

**ERAG Management Committee  
Conference Call  
June 18, 2007  
10:00 a.m. ET (9:00 a.m. Central)**

Call-In Number: **866-861-5236**  
Conference Code: **1778795610**

**Notes**

**1. Approve the April 2007 meeting minutes**

The minutes from the April 18-19 ERAG MC/Joint and ERAG MC meetings were reviewed and approved. **Paul Roman will e-mail the final versions to the ERAG Management Committee (MC).**

**2. Discuss and Determine Direction for MMWG Database Proposal – Mark Kuras to lead the discussion**

Mark Kuras summarized the MMWG review of the proposals:

- There were five valid proposals, but one of the proposals was quickly withdrawn and the remaining four evaluated by the MMWG were: AREVA, Commonwealth Associates Inc., Power Tech, and Siemens/PTI.
- The AREVA and Commonwealth Associates Inc. proposals were reviewed by MMWG, but quickly eliminated because of deficiencies compared to the other two.
- The Powertech proposal was judged to be better than the PTI proposal because of: 1) lower cost, 2) previous MMWG experience with Powertech for SDDWG has been good 3) previous experience with PTI has not always been good, and 4) the Powertech proposal is more flexible; that is, the MMWG work drives the product rather than an established product driving the MMWG work.
- The Powertech proposal calls for two phases. The Phase 1 application is local on machines and on sites. Phase 2 will be one data base with web interface access.

Database Proposal questions, comments and discussion items:

- Paul Roman: the Powertech proposal is written in a highly technical style and does not address the specific steps in the MMWG work that it would be used to improve. This makes it hard to use to determine if it would provide improvement. It was indicated that the RFP had addressed the specific MMWG items that would be improved. The RFP will be reviewed to determine this. **Mark Kuras will provide a summary list of the benefits to the MMWG process that are anticipated through the use of the Database. ERAG MC members who are interested can review the**

- RFP points and send their questions to Mark Kuras.** Any questions should be sent to the ERAG MC mailing list so all are informed.
- The all-inclusive cost quote for the Phase 1 portion of the proposal from Powertech is \$100,000. It is understood that this would cover the needs for the annual power flow building process and that would include the seasonal base case as well.
  - Vince Ordax: There is no annual maintenance charge for time and materials indicated in the Proposal. Does this leave the annual charge open-ended? —It was indicated that the SDDWG has had a similar arrangement with Powertech and annual maintenance fees or other miscellaneous costs have not been charged.
  - Jeff Mitchell had several questions on the Proposal content:
    - 1) Will the Database program accept IDEVs? —No, it will accept raw data files. The IDEV formats present difficulty and use of raw data is more flexible.
    - 2) Can a tie line data base using ACCESS previously developed and fine-tuned by ECAR be incorporated into the Database software? —It likely can be.
    - 3) Are the two sets of ratings that can be handled summer and winter ratings? Yes. Dynamic ratings will also be accommodated in the Database.
    - 4) How many simultaneous loads can be allowed at a single bus? —Expect that this will be a large enough number to exceed the number of possible base cases (above 15).
    - 5) The power flow that is callable from the Database is based on the Powertech program. Will this require users to buy the Powertech PSAT? —It is assumed that the working of this is internal to the Database software and no additional software would be required by users. **Mark Kuras will check with Powertech on this point.**
    - The Common Information Model (CIM) is being used as part of the Phase 1 design. Is this really needed in Phase 1 or can it be delayed? —This is just a data format used and should not impact users.
    - Will the Database have compatibility with the PTI Models on Demand (MOD) software? —Interface used will be through raw data files so there should be no problem with sending or receiving data.
  - John Odom raised the concern that with the arrival of Models on Demand there was uncertainty, as many users were evaluating whether to change the power flow program they use and are determining whether to go with MOD. Based on that it may not be a good time to commit to the Database and it is better to wait until more users decide what to do. Some Regions are going with MOD and others are not.
  - It was pointed out that a major benefit with the Database is that once a change is made it will be in place for all 12 MMWG base cases. The same IDEV file will not need to be used repeatedly. **ERAG MC members who have any questions on the Database proposal should send their questions to Mark Kuras and Harvey Scribner. Any that need to go to Powertech will be forwarded by Mark.**
  - The intention is to make a decision on the Database proposal at the August 9-10 ERAG MC meeting.

- The payment process to use if a Database is purchased was discussed:
  - There are still unresolved issues, such as who would sign contracts or how legal support would be obtained for ERAG matters. NERC still has money allocated in their budget for 2007 for MMWG but that would not apply toward the purchase of database software. At the April 18-19 meetings it was proposed that one of the ERAG MC regions volunteer to sign a contract and then collect the funds from the others to make the payment. No one has yet volunteered for this. **Jeff Mitchell will contact the Regional Managers to determine if one Region is willing to volunteer for this task.** The alternative would be for Powertech to bill all 6 regions by allotted cost, but Powertech is not likely to agree to that. Powertech has not yet been contacted on the possibility of this request. **Jeff Mitchell will check with Tim Gallagher to get a legal interpretation of the ERAG Agreement and how that applies for signing a contract and purchasing the Database software.**

### 3. **Agenda for August 9-10 ERAG MC meeting**

Topics for the agenda of the meeting were proposed:

- Decision on Database
- ERAG MC Handbook
- ERAG MC web site, access to web site, password for web site
- Posting of reports (public, private, where, etc.)
- Need for near-term and long-term studies to satisfy NERC Standards. What is required by regions, by study forums, by ERAG.
- Contracts and payment mechanism
- Status of 2007/08 Winter Study Forum progress
- Status of MMWG 2007 series progress

Each of the study forum steering committee chairs will be requested to attend the August 9-10 ERAG MC meeting.

### 4. **Future Conference Call and Meeting Schedule**

- a. August 9-10, 2007 (noon to noon) – Chattanooga, TN - coincides with SERC August 11 pig roast
- b. October 29-30, 2007 (noon to noon) – RFC office, Fairlawn, OH
- c. Other meetings/calls needed? —It was agreed no conference calls were needed prior to the August 9-10 meeting.

Prepared by Paul A. Roman  
Draft notes issued on July 19, 2007  
Approved August 9, 2007