

Notes

Balancing Authority Controls SDT— Project 2007-05

May 19, 2010 | 11:00 am – 5:00 pm EDT

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, Chairman
- Gerry Beckerle
- Will Franklin
- Doug Hils
- Howard Illian
- Ken McIntyre
- Sydney Niemeyer
- Kris Ruud
- Scott Sells
- Wayne vanLiere
- Andy Rodriguez

c. Approval of Agenda

The drafting team reviewed the Agenda. The team approved the Agenda unanimously.

d. Approval of Meeting Notes

The drafting team deferred approval of the March and April meeting notes until the next meeting.

2. Review of Roadmap

The team briefly reviewed the roadmap and discussed the state of the standards drafting effort.

3. **Discussion DCS Standard and Supporting Standards** — BAL-013, -014, and -015

Andy provided a brief overview of the current drafted BAL-013, BAL-014, and BAL-015.

Regarding BAL-013, the team briefly questioned whether or not it was appropriate for the BACS DT to work on Primary Control, or if this should be moved to the FRSDT. The team tentatively agreed that it should remain with the BACS DT, but be closely coordinated with the FRSDT. The team also questioned if the Generation Owner and Distribution Provider was the right entity – should it be the PSE? The Gen Operator? Also, should we use the word “commit” (as in “entities that commit to provide control must...”) ? Or should we be saying that the BA must decide who has to provide the control? The team generally agreed that the BA should have to qualify the entities in some way. Also, the team wants to re-categorize the criteria for all services by specifying the following characteristics – proportional, continuous, bi-directional, sustainable, and frequency/demand responsive.

The team also noted that the definition of “Secondary Response” seemed to be too restrictive. As written, it implies that it only occurs in response to a frequency deviation... but since AGC is controlled by ACE, it can be driven by Interchange as well. Andy will send a note to Bob Cummings about this.

The team also questioned if the “1-hour” provision in R2 should apply to a resource, or to the portfolio of resources.

Regarding BAL-014, the team will need to think about the percentages in R3 and see if we can identify a logical rationale for picking one.

The team reviewed BAL-015 and made some changes to consolidate R5.

The question of DCS performance “spoofing” through an instantaneous transfer still needs to be considered. This will be added for further discussion on the next meeting’s agenda.

FOLLOW UP: Andy checked with Legal regarding the current “defacto reserve sharing group” language and Legal suggests it would be better to not address this in this fashion. If we can come up with no other alternative, then we should bring it back to legal for further discussion.

4. **Strategy for BAL-005 (AGC), BAL-006 (Inadvertent), and BAL-012 (ACE)**

With regard to BAL-005 and Regulating Reserve, the team discussed what was really needed and concluded that a “risk-mitigation” type standard was really what was required. The BAAL and CPM performance measures really address any kind of post-measure, and because they are being calculated all the time, we don’t really need a pre-measure of Regulating Reserve... but we do need some

sort of standard that ensures entities have a way of calculating the minimum amount of Regulating Reserve and a process for obtaining it.

With regard to BAL-006 and the FERC directive to address large accumulations of inadvertent, the team agrees that it is going to need to justify why there is not a need for what FERC is directing. Howard indicated that he may be able to demonstrate mathematically why FERC's directive is a bad idea.

With regard to BAL-012, the team discussed Maureen's concerns with the standard not being sufficiently "results based." To address this, the team discussed adding a requirement that the information be given to the RC (which would be consistent with IRO-005). The team also suggested rewording Part 1.6 to see if we make it clear that it must be run every 6 seconds (Howard suggested stating that it must be current within two scan rates)

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

July 12,13 – Meeting, St. Paul (half day, full day)

August 3,4 – Meeting, Princeton or Montreal (*full day, full day*)

6. **Adjourn**

The drafting team adjourned at approximately 3:36pm.