

ERAG Management Committee Meeting Minutes

April 18, 2007 (1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.) – Joint with MMWG

In attendance:

ERAG Management Committee and MMWG members. A copy of the attendance sheet will be attached to the final version of the minutes.

1. Introductions and logistics

2. Review proposals in response to database RFP and MMWG recommendation. Provide direction to MMWG for database project.

Mark Kuras provided a status report on the MMWG database proposal. Items discussed with regard to this are indicated:

- The request for the proposals had gone to 20 vendors. Six have responded so far.
- MMWG will evaluate the responses and have a conference call about 3 weeks after all are reviewed by them
- The data base, if adopted, would need to converge with future case-building methods (e.g. Models on Demand).
- NERC standards MOD-010 and MOD-012 contain requirements for case building. **TPL standards will be checked by MMWG to determine if there are any related requirements.**
- MMWG requested ERAG MC direction on how to proceed with base case building.

3. Discuss solution to problems encountered with the 2007 summer base case update process, and how these problems will be corrected for the 2007/08 winter update process. Provide direction, if needed.

The joint groups discussed the problems encountered with the 2007 summer interregional base case development. Some key items include:

- The MMWG data contacts are generally planning representatives and the seasonal case fine tuning work contacts are generally operations planning representatives. There was some miscommunication or lack of communication on some of the items. The AEP contractor had contact with MMWG representatives but in some cases not with the seasonal case representatives.
- There were different PSS/e versions and sub-releases used by those submitting data and along with that there was some incompatibility.
- The Master Tie Line list was not consistent with the tie line data used in some data submissions.

- IDEVs were in a confusing format.

The fine tuning work for the 2007/08 winter interregional seasonal case will be done differently than the 2007 summer. Two possible options will be considered: 1) the fine tuning will be handled like past MEN/VEM efforts where representatives from all the Study forums will meet to resolve case differences and arrive at a final case at the meeting or 2) add operations planning representatives under MMWG and do fine tuning phase of the work under MMWG. The case development work at the final phase would be handed over for the fine tuning at a point in the case development process. The final model would be used for all Steering Committee seasonal studies.

An ad hoc group will be formed consisting of one MMWG member from each of the six regions plus two ERAG MC members. The ad hoc group will consider the two possibilities and decide the best course. A recommendation will be made to MMWG and the ERAG MC. A decision is needed by June as the winter base case development must start then.

4. Review and discuss draft base case release policy for Eastern Interconnection.

MMWG members indicated that a policy must be in place on the release of the MMWG base cases. Often consultants make requests to various entities to try to get base cases. If they are denied by some then they continue to make requests to others to get the cases they want. Mark Kuras pointed out that based on FERC CEII (confidentiality policy) the cases are considered to be critical infrastructure security information and cannot be released to the general public. Cases submitted to FERC through FERC 715 filings are for and can be requested by the public. FERC 715 filing includes a lot of items beyond base cases. Entities can request and obtain this information through FERC. FERC makes use of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) in providing the cases and information. As long as someone has a FOIA docket # they can receive cases/data.

NERC has a confidentiality policy and that is what has been used to this time. Based on this MMWG has a written policy, which allows release of cases to those who are members of the Regions. There is presently no similar ERAG policy for steady state or dynamics cases.

ERAG MC and MMWG agreed that it is acceptable to release base cases to entities who are regional members or are members of NERC committees. **MMWG will prepare a draft base case and data release policy for review by the ERAG MC.**

5. Review and discuss process for 2007 Series case development and how quality of cases will be improved. Provide direction, time, if needed.

The 2007 MMWG process was reviewed. Some major points of the discussion included:

- For this effort the regions were pulled out of the case and reviewed separately and then merged back. The merging was done using the Master Tie Line List. MMWG saw some advantages of running one change at a time.
- The timeliness and accuracy of data submitted for the base case building and case fine tuning efforts should be stressed even more than in past years.
- The use of different platforms (Windows vs. other operating systems) in past case building efforts has created problems and errors.
- Batch IDEV files recently used has a weakness in that it is not analogous to data card input (individual instructions).
- MMWG did a post mortem analysis of the 2007 effort and it was considered to be thorough.

6. Determine invoice/payment process for MMWG costs (NERC wants ERAG to handle this) [see also MC agenda item 4 below]

If a different contractor is used and there is an increase in the costs due to the use of a database then the overall cost may be high. Also, selecting a vendor in response to the RFP will require an entity to sign the contract and the ERAG MC cannot sign because it is not an entity. This issue was not resolved.

7. Discuss NERC staff involvement and involvement of other outside Entities

Contractors may attend MMWG meetings, however they may be asked to leave the meeting for discussion of confidential items. Similarly the MMWG and SDDWG coordinators are contractors and can be requested to leave during discussion of certain topics. The same may apply for NERC staff. NERC presently furnishes the MMWG secretary but it is not clear if that will continue.

There were some other items in which ERAG MC comments were requested:

Other MMWG function items:

- Email Mailing list who will administer for MMWG.
- If data base repository need hosting server.
- Base cases and data host and data exchange if no longer on NERC.
- Web site for MMWG is a major item.
- Anything done need security requirements that are the same as now

The MMWG will discuss these items at the April 19 MMWG meeting and will prepare some suggestions.

8. Other issues

a. MMWG—selection of Vice chair:

Hopefully, sharing of responsibilities can be rotated. **Following the meeting, MMWG will check on which regions that have held the chair before and they will determine a vice-chair.**

b. Late Data-Compliance Policy

There is a procedure presently in place to enforce lateness of parties submitting their data. That is something the predecessor NERC MMWG had developed and used. Modifications have been made to the procedure to change who the violations would be reported to--appropriate regional person instead of NERC organization or Planning Committee representative. In more serious cases it can be reported to the Regional Manager. The groups discussed which NERC standard may address this and MOD-011 and MOD-014 content will be checked. Standard TPL 006 is under a SAR right now and may go to balloting by the end of 2007. to the TPL-006 content addresses data submittal compliance.

c. Other Changes

ERAG MC members provided some overall guidance on how to deal with changes to the MMWG process. If changes are made to improve the process then MMWG should weigh whether they are significant and whether a large amount of resources (time, people, money) are required. If something is considered significant it must be brought to the attention of ERAG MC. The items of less significance can be dealt with by MMWG, independently.

Prepared by:
Paul A. Roman
Draft for Comment minutes issued on May 11, 2007.
Approved June 18, 2007