

## Meeting Notes

### Project 2008-12 Coordinate Interchange Standards Drafting Team Meeting

September 4-5, 2013

Public Service Company of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, NM

#### Administrative

##### 1. Introductions

The meeting was brought to order by Chair Cheryl Mendrala at 8:30 a.m. MT on Wednesday, September 4, 2013. Don Lacen of PNM provided the team with building and safety information and logistics. Participants introduced themselves and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/Observer (M/O)	In-Person (Y/N)
Cheryl Mendrala, Chair	ISO New England	M	Y
Bob Harshbarger	Puget Sound	M	Y
Kelly Bertholet	Manitoba Hydro	M	Y
Don Lacen	PNM	M	Y
Chris Pacella	PJM	M	Y
Mary Willey	BPA	M	Y
Mallory Huggins	NERC	M	Y
Stephen Crutchfield	NERC	M	Y
Sean Cavote	NERC	M	Y
Ena Agbedia	FERC	O	N
Bob Birch	Florida Power & Light	O	Y

Name	Company	Member/Observer (M/O)	In-Person (Y/N)
Joshua Phillips	SPP	O	Y
Tracy Townley	Avista	O	N

## 2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC staff reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public meeting announcement. There were no questions raised.

## 3. Review Meeting Objectives and Agenda

The Chair announced that the objective of the meeting was to come up with a plan for next steps for the standards, focusing on the requirements that should be retired and those that are truly necessary for reliability (taking into consideration coordination with NAESB). She reminded the team that it does not need to provide individual responses to each comment, because the posting was for informal comment, and thus a summary response will be sufficient.

## Agenda

### 1. Review Comments Received on Posting; Revise Standards Accordingly

- a. **INT-004-3—Dynamic Transfers:** The SDT modified R1, R2, and R4 and deleted R3.
  - i. R1: Incorporated an exception for Pseudo-Ties that are already accounted for in other congestion management procedures; deleted the two bullets under R1.
  - ii. R2: Specified applicability to only those LSEs that have submitted an RFI and clarified subrequirements.
  - iii. R3: Deleted, since R4 covers the registration in the NAESB Electric Industry Registry (EIR). The SDT is no longer suggesting that a manual process be used until the NAESB EIR registration is in place.
  - iv. R4 (will become R3): Modified for clarity and to ensure that all Pseudo-Ties, including existing Pseudo-Ties, are registered; Implementation Plan will be updated to activate only when NAESB begins registering Pseudo-Ties in the EIR
- b. **INT-006-4—Evaluation of Interchange Transactions:** The SDT deleted R1 and modified R2, R3, R4, R5, and R6. While the SDT discussed whether some of the requirements were better handled by NAESB, the team determined that accountability does need to be retained in the NERC

standards. The SDT deleted the content of columns A and C in the timing table, as they are no longer addressed in the Reliability Standards.

- i. R1: The timing associated with the distribution task was determined to be administrative and was deleted as it is better addressed in NAESB business practices. The entities that are required to receive the transaction are already addressed in the eTag spec.
  - ii. R2 and R3 (will become R1 and R2): Modified for clarity. The timing for the evaluation by reliability entities is not covered in the eTag spec, so R2 should be retained since it addresses responsibilities of reliability entities.
  - iii. R4 (will become R3): Modified to specify responsibility of Source and Sink BA.
  - iv. R5 (will become R4): R5 was discussed at length to determine whether it is necessary to define the rules for when the Arranged Interchange should be transitioned to Confirmed in the NERC Reliability Standards. These rules in the standard require that 'no action' results in the 'denial' of an eTag. Since these rules of how the actions by reliability entities impact the status of the interchange, the SDT believes they should remain in the NERC Reliability Standards.
  - v. R6 (will become R5): While this is a distribution-focused requirement, the SDT believes it's necessary for reliability because a Confirmed Interchange cannot be implemented if the entities involved are not aware that the Interchange has been confirmed.
- c. **INT-009-2—Implementation of Interchange:** The SDT retained all requirements but modified them for clarity. The team discussed whether there would be value in resurrecting INT-003-3 (which was originally proposed for retirement) and providing recommendations for future changes to BAL-005-2b to address the concepts identified in the last posting of INT-009. The primary difference in concept between INT-003 and INT-009 is the change from confirming individual Interchange Schedules to confirming the net of Interchange Schedules with each Adjacent BA. There was concern of one attendee that this would create a significant change in current practice with minimal reliability benefit. After discussion, the SDT determined that it would be most effective to retain INT-009-2, which incorporate perceived gaps in BAL-005-2b.
- i. R1: Incorporated a reference to the Reliability Coordinator.
  - ii. R2: Now addresses Pseudo-Ties in the same manner that BAL-005-2b addresses Dynamic Schedules. R12.3 of BAL-005-2b addresses common metering for Dynamic Schedules and Pseudo-Ties, but not their implementation into ACE. INT-009-2, R2, which addresses Pseudo-Ties, is equivalent to R10 of BAL-005-2b, which addresses Dynamic Schedules. While the updates to INT-009-2, R2 may fit better in BAL-005-2b, R12, the SDT elected to retain the Pseudo-Tie language in INT-009-2 to ensure that it's covered.
  - iii. R3: The SDT considered deleting R3 (carried over from INT-003-3, R1.2) because it's focused on notification, but ultimately determined that the requirement does support reliability

since the Transmission Operator is not necessarily part of the Interchange transaction approval process.

- d. **INT-010-2—Interchange Initiation and Modification for Reliability:** The SDT modified R1, R2, R3, and R6 and deleted R4 and R5. It also removed the Transmission Service Provider and Reliability Coordinator from the Applicability section, as they no longer appear in any requirements.
  - i. R1: Replaced “request for Arranged Interchange” with the correct term, “Request for Interchange.”
  - ii. R2, R3: Modified slightly for clarity.
  - iii. R4: Deleted because the allowable list of reasons for issues a curtailment does not impact reliability and, if needed, should be defined on the NAESB side.
  - iv. R5: Deleted because this is comparable to the INT-006 R1 distribution requirement that was removed. Also, INT-006 R6 indicates which entity’s approvals shall be considered when transitioning Arranged Interchange to Confirmed Interchange.
  - v. R6 (will become R4): Added Pseudo-Ties and modified the language for clarity.
- e. **INT-011-1—Intra-Balancing Authority Transaction Identification**
  - i. R1: While some commenters did not support this standard, the SDT believes that it must continue to be included to satisfy the FERC directive.
- f. **Definitions**
  - i. The SDT reviewed the definitions and made updates for clarity. The definition changes will be incorporated into all standards that reference the definitions.

## 2. Develop Summary Consideration of Comments

- a. The SDT will develop summary of the changes it is proposing for the formal posting based on its consideration of all comments submitted. The SDT will also address some minority concerns in its summary.

## 3. Discuss Work Plan

- a. Over the next several weeks, NERC staff and SDT leadership will work together to finalize the following documents to post for a 45-day comment and ballot period by late September or early October:
  - i. Clean and redlined versions of all standards, including redlined definitions and Implementation Plans
  - ii. Definition revisions to address FERC Order 693 regarding the RC
  - iii. Mapping Document

- iv. FERC/Issues Disposition
- v. VRF/VSL Justifications
- vi. Summary Consideration of Comments, including an updated version of the 2009 Consideration of Comments
- vii. Comment Form

**4. Future Meetings**

December 4-5, 2013 – Location to be determined

**5. Adjourn**

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 MT on Thursday, September 5, 2013.