meeting were worked out. Robert will follow this up with Larry Kezele and Julie Novacek and report back to DFWG. OATI told IDCWG at its January meeting that the CO must be finalized by late February in order to be implemented by May 1. Current plans call for the IMO-MECS phase shifters to become operational by mid-May.

CO-95 JOU TDF calculations

ATC has expressed a willingness to pay for this CO, but would like to have another opportunity to take a look at the CO. This coupled with all the other IDC changes that are scheduled to take place before the summer has lead ATC to decide not to push for immediate implementation. They currently have a fix in place that works around this issue and are willing to stick with it for the time being.

CO-112 SDX Load Alarming

In early January, the IDC was modified to alarm the RCs if the SDX daily load was less than 50% or greater than 150% of the IDC base case peak load. When implemented, this created numerous error messages. Small CAs experienced errors, some generation only CAs experienced errors, etc. In addition these alarms were generated every hour throughout the day. Based on this bad experience, the new alarming feature was disabled. Since then the SDX load alarming scheme has been modified to resemble the alarm scheme used for SDX outage alarms with the intent of eliminating the hourly alarms. IDCWG requested DFWG to consider the $\pm 50\%$ alarm window and determine if additional alarming criteria were needed. For example, establish a dead band to minimize nuisance alarms from generation only CAs or use a fixed MW amount for alarming rather than the $\pm 50\%$ window.

DFWG proposed to lower the 50% lower limit to 30% since CA loading during light load periods can legitimately drop below 50% of peak loading. DFWG also proposed that the 150% upper limit be reduced to a more reasonable 120%. DFWG went on to propose that a 2 MW dead band be utilized with the new limits. Thus a submitted SDX daily peak load would have to be less than 30% or greater than 120% of the IDC base case peak load and be larger than 2 MW in order to trigger an alarm.

CO-113 NNL Report with variable thresholds

ATC proposed this CO in which the 5% threshold could be varied to make it comparable to the variable threshold on the Whole Transaction List in the IDC. ATC wants all its members to participate in redispatch even if their impact is below the 5% cut-off used in the IDC. Currently there is no mechanism for determining impacts below 5%. ATC has agreed to pay for this CO, which should be ready for implementation in mid-February.

Documentation of IDC Modeling Processes

Discussion of the latest draft of the Base Case Guideline Procedure Document, dated November 19-20, 2002, was postponed until the next meeting.

Other Items

PJM-MISO Congestion Management Coordination

Dave Mabry updated DFWG on the latest proposals on congestion management coordination for the expanded PJM footprint. The PJM-MISO proposal calls for the IDC to receive three values in real-time for any coordinated flowgate:

1. Total Market Flow
2. NNL value as determined day-ahead
3. The difference between the Total Market Flow and the NNL value

If the Total Market Flow exceeds the NNL value, the difference would be subject to curtailment under a TLR 3. As is presently done, the IDC would determine what share of this difference needs to be curtailed to provide the relief requested. PJM would redispatch its system and set Locational Bus Prices accordingly to provide the required relief indicated by the IDC.

For a TLR 5 curtailment, the IDC will use the PJM provided NNL value in determining the amount of relief required by PJM.

In both cases, though the values are being provided by PJM and are not calculated by the IDC, the proportionate share of relief will be calculated by the IDC as is presently done.

For next hour analysis, the above three values will also be provided to the IDC.

Additionally, the PJM-MISO proposal calls for providing the PJM sink/source location(s). These points will be based on the location of the marginal generator(s) within the RTO.

DFWG Representation

With AEP being brought into the PJM footprint, AEP will no longer be an RC and, regrettably, Jon Riley will no longer represent AEP on DFWG. DFWG expressed its appreciation to Jon for his many years of faithful representation on the WG. Jon's expertise and experience will be missed.

No other representation changes are expected until at least the summer. Depending upon when the SPP-MISO merger is finalized, SPP representation could change on the WG. Nelson Burks anticipates remaining on the WG until the fall when the VACAR North RC would be dissolved.

Future Meetings and Conference Calls

The NERC ORS and IDCWG have requested DFWG representation at their meetings. DFWG should schedule its meetings to accommodate these requests when possible. ORS meetings are currently scheduled through December 2003. IDCWG typically schedules its meetings 2-3 months in advance.

What	Date	Time	Location
Conference Call	February 7, 2003	10 a.m. Eastern	For FG Administration
Conference Call	March		If Needed
Conference Call	April		If Needed
Meeting	April, 2003	1 p.m.–5 p.m. & 8 a.m.–noon	New Orleans (Tentative)

Since several members were not present, those in attendance suggested the following possible meeting dates: April 22–23, April 23–24, April 29–30, or April 30–May 1. The group will be polled by email to determine the date for the next meeting.

Adjournment

Vice-Chairman Rhodes adjourned the meeting at 10:06 a.m. on February 4, 2003.

DFWG Attendance List

**February 3–4, 2003
Orlando, Florida**

Name	Representing	E-Mail Address
Pat Shanahan, Chairman ¹	ATC	pshanahan@atcllc.com
Nelson Burks	Dominion	nelson_burks@dom.com
Jon Riley	EMSC	jhriley@aep.com
Matt McNeece	Entergy	mmcneec@entergy.com
Paul Graves	FRCC	paul.graves@pgnmail.com
Chi Tang	IMO	chi.tang@imo.com
Jason Marshall ¹	MISO	jmarshall@midwestiso.org
Phillip Shafeei	NYISO	pshafeei@nyiso.com
Dave Mabry	PJM	mabry@pjm.com
Robert Rhodes, Vice- Chairman	SPP	rrhodes@spp.org
Dan Kehoe	TVA	djkehoe@tva.gov

¹- via call-in on February 4 only