

## Notes

### Balancing Authority Reliability-based Controls — Project 2010-14

September 8-9, 2010

#### 1. Administrative Items

##### a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chairs called the meeting to order at 0800 MDT on Wednesday, September 8, 2010 at the Xcel Energy offices in Denver, CO. Meeting participants were:

Larry Akens, Co-Chair	Bill Herbsleb	Doug Hils, Co-Chair
Dave Lemmons	Clyde Loutan	Steve Myers
LeRoy Patterson	Mike Potishnak	Mark Prosperi-Porter
Guy Quintan	Jerry Rust	Kris Ruud
Tom Segrist	Glenn Stephens	Tom Washburn
Don Badley, Observer	Will Franklin, Observer	Carlos Martinez, Observer
Guy Zito, Observer	Leslie Saponaro, FERC Observer	Bob Cummings, NERC staff
Phil Tatro, NERC staff	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	

##### b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines & Meeting Announcement – Ed Dobrowolski

No questions were raised.

##### c. Agenda and Objectives — Doug Hils & Larry Akens

The objective of the meeting was to bring the 2 merged groups together and bring everyone up to speed. Everyone needs to be on the same page so that the combined SDT can properly leverage all of the synergies from the merger. Two items were added to the agenda: a report from the FRRSDT and an update on the new Standards Process Manual.

## 2. **BACSDT History – Larry Akens**

Larry provided a history of the former BACSDT efforts up to the time of the merger. The Power Point file is attached to these notes.

Coordination between the BACSDT, RBCSDT, and FRRSDT was an important element of the previous work and the same high level of coordination needs to continue between BARCSDT and FRRSDT.

It was pointed out that there are questions on the role of the BA vs. the GO/GOP. When writing requirements in the future, this needs to be taken into account.

## 3. **RBCSDT History – Doug Hils**

Doug provided a history of the former RBCSDT efforts up to the time of the merger. The Acrobat file is attached to these notes. The report included a review of the field test results to date which has been on-going in the east since 2005 with no reported reliability concerns. Following the report, Doug went to the field test web site to review the material there.

The RBCSDT had previously recommended that SAR items dealing with BAL-003 (and thus BAL-010) should be moved to the FRRSDT. There needs to be follow up to make sure that this happens.

There is an open question as to whether BAL-007 should retire BAL-001 or whether BAL-001 should simply be revised based on BAL-007.

Due to the complexity of the concepts involved and the new nature of the associated requirements, the 'public' needs to be educated as to what is being planned prior to any future votes.

Doug needs to write a letter to NERC Compliance to update the waiver for the BA's participating in the field test.

*AI* – Doug to write a letter to NERC Compliance to update the list of BA's participating in the field test and thus requiring a waiver. This should be completed by the Carmel meeting.

## 4. **Review of New Standards Process Manual – Ed Dobrowolski**

Ed reviewed the major changes in the newly approved Standards Process manual. The new manual and a Power Point highlighting the changes were distributed prior to the meeting.

A major source of concern was the NERC staff quality reviews. The SDT questioned who would be doing the reviews, the timing of the reviews, and what they were obligated to do with the comments.

## **5. BARCSDT Objectives – Doug Hils & Larry Akens**

The two SARs for the old projects are being carried forward so the purpose of the SDT remains unchanged just expanded to accommodate both former projects.

The web sites for the 2 former projects will remain in place throughout the life of Project 2010-14. They have been cut off as far as updates are concerned with the formation of the BARCSDT and will now simply point to the web site for this project. The web site for Project 2010-14 starts as of the SC approval of the merger and contains pointers back to the 2 former projects for historical purposes.

The mail lists for the 2 former projects will be terminated by the end of the week as they are no longer needed.

A schedule for this project needs to be developed by the end of the month so that it can be presented at the October SC meeting.

## **6. Discuss Scope of Existing BACSDT Work vs. SAR – Larry Akens**

The previous work of the BACSDT included work that was beyond the scope of the BACSDT SAR. In light of the NERC initiative to complete the SDT efforts by the end of 2011 and to preclude developing a supplemental SAR, it was suggested that the BARCSDT needed to return its focus to the existing SAR. Additional changes to the BAL standards could be taken up at a later time through the issuance of a new SAR.

Larry showed a preliminary revision of BAL-002 that was consistent with the scope of the SAR and attempted to address the FERC Order 693 directives associated with this standard. The preliminary effort seems to show that revising BAL-002, rather than rewriting and expanding it, is a possible solution. Some of the issues involved will be relatively simple to address while others, such as a continent-wide reserve policy and significant frequency deviations may be more difficult.

Larry agreed to take BAL-002 and formally revise it to show how a revision can be utilized to accomplish the goals of the SAR. He will have this draft ready for the SDT to review in Carmel.

*AI* – Larry will provide a complete revision to BAL-002, addressing the issues and directives associated with the standard for SDT review at the Carmel meeting.

If the BAL-002 revision is acceptable, a similar path will be employed for BAL-005 and BAL-006. If the work is deemed unacceptable, then the SDT will re-visit this decision.

## **7. Discuss Scope of Existing RBCSDT Work vs. SAR – Doug Hils**

The discussion was started by looking at the status of the proposed BAL-007 through -011 standards.

BAL-007: Need to incorporate ADF concepts and decide whether to revise BAL-001.

BAL-008: Probably not needed as a separate standard, should be investigated to see if requirements are still needed and if so, move to BAL-007 (or revised BAL-001).

BAL-009: No longer needed as requirements are covered in other standards.

BAL-010: Move to FRRSDT.

BAL-011: This was originally assigned to NERC and there were many objections to having NERC as an applicable entity in the standards. However, the task still needs to be done and NERC is probably the right entity to perform the work. Also, since this will involve periodic updates to limits, it would be awkward to try to handle this through standards. This effort should probably be incorporated in to the NERC Rules and Procedures.

It was pointed out that future postings from the SDT must come forward as SDT documents and not documents associated with a single individual.

It was suggested that the SDT needs to move forward now with BAL-007 as the field test has been going on for quite some time and no reliability problems have been uncovered. Since the west has only recently begun to participate in the field test, the suggestion was to move BAL-007 forward now just for ERCOT and the east and to bring the west along after they conclude their portion of the field test. Based on the success of the BAAL field trials in the east, it should be formally standardized as quickly as possible. It was also pointed out that SDTs are not the proper forum for running research projects as with the current BAAL field trials. Eastern representatives cited lack of conclusive proof from the field test due to limited BA involvement. Western representatives cited that they agreed to participate in the field test only because it was supposed to eventually include transmission limits. Without such a promise, the western members would likely never have approved participation in the field test. NPCC stated that the field test proved nothing without the inclusion of transmission limits. Several SDT members expressed the opinion that moving forward as suggested violated the Standards Process. The SDT did not accept this suggestion and will continue to move forward with the field test and the development of transmission limits based on ACE Distribution Factors (ADF).

In addition, the SDT discussed expanding the current field test and the possibility of starting a new field test to examine the frequency model. Such a test could run for up to a year.

The SDT developed an action plan based on the discussion:

1. Revise present field trial document to bring it up to date, clarify wording, & update participant list.
2. Request additional participation in field trial for both Eastern & Western Interconnections.
  - a. Smaller BA's needed to see if smaller entities have unique problems – smallest BA at present is 4500 MW.
  - b. Request more participation from NPCC, SPP, and FRCC members – need better and more complete geographic coverage.
  - c. Work with WECC PWG on WECC posting for more WECC participation.
3. Additional discussion on developing historic performance for small BA's based on NERC data from Resource Adequacy application.
4. Periodic webinars to explain field trial and educate industry segments.
5. Request information on possible transmission problems associated with BA actions from NPCC.
  - a. Examine bottlenecks presently handled internally to see if information can be shared to assist in developing transmission limits for BAL standards, e.g., ISONE's impact on Central East.
6. ACE Transmission Limit (ATL) development.
  - a. Need distribution factors and historical TLR's from Eastern Interconnection.
    - i. Direct access to data from OATI for IDC TDF's desired – one historical snapshot only.
  - b. Consolidate documentation on ATL methodology including ADF white paper.
  - c. Respond to comments from posting.
  - d. Develop methodology on incorporating into field trial.
  - e. Develop implementation requirements for IDC and WebSAS.
7. Review of BAL-008 to determine if there are any requirements applicable to an RC and whether a measure is needed to capture additional action by the BA when frequency drops below Frequency Abnormal Limit (defined in document).

8. Request SC to move responsibility for frequency bias to the FRRSDT (Project 2007-12), i.e., BAL-010 and BAL-003 moves to FRRSDT.
9. Develop a revision to the Rules and Procedure to review and periodically revise frequency limits (BAL-011) – would need to be posted with standards.
10. Evaluate alternative frequency models and requirements specific to single BA interconnections.
11. BAL-009 is now duplicative and is no longer needed.
12. BAL-007 to be modified to include ATL.
  - a. Discuss whether to retire BAL-001 or move BAL-007 into BAL-001.
  - b. If BAL-001 is retired, need to move the formal definition of the ACE equation to another standard, possibly BAL-005.
13. Discussion of methodology to support Purpose Statement C on short duration frequency excursions.
14. Periodic review of standards developed for conformance to Order 693.
15. Need to develop a timeline for these activities.

It is anticipated that a request to expand the field test as described above will be made at the October SC meeting. A definitive timeline for all activities will need to be included with the request to the SC.

NERC staff stated that they do not support the intent of the SDT and that they will likely state same at the SC meeting.

*AI* – Ed will build a draft schedule for SDT approval in Carmel based on the inclusion of items 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 in the base project.

*AI* – Bob Cummings will obtain the requested IDC data.

## **8. FRRSDT Overview – Bill Herbsleb**

Bill presented a brief update on FRRSDT activities. The Power Point is attached to these notes.

Bob Cummings provided a verbal update on the FRI Project.

## **9. Review Response to Comments from RBCSDT Posting – LeRoy Patterson**

This was a formal comment period, not an informal one as the SDT thought. Therefore, responses are required for each and every comment received.

The SDT reviewed the draft responses provided by LeRoy and made numerous changes during the meeting. The document will be distributed to the SDT for any additional comments. This work should be accomplished through e-mail prior to the Carmel meeting so that at Carmel, formal approval of the document can be achieved.

*AI* – Ed will clean up the Response to comments document and distribute it to the SDT for review.

#### **10. Discussion of Time Error Correction (TEC) – Larry Akens & Ed Dobrowolski**

NERC's response to FERC's March 18<sup>th</sup> NOPR on BAL-004 included a proposed field test designed to eventually eliminate time error correction. This SDT should be the one requesting such a field test but it would be run under the auspices of the OC. Andy Rodriguez crafted a proposed test document which was presented to the SDT for review.

Several issues were raised with the scope of the proposed test:

- Do all BA's need to participate? The west doesn't feel that they need to be involved with this effort.
- Do you need to go through a drawn-out phased approach to increasing the time error initiation threshold and the frequency offset or should time error correction be suspended during the field test?
- Do customers need to be notified?

The plan is to handle comments to the document through e-mail and bring a final document for formal approval to the Carmel meeting. Ed will distribute the document again and take a poll of members on the bulleted items.

*AI* – Ed will distribute the TEC field test draft for comment.

*AI* – Ed will poll SDT members on the bulleted items concerning the proposed TEC field test.

#### **11. Next Steps – Doug Hils & Larry Akens**

Next steps were basically covered during the discussions of the other agenda items.

It was noted that the SDT will receive results-based standards training in Carmel.

## 12. Next Meetings

- a. Tuesday, September 28, 2010 (0800 EDT) through Thursday, September 30, 2010 (1200 EDT) – Carmel, IN, hosted by MISO. Meeting details will be distributed shortly. MISO has set aside a room on Monday afternoon for anyone wanting to participate in the next field test conference call.
- b. Monday, October 25, 2010 (0800 EDT) through Tuesday, October 26, 2010 (1700 EDT) – Philadelphia, PA, hosted by PJM. Bill Herbsleb will be providing details at a later date.
- c. Tuesday, November 30, 2010 (0800 CST) through Thursday, December 2, 2010 (1700 CST) – Austin, TX, hosted by ERCOT. Tuesday is going to be set aside for sub-team tasks. The official SDT meeting will be starting on Wednesday. Details will be provided at a later date.
- d. Conference call and web ex – Wednesday, January 5, 2011 from 1000 – 1400 EST.
- e. Conference call and web ex – Thursday, January 6, 2011 from 1000 – 1400 EST.
- f. Monday, January 24, 2011 (0800 CST) through Tuesday, January 25, 2011 (1700 CST) – Austin, TX

## 13. Action Items and Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during the meeting:

- Doug to write a letter to NERC Compliance to update the list of BA's participating in the field test and thus requiring a waiver. This should be completed by the Carmel meeting.
- Larry will provide a complete revision to BAL-002, addressing the issues and directives associated with the standard for SDT review at the Carmel meeting.
- Ed will build a draft schedule for SDT approval in Carmel based on the inclusion of items 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 in the base project.
- Bob Cummings will obtain the requested IDC data.
- Ed will distribute the TEC field test draft for comment.
- Ed will poll SDT members on the bulleted items concerning the proposed TEC field test.
- Ed will clean up the Response to comments document and distribute it to the SDT for review.

The schedule for this project still needs to be developed.

## 14. Adjourn

The Chairs thanked Xcel for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 1700 MDT on Thursday, September 9, 2010.