

**ATC/TTC/AFC and CBM/TRM Revisions Standard Drafting Team**

**August 27–29, 2007**

**Meeting Notes**

**1. Administration**

**a. Introduction of Attendees**

The following members and guest were in attendance:

- Larry Middleton, Chair
- Rebecca Berdahl
- Daryn Barker
- Bob Birch
- Shannon Black
- John Burnett
- Ron Carlsen
- DuShaune Carter
- Sedina Eric
- Chuck Falls
- Bill Harm
- Nick Henery
- Ray Kershaw
- Dennis Kimm
- Ross Kovacs
- Laura Lee
- Partha Malvadkar
- Cheryl Mendrala
- Abbey Nulph
- Biagio Pinto
- Narinder Saini
- Nate Schweighart
- Jerry Smith
- Aaron Staley
- Stephen Tran
- Greg van Pelt
- Andy Rodriguez

**b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

Andy Rodriquez reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

**c. Adoption of Agenda**

The agenda was approved unanimously.

**d. Approval of Meeting Notes**

Nick Henery moved that the meeting notes from the August meeting in Portland be approved. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

**2. NERC Staff Update**

**a. SAR Update**

Andy Rodriquez reviewed the status of the Supplemental SAR, which has been submitted back to the Standards Committee for authorization.

**b. Project Schedule**

Andy Rodriquez reviewed the current project schedule and timeline. Based on current status, labor burn rate, and forecast work load, the target posting date of September 1 is infeasible. Andy Rodriquez presented an alternate schedule, which included more time to work on the standard and an additional posting period. This schedule would result in an August delivery. Chuck Falls moved that the schedule be accepted as the new working timeline. The motion passed, 9/2.

**c. Future Meetings**

Andy Rodriquez reviewed the meeting schedule. Following the discussion regarding the new schedule, the following meetings were scheduled, pending verification:

- September 12–14 — 1–5 p.m., 8 a.m.–5 p.m., 8 a.m.–3 p.m. — Houston, TX (NAESB Offices) VERIFIED
- September 25–27 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Atlanta, GA (Southern Company Offices) VERIFIED
- October 9–11 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Washington, DC (NERC Offices)
- November 7–9 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m., 8 a.m.–5 p.m., 8 a.m.–noon — Washington, DC (NERC Offices)
- December 4–6 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Phoenix ,AZ (Salt River Project Offices)
- January 8–10 — 8a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Orlando or Tampa, FL (OUC or FRCC)
- January 22–24 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Houston, TX (NAESB Offices)

- February 5–7 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — New Orleans, LA (Entergy Offices)
- April 22–24 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Atlanta, GA (Southern Company Offices)
- May 6–8 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Charlotte, NC (Duke Energy Offices)
- July 8–10 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Saint Paul, MN (Midwest ISO Offices)
- July 15–17 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. all three days — Seattle, WA (NERC to host at local hotel)

### **3. Meeting Preparation and Discussion**

a. The team reviewed the discussion points provided by FERC, and prepared consensus answers in advance of the afternoon meeting. Presenters were reviewed:

- Larry Middleton would provide a high-level introduction and explain we were looking for guidance.
- Laura Lee would provide an overview of the structure and the potential retirement of FAC-012.
- Nick Henery would provide an overview of MOD-001 and discuss data exchange.
- Ray Kershaw would provide an overview of the CBM work and highlight some of our trouble areas.
- Narinder Saini would discuss TRM, and highlight the transparency aspects.
- Aaron Staley would review the Area Interchange methodology.
- Chuck Falls would review the Rated System path methodology.
- Nate Schweighart would review the Flowgate methodology.

When FERC asked questions, it was agreed that Larry would field the question and answer as best he could, with the option to forward the question to someone else on the group. The group also reviewed the questions that would be asked of FERC.

As a side note, it was questioned if the data exchange needed to include honoring your neighbors CBM and TRM.

### **4. Meeting with FERC Staff**

a. See notes compiled by Ron Carlsen posted separately.

### **5. Review of Meeting with FERC Staff**

The team reviewed the results of the FERC meeting. A straw poll was taken to see whether or not the group needed to move from three standards to one. 15 people said no; 2 said yes; 2 said that either course was acceptable.

The team discussed the “time frame” examples that FERC gave (e.g., hourly assumptions, daily assumptions, weekly assumptions, monthly assumptions). It was agreed that more work would need to be undertaken in this area.

## **6. Team Break-out sessions**

a. The team broke into four sub-teams, and worked independently. The teams were

- MOD-028
- MOD-029
- MOD-030
- Template Design

The template design team worked on a new structure for MOD-028, MOD-029, and MOD-030 that would be consistent across all three standards. The full team reviewed the template. Narinder Saini moved that the team accept the template as the correct structure to move forward. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. Andy Rodriguez was tasked with, at some point in the future, assembling the work of the various sub-teams and reformatting it into the template form.

## **7. NERC NAESB Joint Call**

### **a. Introduction of Attendees**

The following people joined the meeting

- Stephen Bennett
- Laura Kennedy
- Alan Pritchard
- Martin Summe
- J.T. Wood

### **b. NAESB Antitrust Guidelines**

Laura Kennedy read the NAESB Antitrust Guidelines.

### **c. Review of NERC and NAESB work**

The NAESB team presented their draft “postback” catalog, which identifies the various types of post-backs. The NERC team was asked to review the document. A brief discussion of Reserved versus Scheduled CBM occurred; reserved refers to CBM that is being withheld for potential use, whereas scheduled means CBM that was reserved in the past and is now being used by an actual use. A similar discussion occurred with regard to firm TRM (TRM withheld from Firm ATC) and non-firm TRM (TRM withheld from non-firm ATC, which may be less than firm TRM).

The need for the CBM Usage Report was questioned. NAESB already requires tag data for audit purposes, which (assuming CBM schedules are tagged, a point on which the two groups seemed to agree) will cover the usage part. An EEA2 (which is the trigger for using CBM) also requires a report. Perhaps the CBMUR is superfluous.

Some discussion occurred whether CBM is a “firm product” or a margin. Perhaps it is both, and the customer chooses which they want (e.g., they can buy “Guaranteed CBM,” meaning it is there no matter what, or they can buy “Conditional CBM,” meaning they have the right to use it if it isn’t already scheduled.

## **8. Adjourn**