ELECTRONIC SCHEDULING COLLABORATIVE

October 6, 2003

TO: NAESB WEQ EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
NERC MARKET COMMITTEE
ISO/RTO COUNCIL

Dear Members:

ESC Deliverables

In early 2000, the Electronic Scheduling Collaborative (ESC) and OASIS Standards Collaborative (OSC) began to develop electronic scheduling standards and communication protocols and identify the future business practices needed to promote the timely exchange of information in support of efficient markets and grid reliability. This task took on new meaning, and substantially broadened in scope, as FERC issued Order 2000, the OASIS II ANOPR, and the SMD NOPR. In addition to the new functionality and complexities introduced by these FERC initiatives, there were also hurdles to overcome in accommodating the proposed NERC Functional Model.

Through all these industry changes, the two groups remained focused on the creation of a common market interface (now referred to as OASIS II) that will allow all Market Participants to:

- Participate in and across all markets whether they are physical or financial
- Distribute that information to the multiple market systems
- Provide dynamic feedback to the Market Participants.

The goals of OASIS II are:

- Eliminate duplication of effort
- Provide a single secure source of dynamic communication
- Provide up to date status of market activities across the multiple markets
- Reduce “seams” issues

The ESC and OSC have completed the first phase of developing OASIS II. The OASIS II System Requirements document and Use Case Specifications, which describe the high-level functional requirements of OASIS II, are now complete. These documents will serve as the building blocks for the next phase of development, which is detailed business process design. The business process design can then be used by the newly formed NAESB Information Technology Subcommittee (ITS) to develop an OASIS II Standards and Communication Protocol (S&CP) document. The ESC’s Business Plan and Modeling Committee has identified a number of open issues that pertain to the use cases (**Attachment A**).

The System Requirements document and Use Case Specifications are divided into six areas that represent distinct functions within the physical or financial markets:

- Bi-lateral and Self-schedules
- Transmission Rights
- Registration
- Energy Markets (Real-time Market and Day-ahead Market) Operations
- Coordination

You can view the deliverables at the following website: https://www.nerc.net/esc/RelatedFiles.asp

With the delivery of the System Requirements document and Use Case Specifications, the ESC has successfully discharged its duties under its current scope. We would like to take this opportunity to thank those industry participants who have supported the ESC, which has provided a valuable service to the industry in providing feedback to FERC regarding their various industry initiatives and in its work on the requirements and specifications for OASIS II. It was indeed a daunting but rewarding task.

Thank you for your support and good luck in your future endeavors.

Regards,

John M. Simonelli

John M. Simonelli
Chairman, Electronic Scheduling Collaborative

Jim Hansen

Jim Hansen
Vice Chairman, Electronic Scheduling Collaborative

JMS/bsb

cc: Electronic Scheduling Collaborative
OASIS Standards Collaborative
EPRI Common Market Extension

Attachment A

OASIS II Use Cases – Open Issues
ESC Business Plan and Modeling Committee
October 4, 2003

The Business Plan and Modeling Committee (BPMC) has identified questions and open issues pertaining to the OASIS II Use Case Specification. These issues remain open due to uncertainty within the industry on issues pertaining to the confirmation/coordination of bilateral schedules and interchange schedules.

Two NERC groups, the Functional Model Review Task Group (FMRTG) and the Coordinate Interchange Standard Drafting Team (CI SDT) are currently working to define these processes. The BPMC believes it is in the industry's best interest to design OASIS II using a scheduling paradigm and terminology that is consistent with the work of these two groups. The groups appear to be nearing closure on these issues and the results should be incorporated in the Use Case Specification. Rather than make changes that may require revision in the near future, the BPMC is documenting the questions and open issues for the appropriate industry group(s) to address.

Question for the Functional Model Review Task Group:

1. What is the role of the IA in coordination? Does the IA approve schedules or does it manage the communication of approvals between other entities, such as BAs and RAs?

Questions for the Coordinate Interchange Standard Drafting Team:

2. What is coordinated – Bilateral Schedule or Interchange Schedule?
3. Are Bilateral Schedules and Interchange Schedules really the same thing in two different stages of completion? Please provide definitions for the terms being used or developed.
4. The CI SDT is currently discussing three stages in the scheduling process — Arrange, Confirm, and Coordinate. Because the use cases are more detailed than the standard, the use cases contain more specific states. We would like to ensure that the state changes in the use cases are consistent with the more general "states" of Arrange, Confirm, and Coordinate. What types of "approvals" are provided during these three stages and which entities provide the approvals (MP, MO, BA, RA) during each stage?

Open Issues within the Use Cases:

1. Several use case summaries refer to coordinating Interchange Schedules, but the detailed steps in the Coordinate Interchange use case pertain to coordinating Bilateral Schedules. This discrepancy needs to be corrected when Questions 2 and 3 are answered.
2. The Determine Schedule use case is designed to create certain types of schedules that are not directly created by Market Participants. The Determine Schedule use case is typically run after market clearing but can be run at other times as well. It is unclear what types of schedules the Determine Schedule use case should create at various points in the overall scheduling process. Schedule types can be determined when Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 are answered.
3. Overlap may exist between the Bilateral Schedule Modify and Adjust use cases and the Coordinate Interchange use case. The overlap can be determined when Question 4 is answered.