

Ed Skiba

From: Paul Sorenson [Paul.Sorenson@oati.net]
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2008 11:17 AM
To: Ben Li Associates; Ed Skiba; tlrtd_plus@nerc.com
Cc: Marceline.Otondo@aps.com; Marcie Otondo; Wood, James T.
Subject: RE: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

All, note that there are two minor changes being recommended to WEQ-008 NAESB TLR standards to account for the two new products added for conditional curtailment, 6-CF, and use of CBM, 7-CB. These are in the respective CCO (as a submitted formal comment) and CBM (informal comment) recommendations.

Suggested modification to WEQ-008-2.1.7:

008-2.1.7 Priority 6. Network Integration Transmission Service from sources not designated as network resources – NN and Long-term Firm Point-to-Point Transmission Service subject to the Conditional Curtailment Priority Level - CF

Revisions to WEQ-008-2.1.8:

008-2.1.8 Priority 7. Firm Point-to-point Transmission Service - (F), ~~and~~ Network Integration Transmission Service from Designated Resources – (FN), and Capacity Benefit Margin – (CB)

Paul R. Sorenson
Open Access Technology International, Inc.
Phone: 612-360-1633
Email: paul.sorenson@oati.net

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION: This email and any attachment(s) contain confidential and/or proprietary information of Open Access Technology International, Inc. Do not copy or distribute without the prior written consent of OATI. If you are not a named recipient to the message, please notify the sender immediately and do not retain the message in any form, printed or electronic.

From: Ben Li Associates [mailto:ben@benli.ca]
Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2008 3:53 PM
To: 'Ed Skiba'; tlrtd_plus@nerc.com
Cc: Marceline.Otondo@aps.com; 'Marcie Otondo'; Paul Sorenson; 'Wood, James T.'
Subject: RE: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

Ed, thanks.

These changes appear to affect the tagging requirement, notably the specification of a priority 7 assigned to the transmission product. IRO-006 specifies the curtailment requirements according to the assigned transmission priority. As such, I do not see any impact on the standard.

Other TLR SDT members please comment.

7/29/2008

Ben

-----Original Message-----

From: Ed Skiba [mailto:ESkiba@midwestiso.org]

Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2008 4:45 PM

To: tlrtd_plus@nerc.com

Cc: Marceline.Otondo@aps.com; Marcie Otondo; paul.sorenson@oati.net; Wood, James T.

Subject: FW: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

All,

The NAESB Joint ESS/ITS and BPS group working on the 890 ATC/AFC requirements per FERC Order 890 have to develop business practices to Audit the Usage of CBM. In doing so we have been working with the NERC ATCDT to make sure that we are in sync. However, in order to audit CBM usage we are finding that we are crossing over into other areas. On Thursday, the Joint Interchange Scheduling Working Group agreed to some proposed changes to the WEQ-004 (Coordinate Interchange Business Requirements). Please see the attached document for the specific changes. In particular there will be a new Product Code 7-CB on the e-Tags. I've been asked to follow-up with the NERC/NAESB TLR Standards Drafting Team and the NAESB BPS to determine if there are other standards (e.g. WEQ-008 or IRO-006) that may be impacted.

Please review the proposed changes to WEQ-004 and let me know if you think there will be an impact on IRO-006. Any input you can give me by COB on Tuesday will be greatly appreciated. The Joint ESS/ITS and BPS meets on Wednesday.

Jim Busbin – We may want to discuss this item with the BPS when we meet on Tuesday.

Regards,

Ed

From: Harshbarger, Robert [mailto:robert.harshbarger@pse.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2008 2:19 PM

To: Marceline.Otondo@aps.com

Cc: JTWOOD@southernco.com; Paul.Sorenson@oati.net; Ed Skiba; Tom Vandervort; Cory Galik [NAESB]; James.Hansen@Seattle.Gov

Subject: RE: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

Marcie – attached is the JISWG's wording for modification of WEQ-004 to support CBM usage.

Cory – could you have the attached posted on the JISWG's portion of the web site under today's meeting?
Thank you.

Bob Harshbarger

OASIS Trading Manager

Puget Sound Energy

robert.harshbarger@pse.com

425-462-3348 (office)

206-604-3251 (cell)

425-462-3049 (fax)

From: Marceline.Otondo@aps.com [mailto:Marceline.Otondo@aps.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2008 6:54 AM

To: Harshbarger, Robert; James.Hansen@Seattle.Gov

Cc: JTWOOD@southernco.com; Paul.Sorenson@oati.net; ESkiba@midwestiso.org

Subject: FW: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

7/29/2008

Bob and Jim,

The joint BPS and ESS/ITS discussed the proposal described below and believe that the first three bullets address our request. As you know, the joint BPS and ESS/ITS is working on this task (auditing of CBM usage) as part of the NAESB effort to draft and file with FERC business practice standards in support of the NERC ATC-related standards that were directed in FERC's Order 890. This is our last ATC-related standard and it is time sensitive. At our July 30, 2008 joint BPS and ESS/ITS meeting, we hope to complete and vote out for formal comment the CBM auditing standard so that it can go through the 30-day formal comment period, be addressed by the EC, then filed with FERC shortly after the NERC ATC-related standards are filed with FERC. This timeline is dependent upon your finalizing and approving a "CBM in e-Tag" proposal prior to our July 30th meeting.

Because this work is time sensitive and the standard that the joint BPS and ESS/ITS develops will be highly dependent upon your proposal being approved, I would like to ask your preference on how to proceed. I've come up with 2 options:

1. JISWG votes out a recommendation for WEQ-004 (separate from the CBM auditing recommendation) to incorporate the "CBM in e-Tag" requirements, or
2. JISWG finalizes the changes to WEQ-004 to incorporate the "CBM in e-Tag" requirements and forwards those changes to the joint BPS and ESS/ITS for inclusion in the CBM auditing recommendation.

I can see pros and cons to either option and perhaps there are additional options.

Option 1

As co-chairs of JISWG, you may determine that proposed changes to WEQ-004 should come from JISWG and you may also have other changes to WEQ-004 that you would like to include as a single recommendation. Under this option you can expect the EC to take swift action on your recommendation once the 30-day formal comment period has closed. On the down side, JISWG will be in the critical path for completing the 890 requirements which have a FERC mandated deadline. Any delays in completing your recommendation would result in close scrutiny by NAESB management and the Executive Committee. From a process management perspective the EC will have to approve two separate recommendations in order to meet the FERC requirements.

Option 2

Alternatively, you may decide that it is better to include the CBM related changes to WEQ-004 with the joint BPS and ESS/ITS CBM auditing recommendation so the entire set of CBM related changes go through the final comment, EC approval and membership ratification process together. I would also add that the changes the joint BPS and ESS/ITS will be recommending to other WEQ standards will be citing to WEQ-004 which is difficult to do when you don't have a paragraph number. Under this option pressure remains with the BPS and ESS/ITS to complete the 890 time dependent requirements. On the down side, using this approach may take longer to obtain EC approval for other changes to WEQ-004 since they are not on the Order 890 critical path.

Please advise which option you would prefer. There are risks and benefits to each option.

I'd like to close by letting you know the joint subcommittee specifically requested the co-chairs express thanks to you and the JISWG for quickly responding to our request – thank you. We really do appreciate your responding to our request so quickly and developing a proposal that meets the needs expressed in our request.

Marcie

From: Harshbarger, Robert [mailto:robert.harshbarger@pse.com]

Sent: Monday, July 07, 2008 3:07 PM

To: Otondo, Marceline M(F01277); James.Hansen@Seattle.Gov

Cc: paul.sorenson@oati.net; JTWOOD@southernco.com; llee@duke-energy.com; cnorris@electricities.org;

ESkiba@midwestiso.org; jbooe@naesb.org; rmcquade@naesb.org; Andy.Rodriguez@nerc.net; mdesselle@spp.org; keyork@tva.gov

Subject: RE: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

Good afternoon Marcie and others...

A draft table of "CBM in e-Tag" options has been developed from which a preferred option is being considered. Here's the direction we are tending towards:

- Specified transaction type = EMERGENCY
- Explicit listing of the LSE "calling on" the CBM as the transmission customer (PSE in the transmission segment)
- A transmission product code of "7-CB" for the segment(s) associated with the CBM
- Use of TP assigned transmission contract number/identifier

We believe this will provide good tracking for the use of CBM by the LSE and will give the TP the ability to provide for additional tag validations using the TP assigned contract number/identifier. Possible validations could be:

- Tag POR must represent interface that has CBM set-aside for import
- Tag POD must be an internal delivery point, i.e., no wheel-throughs on CBM
- CBM contract number/identifier may only be used in last physical transmission path – TP delivery to load within LCA
- Sum of all tagged transactions at POR using CBM contract number/identifier must be less than CBM set-aside

I hope this preview is helpful for your meetings the next couple of days. Please feel to provide feedback.

The draft table, preferred approach, and any feedback will be discussed in detail at the next JISWG meeting July 23rd and 24th in Halifax, NS. You all welcome to attend.

Bob Harshbarger, Co-Chair JISWG, and on behalf of *Jim Hansen*, Other-Chair JISWG

-----Original Message-----

From: Marceline.Otondo@aps.com [mailto:Marceline.Otondo@aps.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2008 3:46 PM

To: James.Hansen@Seattle.Gov

Cc: paul.sorenson@oati.net; JTWOOD@southernco.com; llee@duke-energy.com;

cnorris@electricities.org; ESkiba@midwestiso.org; jbooe@naesb.org;

rmcquade@naesb.org; Andy.Rodriguez@nerc.net; Harshbarger, Robert;

mdesselle@spp.org; keyork@tva.gov

Subject: RE: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

Jim,

Thanks. There are two issues for which we need help from the JISWG. Please remember that we are trying to address the 2008 Annual Plan item 2.b.iii.2, "Business practice standards that include an OASIS mechanism to "allow for auditing of CBM usage."

First, we need to have an identifier added to the tag to indicate that the tag is for CBM. We don't know whether there is an existing field in the tag that can be used, by adding another code value, or whether a new field has to be added. The key is that the data element can be included in the query parameters in the scheduledetail template; we would not want to have the data in a free form text field. The Joint ESS/ITS and

BPS subcommittee does not want to specify which solution the JISWG should implement (code value in existing element or new element). We think that is best left to JISWG to decide. Based on the JISWG decision we can determine what changes, if any, we need to make to scheduledetail.

Second, we need to know if there are any changes required to the NAESB Coordinated Interchange Business Practice (WEQ-004), based on the decision on the first issue.

Also, the Joint ESS/ITS & BPS made a determination not to write standards to include a new transmission product nor to require a TSR be submitted (therefore, no AREF). The Joint ESS/ITS & BPS determined that the usage of CMB could be audited by querying the scheduledetail template. However, to do this, the tag must have an indication that it is CBM being scheduled (the request we're making to JISWG) and that indication of CBM usage must get into scheduledetail as a query-able field (work the Joint ESS/ITS & BPS will do after JISWG informs us of the decision).

The Joint ESS/ITS & BPS meets again on July 8th and 9th. It would be great if we could have an answer for this meeting. If you can't address it by then, we definitely will need the answer by the time you wrap up the JISWG meetings July 23-24.

Hopefully, this is enough information for you to proceed with responding to our request. However, if it is not, we can schedule a conference call with the co-chairs of the Joint ESS/ITS & BPS (Ed Skiba, JT Wood, Paul Sorenson and me) and members of the JISWG to discuss further. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to schedule something. My phone number is 602-250-4566.

Marcie

-----Original Message-----

From: James Hansen [mailto:James.Hansen@Seattle.Gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2008 2:50 PM
To: Laura Lee; cnorris@electricities.org; Ed Skiba; Jonathan Booe; Rae Mcquade; Andy Rodriguez; Robert Harshbarger; mdesselle@spp.org; Katherine E York
Cc: Otondo, Marceline M(F01277); paul.sorenson@oati.net; JTWOOD@southernco.com
Subject: RE: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item2.b.iii.2

JISWGers are pretty easy going so just tell us the problem and the target completion date and we'll get on it.

We have a meeting coming up 7/23-24 but we could address it before then if necessary.

Cheers,

Jim

>>> "Rae Mcquade" <rmcquade@naesb.org> 6/19/2008 2:22:52 PM >>>
Ed - thank you for bringing this to our attention. As the subcommittee to which this development effort was assigned, the subcommittee

leadership (you) have full authority to contact and work with other subcommittees to complete the effort. Clearly not all standards development can be completed from one group, so the group to which it is assigned typically works with the others that are needed to bring the standards to a full development. Let us know if you or the JISWG leadership anticipates any delays as this is related to Order No. 890 which has a hard date set by the FERC. Thanks, Rae

Rae McQuade, President, NAESB
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350, Houston, Texas 77002 713-356-0060 (phone),
713-356-0067 (fax),
281-830-7406 (cell), www.naesb.org <<http://www.naesb.org/>> (web)

From: Ed Skiba [mailto:ESkiba@midwestiso.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2008 3:09 PM
To: Rae McQuade; Andy Rodriguez; York, Katherine E;
cnorris@electricities.org; Lee, Laura; Robert Harshbarger; James Hansen;
Booe, Jonathan
Cc: JTWOOD@southernco.com; Marceline.Otondo@aps.com;
paul.sorenson@oati.net
Subject: JISWG Help Needed on Annual Plan Item WEQ Annual Plan Item
2.b.iii.2

All,

The Co-Chairs of the Joint ESS/ITS and BPS need a little help out on completing its Annual Plan Item 2.b.iii.2, "Business practice standards that include an OASIS mechanism to "allow for auditing of CBM usage.'" The Joint Subcommittee identified after much deliberation that the audit mechanism could be done through the OASIS scheduledetail. However, in order to meet this FERC Order 890 requirement something needs to be included in the tag in the e-tagging system to identify the tag as being CBM. For this annual plan item, our scope document from yesterday states:

Conclusions: The Joint BPS-ESS-ITS work scope will include:

- * Requesting (of JISWG) that something be added to the e-tag specifications to identify usage of CBM (should verify that the NERC team hasn't already taken care of this and perhaps jointly make the request to JISWG),
- * Ensure that the identifier added by JISWG is included in the query parameters scheduledetail template,
- * Ensure that any changes to the e-tag spec will not impact other NAESB Business Practice Standards

The co-chairs do not understand the protocol for requesting the JISWG to

work on this item, nor do we know if the NERC ATCDT has also requested something similar for JISWG. We were thinking the NERC ATCDT may need this information on the tag as well to meet "MOD-004 R.12.1 The CBM is available." What is the process for requesting support from JISWG and having an answer on how CBM would be identified in the tag (new field or a specific value to existing field). In looking at the organization structure it looks like the JISWG reports up through the ESS/ITS and they could direct the JISWG to complete this work. Then looking at the Mission Statement for the JISWG it appears that the JISWG takes their direction from the Executive Committee. From another perspective one might think this needs to be discussed as a joint (NERC/NAESB) development issue and we need to invoke the joint development process.

Needless to say, we're not sure what path we need to follow to request/get changes made to tags so they can be identified as CBM. However, we are sure that the Joint ESS/ITS and BPS cannot finalize the 890 CBM recommendation until we have a decision from JISWG on how a tag can be identified as CBM. If the decision is to add a new field we'll have to make a change to the scheduledetail template. If the decision is to add a code value to an existing field we'll need to add that information. Any direction you can provide on how to get things started so these questions are resolved quickly would be most appreciated.

Thanks,

Ed Skiba Tech. Mgr.
Standards Compliance & Strategy
Midwest ISO
P.O. 4202
Carmel, IN 46082-4202
Phone: 317-249-5377
Email: ESkiba@MidwestISO.org

Email Firewall made the following annotations

NOTICE ---

This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain confidential, privileged or proprietary information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original and any copy or printout. Unintended recipients are prohibited from making any other use of this e-mail. Although we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this e-mail, we accept no liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this e-mail or attachments, or for any delay or errors or omissions in the contents which result from e-mail transmission.

Email Firewall made the following annotations

--- NOTICE ---

This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain confidential, privileged or

proprietary information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original and any copy or printout. Unintended recipients are prohibited from making any other use of this e-mail. Although we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this e-mail, we accept no liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this e-mail or attachments, or for any delay or errors or omissions in the contents which result from e-mail transmission.

Email Firewall made the following annotations

--- NOTICE ---

This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain confidential, privileged or proprietary information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original and any copy or printout. Unintended recipients are prohibited from making any other use of this e-mail. Although we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this e-mail, we accept no liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this e-mail or attachments, or for any delay or errors or omissions in the contents which result from e-mail transmission.
