

Conference Call Notes for Project 2010-14 Balancing Authority Reliability-based Controls (BARC)

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the call to order at 1000 EST on Wednesday, January 5, 2011. The call was adjourned for the day at 1400 EST and resumed on Thursday, January 6, 2011 at 1000 EST. Call participants were:

Larry Akens, Co-Chair	Gerry Beckerle	Dave Folk
Bill Herbsleb	Howard Illian	David Lemmons
Clyde Loutan	LeRoy Patterson	Mike Potishnak
Mark Proserpi-Porta	Guy Quintan	Jerry Rust
Kris Ruud	Tom Siegrist	Glenn Stephens
Steve Swan	Don Badley, Observer	Robert Blohm, Observer
Carlos Martinez, Observer	Sydney Niemeyer, Observer	Dave Richard, Observer
Wayne Van Liere, Observer	Leslie Saponaro, FERC Observer	Scott Sells, FERC Observer
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

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

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines or conference call warning.

c. Agenda and Objectives — Larry Akens

No changes were made to the agenda. The objective of the call was to monitor progress on the various draft standards efforts.

2. Review of BAL-001 Straw Man – Tom Siegrist

Tom is taking over this effort from Doug Hils who created the original straw man.

Several questions were raised by the SDT while reviewing the draft:

- Why were the Reliability Coordinator requirements removed?
 - It is felt that they are no longer needed in BAL since RC requirements in this area are now covered in other standards.
- Is Requirement R4 redundant with Requirement R1?
 - Possibly – if an entity is meeting CPS1 as per Requirement R1, then it has, by definition, sufficient reserves. However, this requirement is tied to an Order 693 directive (see paragraph 396) so it can't be just arbitrarily deleted.
- Some discomfort was expressed with the basic frequency model used as the basis for this standard. However, no alternative was offered. A detailed discussion of the frequency model was suggested for the next meeting but the SDT felt that such a discussion was not necessary. The general feeling is that the existing frequency model is sufficient.
- A question was raised on the 30 minute time limit in Requirement R2.
- 30 minutes is associated more with relieving transmission constraints and will be vetted through the industry comment period. The SDT saw no reason to change it at this time.
- Is Requirement R3 really a 'how' since it mirrors Requirements R1 & R2?
 - The sub-team will take this into consideration in their next review.

Tom will convene a conference call for his sub-team and any other interested SDT members on Tuesday, January 18, 2011 at 1000 EST. Call details will be distributed. The goal of the call is to revise BAL-001 based on comments received and present an updated version in Austin. This will include a list of the issues with proposed resolutions.

AI – The BAL-001 sub-team will present a revised standard in Austin including the proposed resolutions of the outstanding issues.

3. Review of Continent-wide Contingency Reserve Policy for BAL-002 – Jerry Rust

The sub-team asked for more time to absorb comments received. The goal is to have a revised white paper based on the comments no later than January 17, 2011. The sub-team also plans to have a BAL-002 straw man based on the white paper for review in Austin.

Section C of the white paper needs to be coordinated with Bill Herbsleb.

The sub-team was asked to consider including a description of what makes up Operating reserve in the white paper.

A question was raised as to whether the white paper effort should continue. The SDT believes that there is value in the white paper for educational and background purposes and stated that the effort should continue.

An SDT can't write policy documents. The proposed response to FERC will be through the presentation of a coordinated set of standards addressing the issues on a continent-wide, consistent basis. The white paper would be for reference only within the SDT although it could be forwarded to the NERC Operating Committee for possible adoption as a guideline.

AI - The BAL-002 sub-team will present a revised standard in Austin including the proposed resolutions of the outstanding issues and an updated white paper.

4. Review of BAL-005 Straw Man – Guy Quintin

The SDT performed a detailed review of the straw man:

- It was noted that AGC has been changed to ARC (Automatic Resource Control) as per Order 693.
- Requirement R1 is probably unnecessary and could be deleted with the sub-requirements promoted to full requirements. However, how do you measure them? One suggestion was to simply provide your registration credentials. This raised the possibility of just deleting the sub-requirements as well since it was a registration issue. Since registration can't be mandated, it was decided to keep the sub-requirements with re-wording to provide additional clarity.
- Requirement R2 was moved to BAL-001.
- Requirements R3, R4, and R5 were unchanged.
- The calculation of reporting ACE was brought in from the BACSDT efforts on BAL-012.
 - Note – Other standards will need to be checked for ACE vs. Reporting ACE terminology appropriateness.
- The ACE equation was brought over from BAL-001.
- Requirement R7 dealing with minimizing ACE was added. There are really two thoughts here and the requirement should probably be split although the second thought is really addressing a process and may not be needed.
 - It was decided to delete the 2nd sentence and change the wording in the first sentence to deal with calculating ACE.
 - Since this was an existing requirement, a strong technical justification for deleting part of it will need to be presented.
 - 'Continuously' has measurement problems and will need to be revised.

- ‘Adversely impacts’ was deleted.
- Requirement R8 was deleted. Since this was an existing requirement, a strong technical justification for deleting it will need to be presented.
- Requirement R9 was deleted as it is now dealt with in Guy’s first new requirement.
- Requirement R9.1 should say ‘shall’ instead of ‘may’.
- Requirements R10 to R13 were deleted as they are now covered in Guy’s two new requirements.
- Requirement R14 – delete the first sentence. Since this was an existing requirement, a strong technical justification for deleting part of it will need to be presented.
- Requirements R15 – R17 are re-written in Guy’s two new requirements and can be deleted.
- First new requirement:
 - Add pseudo-ties to 1.3.
 - 1.4 is somewhat vague and difficult to measure. It may only be an issue for non-digital meters.
 - What is a reliable reference for 1.5 and how do you do the comparison?
- Second new requirement:
 - In 2.1, are ‘non-filtered’ and ‘anti-aliasing’ widely understood terms or will they lead to confusion? Howard distributed a white paper on anti-aliasing that may shed some light on this.
 - 2.4 needs to go into more detail for situations where the EMS is unavailable. However, it may be redundant with 1.6 and 1.7.
 - 2.6 should include pseudo-ties and in general, where ties are discussed, pseudo-ties should be included.
 - The SDT debated substituting N_{me} (net meter error) for I_{me} (Interchange meter error) but no resolution was reached.

AI - The BAL-005 sub-team will present a revised standard in Austin including the proposed resolutions of the outstanding issues.

5. Next Steps – Larry Akens

All of the sub-teams including those working on BAL-006 and BAL-007 are expected to present straw men for review in Austin. Larry will reach out to Doug Hils who had the original action item to create the draft for BAL-007.

AI – Larry to contact Doug on the straw man for BAL-007.

6. Next Meetings

- a. Monday, January 24, 2011 (0800 CST) through Tuesday, January 25, 2011 (1700 CST) – Austin, TX

The meeting information has been distributed.

- b. Conference call and web ex – Wednesday, February 16, 2011 from 1000 EST to 1400 EST
- c. Conference call and web ex - every Thursday starting March 3rd from 1000 EPT until 1400 EPT (except for March 17th and April 7th) until April 28th
- d. Face-to-face meeting on Tuesday, March 15, 2011 through Thursday, March 17, 2011 in Charlotte, NC

Some conflicts with this meeting date have arisen and the dates should be reviewed in Austin.

AI – The SDT should review the proposed March meeting dates in Austin.

- e. Face-to-face meeting on Tuesday, April 5, 2011 through Thursday, April 7, 2011 in Orlando, FL

7. Action Items and Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during the conference call:

- The BAL-001 sub-team will present a revised standard in Austin including the proposed resolutions of the outstanding issues.
- The BAL-002 sub-team will present a revised standard in Austin including the proposed resolutions of the outstanding issues and an updated white paper.
- The BAL-005 sub-team will present a revised standard in Austin including the proposed resolutions of the outstanding issues.
- Larry to contact Doug on the straw man for BAL-007.
- The SDT should review the proposed March meeting dates in Austin.

The project is presently on schedule.

8. Adjourn

The call was adjourned at 1130 EST on Thursday, January 06, 2011.