

## Meeting Notes

### Transmission Loading Relief SDT — Project 2006-08

**January 29, 2008 | 9 a.m.–5 p.m.**

**January 30, 2008 | 9 a.m.–noon**

NAESB Offices

Houston, TX

#### **1. Administration**

##### **a. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

Andy Rodriguez read the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

##### **b. Introduction of Attendees**

The following members and guest were in attendance:

- Ben Li (Chair)
- Daryn Barker
- Jim Battles
- Jim Busbin
- Jim Eckelkamp
- Frank Koza
- Tom Mallinger
- Ed Overtree
- Nelson Muller
- Ed Skiba
- Andy Rodriguez

##### **c. Approval of Agenda**

Tom Mallinger moved that the drafting team approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

##### **d. Approval of Meeting Notes**

Jim Busbin moved that the drafting team approve meeting notes from the previous meeting. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

#### **2. Review of Meetings and Schedule Review**

**a. Schedule Review**

Ben Li suggested the drafting team change its original target deadlines. The immediate goal is to get the Reference Manual posted for comment. Ben would like it posted for a 45-day comment. Then, the team will revise as appropriate and send to the SC for approval (no ballot required). Target will be to post on February 8, 2008.

Tom Mallinger requested an update from Ben Li regarding the approval of the VSL Guidelines. Ben indicated that he had received no clear guidance from the CCC, but would follow up with Ellen Oswald.

Andy was requested to contact Kathy York to discuss how her previous assignment would be handled, given her transition (from previous meeting: 8.) Request to move the first sentence in 2.5.3 to NAESB (The issuance of a TLR Level 4 shall result in the curtailment, in the current hour and the next hour, of all Interchange Transactions using Non-firm Point-to-Point Transmission Service that are at or above the Curtailment Threshold that impact the Constrained Facilities.) (CoC IRO-006-4, Q3 – Duke). If NAESB agrees, they will take this on in the next revision of their Business Practice. With the planned major rewrite of the standard, these sections will end up being moved into the Joint Operator Manual. Need to review after the final version of the Joint Operator Manual is done. KATHY TO BRING BACK TO NAESB, AS THE NEXT VERSION OF TLR DOES NOT CONTAIN THIS LANGUAGE AND NAESB STANDARD USES “BUILD UP” APPROACH).

**b. Future Meetings**

- i. April 1–2, 2008 — 9 a.m.–5pm, 9 a.m.–noon in Carmel at MISO. This meeting is CONFIRMED.
    1. Day 1 goal of this meeting will be to respond to comments on the Reference Manual.
    2. Day 2 goal of this meeting will be to finalize the new standards and agree to post them for a 45-day comment period. Target for balloting will be later part of June.
  - ii. June 26–27, 2008 — 9 a.m.–5pm, 9 a.m.–noon in Toronto at IESO. This meeting is PENDING. Ben Li is working to acquire meeting space.
- c. If needed, the team will have a WebEx and conference call.

**3. ORS Meeting Update — TLR 3C**

Frank Koza indicated that no action had been taken at the ORS. Frank Koza has requested Dan Boezio provide an update, but has received no response. The drafting teams agreed to table discussion regarding TLR3C until further notice and continue its work.

#### **4. Joint Operator Manual Update**

Andy Rodriguez presented the reformatted Reference Manual. Ben Li added a clarifying sentence to the manual, indicating that the requirements were copied from IRO-006 and that the manual should not be considered a replacement for the standards, but an aid. Andy was asked to forward the manual to either Maureen or Barbara for 45-day posting.

The drafting team discussed the maintenance of the manual. Ed Skiba raised the concern with ensuring NERC and NAESB both maintain the document and keep the standards in sync. NAESB generally collects changes to standards and then files them en masse at one time. NERC generally files its changes incrementally as they occur. Ed indicated NERC and NAESB might need to make interim filings to keep the standards and business practice in sync. The concern was also raised that the NERC/NAESB Joint Development Process needs to incorporate the concept of joint management of joint materials (like the reference manual).

The drafting team discussed the comment form to be posted with the Reference Manual, and how to structure the questions. In general, discussion was regarding how to phrase the questions of “do you need this manual,” and “if so, how should it be maintained and by who?”

#### **5. Phase III Work**

The drafting team discussed the naming of the standards. Rather than have an IRO-017, the drafting team is going to pursue a regional naming of IRO-006-EI-1, with the primary standard being named IRO-006-CWS-5. Andy Rodriguez will research the correct naming of the standards.

There was also significant concern about the role of the Transmission Operator in WECC (i.e., in some cases, requirements should be assigned to the TOP, not the RC). It was suggested that when the standards go out for comment, we ask for feedback on how to address this difference.

The drafting team reviewed R2 of the EI standard, and reworded it and the associated measurements to be much more clear and specific about which entities had responsibilities at what time.

Ben Li volunteered to draft the VSLs and have them available for our next meeting. Ben Li asked Frank Koza to work on the data retention, and Frank agreed.

Nelson Muller volunteered to create slides dealing with WECC transactions crossing into other interconnections which will be reviewed by the ORS and others.

Andy Rodriguez was asked to send out the most current versions of the documents and the comment form for the next meeting.

## **6. Phase II Work (Field Test) Report**

Tom Mallinger provided a presentation giving a review of the status of the Phase II Field Tests. Currently markets utilizing the Phase II approaches have proposed several elements that they believe should be considered

- i. Relief would not have to be accomplished in less than 30 minutes (based on the timing associated with the S4 sub-priority).
- ii. Only generators with an impact of 3 percent or more should be considered.
- iii. Requests for relief that are for 50MW or more would get additional time beyond 30 minutes to allow for ramping.
- iv. Relief provided that was within the greater of 10MW or 10 percent of the request would be considered to have been successfully provided.

Additional work will continue to develop this proposal through February, with a goal to complete the final proposal with data to support it on or around March 5<sup>th</sup>.

The team briefly discussed the concept of the SAR for a “minimum curtailment threshold for reliability.” Jim Busbin agreed to investigate either writing such a SAR or appending it to the TLR3C work being undertaken by Dan Boezio.

## **7. Adjourn**

## Attachment 1

### List of Phase III Changes

- 1.) Request for exemption from ramp requirements for TLR-cuts (CoC IRO-006-1, Q3 — OVEC). **Compliance with RC order is mandatory, so this is already covered.**
- 2.) Request that curtailed transactions cannot be reloaded by anyone except the issuer of the curtailment. (CoC IRO-006-1, Q5 — JISWG). **This has been fixed in the IDC. However, we will forward the following comment to the Interchange folks (Subcommittee or drafting team?) “The TLRDT believes that there should be a requirement that transactions curtailed for reliability reasons by an RC should have some restrictions on who can reload them.”**
- 3.) Identify cases where denial of a curtailment may be allowed (CoC IRO-006-1, Q5 — JISWG). **Compliance with RC order is mandatory, so this is already covered. If results are questionable, RCs must coordinate actions.**
- 4.) Identify cases (if any) where a curtailment may be allowed for non-reliability reasons (CoC IRO-006-1, Q5 — JISWG). **TLR cannot be used for non-reliability. Curtailments that are not part of TLR should be covered in other standards or business practices.**
- 5.) Appropriate uses (if any) of “proxy” flowgates (CoC IRO-006-1, Q5 — AEP, OVEC). **There is another task group looking into this area, and we will make changes as necessary based on the results of their work.**
- 6.) Ensure there are no “double jeopardy” situations with IRO-005 (CoC IRO-006-4, Q1 — AEP). **No double jeopardy found.**
- 7.) Review role of TOP in IRO-006 (CoC IRO-006-4, Q2). **Jim and Sue agree that the new standard may work.**
- 8.) Request to move the first sentence in 2.5.3 to NAESB (the issuance of a TLR Level 4 shall result in the curtailment, in the current hour and the next hour, of all Interchange Transactions using Non-firm Point-to-Point Transmission Service that are at or above the Curtailment Threshold that impact the Constrained Facilities.) (CoC IRO-006-4, Q3 — Duke). **If NAESB agrees, they will take this on in the next revision of their Business Practice. With the planned major rewrite of the standard, these sections will end up being moved into the Joint Operator Manual. Need to review after the final version of the Joint Operator Manual is done. KATHY TO BRING BACK TO NAESB, AS THE NEXT VERSION OF TLR DOES NOT CONTAIN THIS LANGUAGE AND NAESB STANDARD USES “BUILD UP” APPROACH.**

- 9.) Request to keep 5.1.5 within the IRO-006 standard (All Balancing Authorities in the Eastern Interconnection shall be obligated to achieve the amount of Constrained Facility relief assigned to them by the Per Generator Method.) (CoC IRO-006-4, Q3 — Duke). **With the planned major rewrite of the standard, these sections will end up being moved into the Joint Operator Manual. Need to review after the final version of the Joint Operator Manual is done. IRO-001 REQUIRES THE BA TO DO WHAT THEY ARE DIRECTED TO BY THE RC, AND 4.1 ASSIGNS RELIEF OBLIGATION.**
- 10.) Request to move sections 6.2–6.2.6 (from mapping document) to either NAESB or the IDC Ref Doc (CoC IRO-006-4, Q3 — Duke). **With the planned major rewrite of the standard, these sections will end up being moved into the Joint Operator Manual. Need to review after the final version of the Joint Operator Manual is done. THESE ARE IN THE IDC REFERENCE PORTION OF THE REFERENCE DOCUMENT.**
- 11.) Request to move sections 7.4.1.–7.4.3 (from mapping document) to NAESB (CoC IRO-006-4, Q3 — Duke). **With the planned major rewrite of the standard, these sections will end up being moved into the Joint Operator Manual. Need to review after the final version of the Joint Operator Manual is done. THESE ARE IN THE IDC REFERENCE PORTION OF THE REFERENCE DOCUMENT.**
- 12.) Request to move sections 7.7–7.9 (from mapping document) to NAESB or the IDC Ref Doc (CoC IRO-006-4, Q3 — Duke). **With the planned major rewrite of the standard, these sections will end up being moved into the Joint Operator Manual. Need to review after the final version of the Joint Operator Manual is done. THESE ARE IN THE IDC REFERENCE PORTION OF THE REFERENCE DOCUMENT.**
- 13.) Attachment 1 — Section 2. Identify whether reference to “On-Path or Off-path” belongs in standard, attachment, reference document, or NAESB (CoC IRO-006-4, Q3 — Duke). **Will be cleaned up in new version of Joint Operator Manual. Rewrite will identify where it belongs. IS OWNED BY NAESB, BUT IS IN THE REFERENCE DOCUMENT.**
- 14.) Redraft of R5 and M5 (CoC IRO-006-4, Q6 — Duke; Q11 — Entergy) **Has been deleted from the standard. NAESB still needs to clean this up.**
- 15.) Restructure of R3 (CoC IRO-006-4, QA6 — Duke) R3 needs to be split into two requirements, one that focuses on implementing a local procedure simultaneously with the Interconnection-wide procedure and another that states specifically, “Each Reliability Coordinator shall follow the curtailments as directed by the Interconnection-wide procedure.” **Has been restructured. Part 1 is eliminated and Part 2 is explicit. Needs team review, so revisit. REVIEWED AND ADDRESSED.**

- 16.) Rewrite of R4 (CoC IRO-006-4, Q7 — AEP). **We will need to add specific coordination language for each interconnection. DEFER; REVISIT AFTER TOM FINDS OUT WHAT IS HAPPENING ON THE GROUND.**
- 17.) Evaluate the need for TLR Level 6 (CoC IRO-006-4, Q7 — AEP). **Still under discussion by the team. Frank Koza bringing to the RCWG for discussion. Frank confirmed minority concern at RCWG, we will ask industry in comment form.**
- 18.) Restructure of R4, which deals with coordination across Interconnections (CoC IRO-006-4, Q7 — ERCOT). **See 16.**
- 19.) Rewrite 4.1–4.5 (CoC IRO-006-4, Q11 — AEP). **Now included in the Reference document.**
- 20.) Update Appendix A diagram with correct terminology (CoC IRO-006-4, Q11 — AEP). **Will be in Joint Manual, and will be updated. DONE**
- 21.) IRO-006-4: The roles of the RC (as initiator or responder) are unclear and should be clarified. (CoC IRO-006-4, Q11 — IRC). **CLEARED UP.**
- 22.) IRO-006-4, Attachment 1: Should be reviewed to determine whether there is any portion that should become part of a standard. Attachment 1 largely is procedural in nature, but part(s) of it possibly should be rewritten in the form of a standard. (CoC IRO-006-4, Q11 — IRC). **DONE, but we may need to adjust the reference manual.**
- 23.) IRO-006-4, Attachment 1: Some of the assumptions made by IDC are fairly crude and can result in the inappropriate selection of interchange transactions to be curtailed. (CoC IRO-006-4 Q11 — IRC). **Specific concerns would need to be taken to IDCWG or RCWG or ORS.**
- 24.) IRO-006-4, Attachment 1: Should either specify requirements for IDC, or require after-the-fact analysis of IDC results upon request to identify and quantify deficiencies, or both. (CoC IRO-006-4, Q11 — IRC) **Specific concerns would need to be taken to IDCWG or RCWG or ORS.**
- 25.) Move timing guidelines in Attachment 1 to IDC Reference Document. **DONE.**
- 26.) Move Attachment 1 Appendix E, F to IDC Reference Document **DONE.**