

## Notes

### Balancing Authority Controls SDT— Project 2007-05

December 1, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. CST  
December 2, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. CST  
Hilton Chicago O'Hare Airport Hotel  
Chicago, IL

#### 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
- Gerry Beckerle
- David Folk
- Will Franklin
- Doug Hils
- Howard Illian
- Sydney Niemeyer
- Guy Quintin
- Kris Ruud
- Scott Sells
- Wayne vanLiere
- Raymond Vice
- Tom Washburn
- Andy Rodriguez

Howard Illian noted that he would also be representing CERTS.

##### c. Approval of Agenda

The drafting team reviewed the Agenda and approved it unanimously.

##### d. Approval of Meeting Notes

The drafting team reviewed the October and November meeting notes, made minor changes, and approved them unanimously.

**2. Coordination Efforts**

The SDT reviewed the status of the RBCSDT and FRSDT. The RBC has nothing new to report. Andy Rodriguez and Larry Akens reviewed the discussion with Doug Hils regarding BAL-012 and BAL-007. Per the NERC Quality Assurance review, Andy and Larry met with Doug to discuss whether it would be appropriate to move BAL-007 into the work of the BACSDT. Doug did not want to release BAL-007, but will remove their discussion of the ACE equation from BAL-007 such that there is no duplication between standards.

Sidney Niemeyer and Howard Illian provided an update on the FRSDT. The FRSDT is still working to get its data request issued. Initially, they will request the data on a voluntary basis. If this does not work well, NERC will issue a Section 1600 data request. The first goal will be to identify which BAs are providing frequency response; the second goal will be to look at generation and determine why BAs are not providing frequency response equally. Howard believes that NERC should have to remove the 1% bias setting minimum, as there is no reason for it and it is sometimes creating problems (e.g., NPCC stability concerns).

**3. Review of Roadmap**

The team reviewed the roadmap and discussed progress. There was some question from Gerry Beckerle and Tom Washburn as to whether the team really needed an ACE standard or not – can it not just be a definition? The majority of the team generally agreed that you could do this, but this might not be the clearest or best approach. It might not be clear that entities needed to look up the definition of ACE, and they may believe that Control ACE is the same as Reporting ACE. Howard expressed some concern that we may still need to have an Inadvertent standard in order to ensure  $I_{ME}$  is calculated correctly. Gerry suggested this could also be a definition. Howard suggested that we might need to have a standard that deals with dispute resolution for checkouts.

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

The team reviewed the draft BAL-002, and drafted several changes to the standard. The team developed some new ideas about the definition for a Disturbance and a Reportable Disturbance. Howard suggested the idea of drafting VSLs based on the impact to the system (e.g., MW X Bias). Andy was tasked with turning the concepts discussed into a new draft standard.

The team reviewed the Operating Reserves documents that Guy Quintin has been working on. Howard discussed the potential need for a “sliding deadband.” Guy discussed that when it comes to reserves, there may be two kinds of requirements/characteristics – those that apply at the BA level, and those that apply at the unit level. Doug Hils proposed a common convention that we refer to

“positive response” (meaning that entities inject MW in response to a loss of generation) and “negative response” (meaning that entities withdraw MW in response to a loss of load). There was some suggestion that Frequency Response should be assigned on a per resource basis (each generator, each load). The team briefly discussed replacement reserve, and agreed that we did not need to have it in the standard (entities should have a replacement plan, but not be required to have one). The team discussed that AGC is a technology, not a product- but the industry tend to think of AGC as “the only” way to implement secondary control. David Folk reminded folks that as they discuss the role of load in reserves, they need to remember that load has no ramp rate (i.e., can create step changes).

**5. Review of Updated BAL-004**

The SDT reviewed the comments and proposed changes identified during the staff Quality Assurance review. The SDT redrafted the standard to address the comments.

**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 to see if anyone is working on a definition of MSSC.

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

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

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 11:30am on December 2, 2009.