

Notes

Balancing Authority Controls SDT— Project 2007-05

November 5, 2009 | 11:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. EDT

1. Administration

a. Antitrust Guidelines

Andy Rodriguez reviewed the anti-trust guidelines with meeting participants.

b. Introduction of Attendees

The following members and guests were in attendance:

- Larry Akens, Chair
- Harvie Beavers
- Gerry Beckerle
- Terry Bilke
- Al DiCaprio
- Bill Herbsleb
- Howard Illian
- Sydney Niemeyer
- Guy Quintin
- Scott Sells
- Wayne vanLiere
- Deonne Cunningham
- Andy Rodriguez

c. Approval of Agenda

The drafting team reviewed the Agenda and approved it unanimously.

d. Approval of Meeting Notes

The drafting team deferred approval of the last meeting's notes until the next in-person meeting.

2. Coordination Efforts

Larry Akens provided an update on the work efforts of the RBCSDT. The WECC participation in the BAAL field trial has been approved by the WECC OC and is slated to begin in March 2010.

Sidney Niemeyer provided a brief update on the FRSDT. The FRSDT has posted their interpretation of the EnergyMark request for ballot.

NAESB is still monitoring the group's progress.

As an FYI, it was noted that the NERC OC has directed that various members form the ORS and RS evaluate the concept and impacts of ACE Diversity Interchange.

3. Update on BAL-004 and BAL-012

Andy gave the team an update on the status of BAL-004 and BAL-012. BAL-004 had some changes recommended during the QA review that are being applied. Andy will review those with Larry when complete, and a determination can be made whether to post the standards for comment or to review it with the team. Maureen Long, NERC Standards Process Manager, suggested that the team meet with the RBCSDT leadership and discuss BAL-012 further, specifically with regard to the BAL-007 proposal. Andy and Larry are setting up a call to do so.

4. Discussion of Inadvertent

Larry, Sydney, and Gerry Beckerle provided an update on their review of CPS1 data and how an hourly CPS would look. All three had acquired the data, but had not yet begun doing analysis.

Andy gave an overview of the "minimizing inadvertent" e-mail he had sent to the group. That mail covered the concepts of Interchange (which he thinks is being addressed by the CISDT), meter accuracy and availability, and looking for chronic offenders through trends analysis of frequency and rate of inadvertent accumulation. Al DiCaprio suggested that trying to write standards to minimize inadvertent was a bad idea. Andy explained the genesis of the document, the relationship to the 693 directive to penalize large accumulations of Inadvertent, and how the team had proposed to FERC that it be allowed to offer a different alternative. Al and Howard Illian suggested that the industry cannot perform any better than it currently is doing. Howard further suggested that the best we may be able to do is establish a method for paying back inadvertent. Gerry stated that all sources of inadvertent are either not reliability issues or are covered by other standards, and suggested we no longer include the concept of inadvertent in the Reliability Standards. Howard suggested that Inadvertent was too far removed from its cause to be of any value. Gerry suggested that entities need to look at the components that cause inadvertent and fix them. Bill Herbsleb suggested that we should be looking for trends using the monthly AIE surveys and use those trends to identify problems. Andy asked if we could draft standards related to metering accuracy and availability. Al suggested that when it comes to balancing, metering is important, but that metering is handled by the TOP and the RC, and that their telemetry is more important than that of the BA. Al also pointed out that the Interchange meters in the field tend to have variable error that is based on their loading. Bill suggested that we might consider giving Balancing Authorities guidance on how to assess themselves and identify problems with their metering.

Al responded that we are a mature industry, everyone should know what they need to do, and they should not require guidance on finding and fixing metering problems. Gerry pointed out that as long as the line meter error is included for both parties experiencing the error, there is no effect to the rest of the Interconnection. Gerry recommended that we not have standards related to inadvertent, as it is not a reliability issue. Al suggested that if we want to do so, we should design an experiment to see if there is any correlation between the accumulations of inadvertent and reliability problems, indicating that this would show a causal relationship. Andy questioned how you would design such an experiment. Al suggested that we look for any violations of medium or high risk requirements (e.g., IROL violations, violations of the TOP standards, violations of CPS1), and see if they correlate to any large accumulations of inadvertent. This would probably require a data request. Howard proposed that we might suggest to FERC that because we are looking at putting a transmission limit on ACE in the RBC work, this might effectively limit inadvertent.

5. Discussion of BAL-002 (DCS) and Operating Reserves

The team discussed the draft BAL-002 standard Andy had sent out. This draft incorporated the comments and suggestions from the last meeting, proposed the eliminating of RSGs (to be replaced with JROs), and suggested a new definition for “disturbance.” Many questioned the validity of trying to define a disturbance explicitly as a MW limit or as a function of L_{10} . Gerry questioned if the purpose was correct. Al suggested that we need to make sure this is only dealing with the reliability problem. Howard pointed out that the UFLS team had defined an operating range between 59.5 and 60.5 Hertz, and movement outside this range started to have negative impact on generator life. Howard further suggested that if we write these standards too loosely, they may end up promoting people operating outside the generator manufacturer’s operating limits, which could be problematic. Howard proposed that we might define a disturbance as a sudden change in ACE that puts you outside the BAAL (or some multiplier of that).

There was significant debate about the inclusion of the frequency component in the DCS criteria. The answer depends on the understating of what recovery meant – whether it meant recovery of the Interconnection back to a balanced state, or recovery of the Balancing Authority back to a balanced state. Larry suggested that if you only looked at the Interconnection, then you would be allowing people to lean on the ties. Andy pointed out that this was essentially accumulation of inadvertent, which the team earlier agreed was not a reliability concern. Larry suggested we consider two approaches on DCS – one to do the minimum required by the FERC, and the other to try to create the ideal standard. The team ultimately agreed to go back to the original and start from scratch. We would add a frequency component based on a 1-minute average of frequency, and state the relationship to frequency as follows: “If a low/high frequency event, the disturbance ends when frequency is greater than/less than or equal to scheduled frequency. The standard should also be written as a per-event measure, eliminate

the reserve adjustment, include the loss of generation and the loss of load, and include the concept of back-down margin. The standard should use the definition of “reportable disturbance” that says the bunds are based on the MSCC or the “tie line” contingency, similar to the “anticipated” language used in the draft. The team did not state any opinion on JROs versus RSGs.

The team the discussed Guy Quintin’s latest updates to the Operating Reserves documents. Howard proposed that each reserve type really needs to discuss four concepts:

Frequency Responsive Reserves

- 1.) Should be proportional to a change in frequency
- 2.) Is continuous with respect to its response to change in frequency (no step changes)
- 3.) Must be bi-directional and can move both up and down (which will make some FRR into supplemental reserves)
- 4.) Must be sustainable until replaced (replaced in the case of a suite of resources acting as a single resource)

Regulating Reserves

- 1.) Do not have to be proportional to a change in frequency
- 2.) Do not have to be continuous (step changes are OK)
- 3.) Must be bi-directional and can move both up and down
- 4.) Must be sustainable until replaced (replaced in the case of a suite of resources acting as a single resource)

Howard suggested that he would work directly with Guy to provide comments. Howard will focus on FRR, while Guy will work on Regulating and Contingency Reserves.

6. **Discussion of FAC/Metering Standard**

This item was not covered in detail, as the team ran out of time. Andy asked the team to review the list of requirements he had sent out that could be considered for inclusion in a FAC/Metering standard.

7. **Assignments and Action Items**

Andy will investigate doing an analysis of Inadvertent Accumulation relative to Standards Violations.

Andy will update the BAL-002 document as discussed above.

Guy and Howard will work on the operating reserves documents.

Al will consider the FAC/Metering requirements.

8. **Future Meetings** (*Italics not confirmed*)

December 1-2 (8-5, 8-12) – Chicago, IL

January 19 – ConCall/WebEx, 10-4 Central

February 24-25 (8-5, 8-12) – Atlanta/SOCO

March 16– ConCall/WebEx, 10-4 Central

April 29-30 (8-5, 8-12) – St Louis/Ameren

May– ConCall/WebEx, 10-4 Central

9. **Adjourn**

The drafting team adjourned at approximately 4:15pm on November 5.