NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350 • Houston, Texas 77002 · **Phone:** (713) 356-0060 · **Fax:** (713) 356-0067
email: naesb@aol.com · **Web Site Address:** www.naesb.org

August 29, 2003
via email

TO: Mr. John Simonelli

Chairman, ESC
ISO New England, Inc.
Manager- Tariffs, Schedules and OASIS
One Sullivan Road
Holyoke, MA 01040-2841

Members of the Electronic Scheduling Collaborative

RE: : Creation of New NAESB WEQ Subcommittee – Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee (ES)

Dear John and members of the Electronic Scheduling Collaborative,

Thank you for the invitation to attend and present NAESB to the joint ESC/OSC meeting held in Vancouver this week. As you may already know, at the recent Executive Committee meeting in Philadelphia, the Wholesale Electric Quadrant (WEQ) Executive Committee (EC) created an Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee (ES).

While there are no plans to populate this subcommittee immediately, it was created for much the same purpose as the WEQ Information Technology Subcommittee (WEQ IT). The WEQ IT subcommittee was created to provide a structure for the ongoing development and enhancement of the technical implementation of business practice components of the OASIS standards – basically the charge of the OSC. The WEQ ES subcommittee was created to provide a potential structure within the NAESB organization and process for developing and maintaining business practice standards related to electronic scheduling.

Should the Electronic Scheduling Collaborative determine that it would transition to the WEQ ES for the purpose of developing and maintaining business practice standards related to electronic scheduling, we would welcome such a direction. We would follow a similar procedure outlined for the WEQ IT subcommittee, with an announcement of a meeting, and request for comments on a list of issues for consideration by the WEQ ES subcommittee, which would become the topic of the first meeting.

Please let us know how you would like us to proceed. At this time the subcommittee is inactive, but could readily be started up to allow ESC members and tasks to continue while using the NAESB organization's process, should that be an attractive option for you and the ESC members.

Best Regards,

Rae McQuade

Rae McQuade

Attachment: NAESB Invitation to the WEQ IT Subcommittee

cc: Monroe Landrum and Alan Johnson, co-chairs of the WEQ IT Subcommittee
Michael Desselle, Vice Chairman WEQ, NAESB Board of Directors
Steve Corneli, WEQ Executive Committee Chair
Steve Cobb, WEQ Executive Subcommittee Vice Chair
Gordon Scott, NERC

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350 • Houston, Texas 77002 · **Phone:** (713) 356-0060 · **Fax:** (713) 356-0067
email: naesb@aol.com · **Web Site Address:** www.naesb.org

August 29, 2003
via email

To: NAESB WEQ Members, Trade Associations, OSC and ESC members and Posting for Interested Industry Participants

From: Rae McQuade

Re: Creation of New WEQ Subcommittee – Information Technology (IT)

At the recent Executive Committee meeting in Philadelphia, the Wholesale Electric Quadrant (WEQ) Executive Committee (EC) created an Information Technology Subcommittee (IT) to address OASIS 1A issues as had been identified and defined by the OASIS Standards Collaborative (OSC), and the technical implementation of business practice components of the new OASIS II, in addition to other standards development activities that may be assigned to it by the WEQ EC. To provide continuity in leadership, we were fortunate to have Monroe Landrum, the current chair of the OSC, with Alan Johnson of our Executive Committee agree to co-chair the IT subcommittee.

We would urge you to join this subcommittee if you have interest in the topics by simply registering for the email distribution list for the WEQ IT subcommittee. Membership in NAESB is not a requirement. For this subcommittee to have the level of success experienced by the OSC and to be efficient in developing standards to support OASIS, we hope that many of the existing OSC members choose to join the WEQ IT subcommittee.

To register, simply, go to NAESB's website at www.naesb.org, and select the Email Subscription option in the lower left hand of the page which will walk you through the process of being added to the distribution list of committees and subcommittees of your choice. One of the listed subcommittees will be the WEQ Information Technology subcommittee. By selecting this subcommittee, as well as any other committee that you may be interested in following, you will be adding your name to those particular distribution lists. By indicating your preference to be on the WEQ Information Technology subcommittee distribution list, you will start to receive invitations, agendas, meeting minutes and other associated documents.

To provide information on possible work items for this subcommittee and levels of priority for those work items, we would ask you to forward written comments on the attached list to the NAESB office (Veronica Thomason at naesb@aol.com, 713-356-0060). The attached list was prepared by the OSC and will serve as a strong foundation for the immediate work of the IT Subcommittee. Should you have specific comments on priorities, additional information of the items, or new items to add, please forward that information in your comments by September 26. Your comments will be posted on the NAESB web site as they are received.

The first meeting of the IT subcommittee will be in Phoenix in conjunction with the NAESB WEQ EC meeting. The WEQ EC meeting in scheduled for October 7 from 9 am to 4 pm, and the WEQ IT Subcommittee will meet from 9 am to 1 pm on the following day. The focus of the first WEQ IT meeting will be an introduction to the subcommittee, a review of the issues proposed for the group to address and the preparation of the subcommittee workplan. The WEQ IT is also asked to attend the WEQ EC meeting on October 7 as the topic of the IT Subcommittee will be on its afternoon agenda. We hope you can attend, but if you are unable, you may participate by conference call. More information on this meeting will be out shortly.

NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY STANDARDS BOARD
1301 Fannin, Suite 2350 • Houston, Texas 77002 · **Phone:** (713) 356-0060 · **Fax:** (713) 356-0067
email: naesb@aol.com · **Web Site Address:** www.naesb.org

Best Regards,

Rae McQuade

Rae McQuade
Executive Director and COO, NAESB

cc: Monroe Landrum and Alan Johnson, co-chairs of the WEQ IT Subcommittee
Steve Corneli, WEQ Executive Committee Chair
Steve Cobb, WEQ Executive Subcommittee Vice Chair
Michael Desselle, vice-chair Board of Directors, representing the WEQ
Gordon Scott, NERC

OASIS STANDARDS COLLABORATIVE

Princeton Forrestal Village, 116-390 Village Boulevard, Princeton, New Jersey 08540-5731

July 30, 2003

TO: OASIS USERS AND VENDORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

OASIS 1A Enhancements and Clarifications

The OASIS Scheduling Collaborative (OSC) believes it is absolutely essential to keep the OASIS Standards and Communications Protocol (S&CP) current and ready to meet the industry's evolving needs. The OSC will provide a list of potential OASIS 1A enhancements to NAESB and other appropriate entities.

The OSC needs your help to prepare a comprehensive standards request to NAESB and is soliciting the industry for enhancements, which would improve efficiencies or clarify business practices in the current OASIS S&CP. The OSC will submit the recommendations for potential enhancements to NAESB or other organizations as appropriate.

I have attached a list of the types of enhancements and clarifications that the OSC is considering. Please submit your recommendations, with a detailed description of each item **by August 22, 2003** to Barbara Bogenrief (mailto:Barbara.Bogenrief@nerc.net). Include your name, contact numbers, and email address. You may also submit your recommendations directly to NAESB (mailto:naesb@aol.com).

Sincerely,

Monroe J. Landrum, Jr.

Monroe J. Landrum, Jr.
Chairman, OASIS Standards Collaborative

MJL:bsb
Attachment

cc: OASIS Registry
North American Energy Standards Board
Electronic Scheduling Collaborative
OASIS Standards Collaborative

Phone 609-452-8060 ■ Fax 609-452-9550

Attachment A

OASIS IA Issues

This document has been created by the OSC to provide the industry with a description of issues related to the current implementation of OASIS. Many of these issues are documented in the form of a question that should be answered by the appropriate group(s). The OSC has categorized the issues (See []). The issues are in no particular order.

1. Additional Standardization in OASIS Phase 1A

Should additional standards be written for OASIS 1A while beginning OASIS Phase II initiatives? [General]

2. GUI Issue/Navigation

Over the years there has been debate over the standardization of the HTML interface to OASIS. HTML "look & feel" requirements were intentionally left out of the S&CP.

The overwhelming majority of the OASIS How Working Group opposed the standardization of the HTML interface to OASIS. The reality is that, with the standardization of the CSV templates across OASIS nodes, vendors have the ability to provide a single interface to all OASIS nodes.

The GUI issue may have deeper roots in customer complaints and "free" OASIS usage. In other words, users of OASIS want a single "look & feel" and they want it at no cost.

If standards were made concerning the HTML interface to OASIS, how would they be policed? What would be the scope of these standards? Would providers have the ability to offer a standard interface as well as an enhanced interface? [General]

3. Output Formats

Should additional output formats, such as XML, be added to the S&CP? [Technical, Specification Change]

4. INFO.HTM

The posting of information in the INFO.HTM file is inconsistent. The availability of the file across providers is also inconsistent.

Should additional standards be written to clarify the information and design of INFO.HTM? How should non-compliance be monitored? [Clarification]

5. Posting of Schedules

There is a need for compliance on the use of the OASIS template "scheduledetail" for queries and responses associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.1). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to an individual schedule. There is a tendency to use the tag for this information; however, the OASIS data is currently the required source for audit information associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions. [Compliance]

6. TLR & Curtailment Posting

There is a need for compliance on use of the OASIS template "security" for queries and responses associated with security events such as curtailments or TLR's (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.2). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to the event, such as facilities involved, start time of the event, etc. Currently, the NERC website provides a central repository for such information associated with the Eastern Interconnection. There is a need to add Western Interconnection information to this repository. [Compliance]

7. Posting of Advertisements

Should the posting of related and/or unrelated advertisements be allowed on OASIS nodes? [Clarification]

8. Upgrade Planning & Progression

Should OASIS changes be incremental? Who determines if a modification is mandatory or voluntary or both? If a modification is voluntary, how can compliance be monitored? [General]

9. Responsibility Determination

Who is responsible for the categorization of issues? For example, given an issue, who determines if it is an implementation issue, a compliance issue, or a technical issue? [General]

10. Redirect of Transmission Service

Using OASIS to process and record redirects of transmission service is a difficult task. There are many issues related to the redirect and resale functionality, but most are caused by provider business rules or vendor design choices.

The primary issue concerns redirects of transmission service. The current OASIS standard does not facilitate primary provider approval of redirected transmission when that redirect is using resold (reassigned) transmission service. When transmission rights are resold to another customer, the customer on the original request is the seller on the resale request. In this case, the primary provider responsible for administering ATC no longer has approval rights for any future transactions, such as REDIRECTS, that use this resold or reassigned transmission service. This is only an issue when the 2nd customer wants to redirect transmission usage to a constrained path. Currently, unless the provider intervenes on the backend, that provider only has the option to deny this type of transaction when it is tagged. [Specification Change, Business Practice]

11. Recalls of Transmission Service

Recall allows a provider to reduce the capacity or duration of a transmission request. The issue with recalls concerns implementation and may be an issue to address at the provider/vendor level. However, clarification is needed.

When a provider recalls a transmission request that is a REDIRECT, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? When a provider recalls any impacting request type, should capacity be returned to the impacted request? If so, should a provider post reductions for the entire "chain" of requests? [Business Practices]

12. Multiple Submissions of Identical Transmission Requests / Queuing Issues

OASIS business rules are very similar across most providers. In general, customers submitting transmission request have time periods when they can "queue" their requests. This queue process and the way it relates to the Internet can create issues when customers are "battling" for ATC on constrained interfaces.

Many customers have automated the submission of transmission requests. In order to ensure their place in the queue, these customers schedule these requests to be submitted as a scheduled event. To account for delays caused by the Internet and the nature of web server systems, customers usually submit multiple copies of the same request beginning a few minutes before the top of the hour and lasting until well after the top of the hour.

The issues created by this are fairly straightforward. Backend systems and the operators working those systems are impacted dramatically. Each request that arrives after the top of the hour is a valid request. Therefore, the provider can have hundreds of requests in the queue that will never be confirmed.

Other issues that are created are related to OASIS performance. Anyone using transstatus to retrieve a list of OASIS requests submitted during a time period similar to the one described above can receive hundreds of bogus requests and only a hand full of legitimate requests. Also, while the systems are busy working on the bogus requests, valid requests can be delayed due to bottlenecks created by this issue.

Does there need to be a standard to limit these issues? Will FERC Order 605 address this issue? [Business Practice]

13. Population of System Data

There is a need for compliance with the S&CP on use of the OASIS template "systemdata" for queries and responses associated with ATC/TTC, etc. (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.4).

This is the template that must be populated in order to meet FERC requirements associated with uploads and downloads of ATC/TTC data. Prior to publication of the S&CP version 1.4, the S&CP required provision of ATC/TTC data through use of the "transoffering" template.

When FERC required CBM data on OASIS, uploads and downloads of CBM were combined with all other system attribute data through the use of "systemdata". At the same time, use of "transoffering" for ATC/TTC data became optional. [Clarification, Compliance]

14. Ancillary Service Requests and Purchases

There is a need for compliance on use of the several ancillary services templates in OASIS for queries and responses associated with the sale and purchase of ancillary services. FERC requires this under Order 889, and as revised. This priority may be lower due to the complexities involved and chaos in the industry associated with ancillary services, in addition to the somewhat rigid methodology provided for in the current OASIS S&CP. This will also be a requirement under OASIS II. [Compliance]

15. ATC Updates

There is a need to revisit the FERC requirement for ATC adjustments and posting updates. In Order 638, FERC requires adjustments to ATC off-line (internally) when the Transmission Provider accepts reservation requests and then on-line, following confirmation, the ATC posting is to be updated. FERC reasoned that use of this two-step method should reduce the number of accepted requests that will be denied service. This methodology tends to encourage delayed acceptance responses from Transmission Providers and has been a trigger for discontent expressed by marketers.

Over the last 3–4 years, there have been significant advances in the automation of backend systems, including calculation of ATC, which interface with OASIS. Revision of ATC postings can be made earlier now and with more certainty than before, so Transmission Providers can avoid the denials of service that once were more frequent due to ATC calculation uncertainties. A pilot project should be designed to test the concerns surrounding denial of service under a one-step method where ATC would only be adjusted upon confirmation. [Business Practice]

16. NAESB Implementation of a Compliance Program

Should an OASIS Compliance program be implemented? [Compliance]

17. Announcing / Posting of OASIS Outages

OASIS Outage posting is inconsistent across OASIS nodes. Some nodes send messages to an email list, such as tsin@nerc.com or osc@nerc.com. Other nodes send a message to a list managed by that TSIP.

Section 4.3.10.1 of the S&CP requires providers to post outages "When the OASIS node is out of service and transmission requests are received by the TP by phone or fax." Using the message template, OASIS users can download this information. All other postings of outages are at the discretion of the provider.

The reality is that many providers leave the posting of node outages to the TSIP. Therefore, the provider has the obligation to make sure that the TSIP is posting outage information on the provider's behalf.

The message functionality was added to provide a standard for the posting of specific messages, such as node outage information. All OASIS outages can be posted using this standard and customers will have unilateral access to this data using the message template.

Should additional standards be implemented? How can compliance with this requirement be monitored? [Specification Change]

18. Standardized Process for NITS service on OASIS

Overall problem of misuse the different status indicators, e.g. setting a request to REFUSED because the request was incomplete. There is a need for a uniform interpretation of the S&CP. Specifically, making sure that similar conventions and data definitions are employed on all nodes. [Compliance]
Examples:

Standardized process for NITS service on OASIS:
a) Initial service application procedure
b) Designation of network resources
c) Addition of network resources
d) Elimination of network resources
[Business Practice – Specification Change]

Some providers post things in “blocks” (i.e., an on-peak block), while others post everything in hourly increments (i.e., 24 discrete values). Another might be that some providers respond to a TRANSSTATUS by using CAPACITY REQUESTED and STATUS to allow a customer to derive CAPACITY_GRANTED, while other providers specifically indicate CAPACITY_GRANTED(and some only use CAPACITY_GRANTED if it differs from CAPACITY_REQUESTED).

There are different implementations all have their own unique flavor that have to be coded around. “If PROVIDER =” type statements must be written in order to catch all the node-specific implementation details. Obviously you can write exception rules to deal with it, but you shouldn't have to.
If we did some standard queries against all the nodes and compared the data, we'd probably find some interesting differences. If there are valid reasons for the differences, then they should be codified in the S&CP or in Order 638. If not, they should be clarified to ensure uniform interpretation and the nodes modified to meet the clarified S&CP. [Compliance, Business Practices]

The standardization issue above is probably a good idea but it might be a little late unless we see the existence of OASIS according to the S&CP 1.4 continuing more than a couple of more years.

The key question is, is it a matter of S&CP 1.4 implementation (i.e., template access) or is it a really a matter of a TP’s tariff (i.e., data content). It would not seem you could affect change to the latter (e.g., your reference to “block” vs. hourly), only the first (e.g., element name usage discrepancies).

Many solutions and associated support systems have been built around the different interpretations and implementations as they are today. I don't know if companies would be inclined to incur the cost to make significant changes.

In addition, I believe a submission to FERC would be required since they are the ones in control of the specification and I believe any clarification should become part of the specification. A validation suite should be developed. [Compliance, Business Practice]

19. Post Reference Field

The post reference is a reference number that must identify the offers being posted on OASIS. The offer posting is in fact a combination of the ATC and the system data, reservations and the price information. When this data is combined to present the offers on the system the post reference has no real meaning, as it is not clear which of the base items posting identifier is to be used. This worked fine in the past when the system data and the offers were not posted separately. This is a change or a clarification on the purpose of the post ref field. [Specification Change]

20. Other Items

1) System Data

There is a need for compliance with the S&CP on use of the OASIS template "systemdata" for queries and responses associated with ATC/TTC, etc. (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.4).

This is the template that must be populated in order to meet FERC requirements associated with uploads and downloads of ATC/TTC data. Prior to publication of the S&CP version 1.4, the S&CP required provision of ATC/TTC data through use of the "transoffering" template.

When FERC required CBM data on OASIS, uploads and downloads of CBM were combined with all other system attribute data through the use of "systemdata." At the same time, use of "transoffering" for ATC/TTC data became optional.

2) Schedule Details

There is a need for compliance on the use of the OASIS template "scheduledetail" for queries and responses associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.1). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to an individual schedule. There is a tendency to use the tag for this information; however, the OASIS data is currently the required source for audit information associated with schedules and curtailments/interruptions.

3) Security Events

There is a need for compliance on use of the OASIS template "security" for queries and responses associated with security events such as curtailments or TLR's (see OASIS S&CP section 4.3.4.2). This is the template where FERC requires information specific to the event, such as facilities involved, start time of the event, etc. Currently, the NERC website provides a central repository for such information associated with the Eastern Interconnection. There is a need to add Western Interconnection information to this repository.

4) Ancillary Services

There is a need for compliance on use of the several ancillary services templates in OASIS for queries and responses associated with the sale and purchase of ancillary services. FERC requires this under Order 889, and as revised. This priority may be lower due to the complexities involved and chaos in the industry associated with ancillary services, in addition to the somewhat rigid methodology provided for in the current OASIS S&CP. This will also be a requirement under OASIS Phase II.

5) ATC Updates

There is a need to revisit the FERC requirement for ATC adjustments and posting updates. In Order 638, FERC requires adjustments to ATC off line (internally) when the Transmission Provider accepts reservation requests and then on line, following confirmation, the ATC posting is to be updated. FERC reasoned that use of this 2-step method should reduce the number of accepted requests that will be denied service. This methodology tends to encourage delayed acceptance responses from Transmission Providers and has been a trigger for discontent expressed by marketers.

Over the last 3–4 years, there have been significant advances in the automation of backend systems, including calculation of ATC, which interface with OASIS. Revision of ATC postings can be made earlier now and with more certainty than before, so Transmission Providers can avoid the denials of service that once were more frequent due to ATC calculation uncertainties. A pilot project should be designed to test the concerns surrounding denial of service under a one-step method where ATC would only be adjusted upon confirmation.

6) Naming Standardization

Standardization for items such as service points is a continuing problem in OASIS and should be addressed.

E-Tag/IS Issues

1. Distinguish between IDC and CA initiated curtailments
    a. Determine costs for implementing the “two-level” reliability profile
2. Add TERMINATE and CANCEL states back into valid states
    a. Develop “whitepaper” explaining need for this feature
    b. Provide estimate of costs associated with doing this
3. Create a “Printable Tag” for use during service failures (would have reduced amount of data provided).
4. Use “WITHDRAWN” state rather than “killed tag” (WSCC-RMS)
    a. Develop “whitepaper” explaining need for this feature
    b. Provide estimate of costs associated with doing this
5. Create CHECKOUT feature.
6. Are FRONT_END tag extensions going to be developed or can we take this off of our list of possible enhancements?
7. Can GPEs have the ability to CURTAIL tags due to loss of generation?
8. With intermediate CAs being allowed to CURTAIL transactions, the significance of the first issue listed above is heightened. Without some method of distinguishing between reliability profiles, each CA will have the ability to inadvertently reload another CA’s CURTAILment, which is the problem with IDC reloads today.
9. Are there any problems with the new functionality of the RC being able to modify the CURTAILMENT start time?
10. For each TP there should be a Scheduling Entity. This was approved back in the first part of 2003. The TISWG will move ahead with a specification change, unless the IS has a reason not to proceed.