

FOR AUGUST 5th STANDARDS CONFERENCE CALL

ISSUES NOT YET RESOLVED IN OUR GROUP:

- 1) “Minimum” language - explicitly outlining the concept.
 - Proposed Language
 - where to put it in the Standards; Principles or Standards sections
- 2) Language capturing the bumping constraint concept clearly and accurately, but without becoming a policy-sounding mandate. Review received proposals.
- 3) What numbers to assign to the principles, keeping with existing standards nomenclature.
<1.1.something>

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED BY LARGER GROUP:

- 1) “Should all intraday’s processed outside the timeline be done on a no-bump basis” - the issue here is whether or not such a decision would be considered a policy decision (of the kind we’ve been trying to avoid making) or a needed clarification similar to the constraints already imposed on bumping in the compromise model. (Chair issue D)
- 2) “Impact to Capacity Release” - this is still unresolved regarding the timeline and other issues. (Chair issue C)
- 3) Date Range versus Rollover concept - decision between the two methods lies in the larger group, including a discussion of the merits. (Chair issue E) SEE PROPOSALS BELOW
- 4) Batch Process handling; Simultaneous vs. Time Stamp - the issue here is whether or not a mandate either way would represent a policy decision similar to the one being avoided about bumping (it refers to character of service), or if it would a fundamental necessity to standardization. (Chair issue F)

PROPOSALS FOR RESOLUTION OF ISSUES FOR LARGER GROUP:

- 1) Regarding the date range/rollover issue, our group will offer our date range semantics to the larger group. (Chair issue E).

FYI - CONCLUSIONS TO BE PRESENTED TO LARGER GROUP:

- 1) All Standards modifications as seen in DRAFT 4, including recommended strikes and new language.
- 2) Approach to new standards should be: Keep existing standards and modify, add or delete from them as necessary to portray the compromise model concepts. Do not delete current intraday standards en masse in favor of a giant new one. (Chair issues A & B)
- 3) Continuous interfaces with batch how? Generally, continuous pipes will hold the grid-bound noms until synchronizaiton time. In the meantime, they can continue to process on-system nom continuously. (Chair issue F)
- 4) TSP Bumping election proposal - TSP’s make election in compliance filings. This concept should be explicitly covered in Standards language. However, the exact language of this concept is an outstanding issue (Chair issue G).