

Functional Model Working Group Meeting

September 26, 2007 — 1–5 p.m. (EDT)

Meeting notes

1. Administration

- a. Introductions — Mr. Cyrulewski asked each attendee to introduce themselves.

Jim Cyrulewski	Steve Crutchfield	Steve Myers
Mike Yealland	Mark Fidrych	Al DiCaprio
Bob Millard	Roman Carter	Tony Jablonski (RFC)
Mike Raezer	Tony Jankowski	Dennis Chastain
Chris Hajovsky (Reliant)	Tom Bradish (Reliant)	

- b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines – Mr. Crutchfield reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

2. Discussion of GO and GOP Responsibilities — Discussion requested by Tom Bradish of Reliant.

Mr. Bradish discussed registration and compliance issues with respect to multi-owner generators (Keysotone, Conemaugh). He has prepared a SAR and submitted it to NERC. The Standards Committee is holding the SAR because it does not conform to the FM. Mr. DiCaprio offered that they did not need a SAR, but an agreement between the owners to have one owner submit the compliance filing to RFC.

3. Follow up on Action Items from previous meeting — Mr. Cyrulewski briefed the group on the call held with the IS. Al DiCaprio pointed out an e-mail from Jim Hansen of the IS. Mr. Crutchfield will ask Tom Vandervort about this e-mail and what further information may be needed from the FMWG.

Action Items: Mr. Cyrulewski to update group on IS Request from Tom Vandervort regarding the Interchange Authority.

The IS will seek clarification from the Functional Model Working Group and request the FMWG to post a clear and unambiguous “Interchange Authority” description, specific responsibilities, and a determination whether the interchange authority is an entity or a function.

4. Commenting on NERC SARs and Standards — Mr. Cyruleswki discussed the option of the FMWG providing comments to SARs or Standards, as a group, to provide input. The group discussed this topic and decided to develop comments as appropriate and reach consensus prior to submitting the comments. If a member of the FMWG feels that a response is necessary, they will initiate a process to solicit

comments and consensus from the FMWG. This will be done via e-mails and conference calls.

5. Functional Model Working Group Version 4 — Continue work from previous meeting

- a. Revise pages 1–12 addressing those concerns listed in the December 21, 2006 letter from the Operating Committee and in the Version 3 mark up by Gerry Cauley that reflected Standards Committee members concerns. The group has completed these revisions in previous meetings.
- b. Review pages 13–53 addressing those concerns listed in the December 21, 2006 letter from the Operating Committee and concerns raised by Standards Drafting Teams. The team began and completed these revisions.
- c. Revise Page 54 addressing review and approval process for subsequent versions of the Functional Model starting with Version 4. The team began and completed these revisions.
- d. Revise Technical Document to conform with tenor of Pages 1–12.
- e. Review recent FERC Orders that mention Functional Model and address any suggestions.

6. Proposed Additions to Scope of Work (see below)

Mr. Crutchfield to will add FMWG Clarification and Interpretation Service Scope to end of v4.

7. Schedule future meeting

October 17, 2007 — 1– 5 p.m.

October 18, 2007 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m.

8. Adjourn

Proposed Additions to Scope of Work (from NERC Staff)

1. One of the new functions we need to consider including is that of Curtailment Service Provider, which aggregates portions of customer load to bid into various capacity and ancillary service markets. One entity that is currently performing this function is EnerNOC. *The FMWG suggests that ENERNOC provide more information and participate in the Chicago meeting.*
2. There is a need to resolve the issue of identifying entities that perform reliability-related tasks under the direction of a reliability coordinator. These entities are typically transmission owners who work under delegation agreements. Right now these folks fall under the radar for compliance with requirements for system operator training & certification, and requirements to have facilities for monitoring, communication and control of a local transmission area. *Mr. Crutchfield to check with Ms. Long about this issue. FMWG does not feel this is our issue.*
3. There is also a need to resolve the issue of the Planning Coordinator. FERC seems to want to require that to the extent possible, we write standards that require the use of almost identical assumptions, models, etc in conducting planning and operating studies. The latest version of the Functional Model does not have any restrictions on the size of the service area addressed by a Planning Coordinator; thus the PC can have a service area that is very small or very large; and there are no longer any requirements for every facility to be in the service area of just one PC and just one Transmission Planner. This means that if NERC asks for all the long-range plans from all the PCs in North America the plans will have some overlaps where more than one PC has planned to use the same facility or facilities. Some debate on the service area of PCs would be a great help and if the PC's service area matched exactly the service area of a Reliability Coordinator, then it would be much easier to move forward and require that the PC and RC share models with the same assumptions, etc. *The FMWG will discuss this issue at our Chicago meeting with overall planning discussions.*
4. There is another FM issue that arose in the backup facilities group and it concerns Transmission Owners. Apparently there are some TO's that operate control centers that while usually small in size could potentially have impact on the reliability of the Bulk Electric System. These TO's are not registering as TOPs. Therefore, items that apply to TOPs are not being applied to these control centers, e.g., backup facilities. Some people feel this is a problem with the registration process while others feel it is a shortcoming in the FM. In the initial SAR for BFSDT, we tried to raise this point by applying the SAR to TO as well as TOP. Industry comments clearly indicated that people felt that this was incorrect. The general tone of the comments was that NERC should make the offending entities register as TOP as well as TO and then the standard would apply to TOP only and be correct, i.e., problem solved. However, as best as I can tell: (1) we can't force someone to register one way or the other and (2) we don't necessarily know who the bad guys are anyway. Therefore it seems that we need to handle this situation within the FM

so that we can correctly address the applicability issues. *Local Control Center issue — FMWG will discuss in Chicago.*

5. See “Rev to TP Relationships.doc” *Add to planning discussions in Chicago*
6. There seems to be a missing entity. If you look at the model, it tends to focus on "planning" and "operations". However, we think there needs to be an area between those two, where someone bridges the gap. The ATCT discovered this problem when we were trying to use the model to determine the responsibilities for determining ATC and TTC. The Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator are generally responsible for 1+ years out, and the RC seems to cover this in real-time, but no one seems to really be on the hook from next-hour to 1 year. Based on this, the team suggested the creation of an "Operations Planning" function and an "Operations Planner" entity. This entity would be tasked with managing that gap between time frames (load forecasting, ATC updates, outage coordination, etc...). Their role would essentially be that of the Transmission Planner, Resource Planner, and maybe even Planning Coordinator all rolled into one, but with only the short- and medium-term time frames. I talked to Don Benjamin about this a bit, and he pointed out that the current "Reliability Concepts" paper (http://www.nerc.com/~members/reliability_concepts/concepts_v4_d11_comment.doc) covers this in some more detail. If you look at page 31, you can see the area between "Real time" and "planning" that is described as "Operations Planning". This is the area the drafting team thinks needs to get covered. *FMWG will discuss in Chicago. General consensus is that we do not need to create another function.*