

## Joint Interchange Scheduling Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, July 23, 2008 — 1–5 p.m. Atlantic Daylight Time  
Thursday, July 24, 2008 — 10 a.m.–5 p.m. Atlantic Daylight Time

Delta Halifax Hotel  
1990 Barrington St.  
Halifax, NS B3J1P2  
Hotel Phone: (902) 425-6700

Conference Bridge (Call-in):  
Wednesday Phone Number: (732) 694-2061  
Wednesday Access Code: 1123072308#  
Thursday Access Code: 1123072408#

Participation via WebEx Webcast  
Location: <https://nerc.webex.com/nerc>  
Topic: JISWG  
Wednesday Password: 072308  
Thursday Password: 072408

### Agenda

1. **Administrative**
  - a. Membership and Guests — Chair
  - b. Arrangements — Secretary
  - c. Approval of Meeting Minutes
    - i) May 21–22, 2008 Meeting Minutes — Chair
  - d. Procedures
    - i) Parliamentary Procedures — Secretary
    - ii) Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Secretary
  - e. Approval of Agenda — Chair
2. **Coordinate Interchange Timing Tables Standard Drafting Team — Chair**
3. **NAESB Confidentiality Agreement — Chair**
4. **NAESB Electric Industry Registry (EIR) Transition from NERC to NAESB — Chair**
5. **EIR Cleanup — Chair**

- 6. **e-Tag Specifications Version 1.8.1 Development** — Chair
- 7. **Informal Proposal to Transfer e-Tag Specifications from NERC to NAESB** — Chair
- 8. **Capacity Benefits Margin** — Chair
- 9. **Future JISWG Meetings/Conference Calls** — Chair
  - a. Review Meeting Dates, Start and End Times
  - b. NERC-hosted Meeting Guidelines
  - c. Future JISWG Meetings Conference Calls/Webcast Schedule

September 16, 2008	Vancouver
November 12–13, 2008	Houston
January 14–15, 2009	Phoenix
March 11–12, 2009	Houston
May 13–14, 2009	Monterey, CA
July 15–16, 2009	Toronto
September 16–17, 2009	Houston
November 18–19, 2009	Houston

## **Item 1. Administrative**

---

### ***Item 1.a* Membership and Guests**

---

Co-chairs Jim Hansen and Bob Harshbarger will welcome the Joint Interchange Scheduling Working Group (JISWG) members, e-Tag vendors, and guests. The chairs will ask members and guests to introduce themselves.

Attachment

Attendance list to be provided at the meeting

### ***Item 1.b* Arrangements**

---

The Joint Interchange Scheduling Working Group meeting will begin on Wednesday, July 23 at 1:00 p.m. and adjourn by 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, July 24. Lunch will be provided to the meeting attendees on Thursday.

### ***Item 1.c* Approval of Meeting and Conference Call Minutes**

---

The chair will ask for review and approval of the May 21–22, 2008 JISWG meeting minutes.

Attachment

May 21–22, 2008, JISWG Meeting Minutes

### ***Item 1.d* Procedures**

---

#### **Item 1.d.i. Parliamentary Procedures**

A summary of Parliamentary Procedures is attached for reference. The chair and secretary will answer questions regarding these procedures.

#### **Item 1.d.ii. Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

On June 14, 2002, the NERC Board of Trustees adopted Antitrust Compliance Guidelines for NERC. In adopting the guidelines, the board passed the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees (1) adopts the draft Antitrust Compliance Guidelines attached hereto as Exhibit A and (2) instructs that these Antitrust Compliance Guidelines be included in the agenda package for each meeting of every NERC committee, subcommittee, task force, working group, and other NERC-sponsored activity.

The resolution also applies to workshops, training sessions, and any other NERC-sponsored event. A copy of the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines will be included in the agenda package for each meeting of each group or event.

Attachments

1. Parliamentary Procedures
2. Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

### ***Item 1.e* Approval of Agenda**

---

The chair will ask for approval of the IS meeting agenda.

## Minutes Joint Interchange Scheduling Working Group

May 21–22, 2008  
Catamaran Resort Hotel  
San Diego, California

A meeting of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) and the North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB) Joint Interchange Scheduling Working Group (JISWG) was held on May 21–22, 2008 in San Diego, California. The meeting announcement, agenda, and attendance list are attached as **Exhibits A, B, and C**, respectively. JISWG Co-chairs Jim Hansen and Bob Harshbarger presided.

### **Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

Secretary Vandervort acknowledged the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

### **Minutes of the Previous Meetings**

The JISWG reviewed the January 23–24, 2008 and March 19–20, 2008 meeting minutes. The JISWG adopted the two meeting minutes by unanimous consent.

### **Vendor Notification for e-Tag Authority Service Modifications**

The JISWG discussed when e-Tag vendor code modifications are significant enough to merit a notification to other vendors. The JISWG concurred that if there are e-Tag code changes that need to be made that impact the operations of one vendor with other vendors, then some sort of notification needs to be made to announce the changes to other vendors. The discussion focused on the details and circumstances that required a notification.

Jerry Dempsey moved to add the following sentence to the e-Tag Specifications as part of the version 1.8.1 revision: “e-Tag vendors implementing a modification(s) to any e-Tag service shall send advanced notification to the appropriate list server(s) if the e-Tag vendor anticipates an impact to interoperability.”

The motion passed by unanimous consent.

### **Deployment of PKI Standards for e-Tags**

The JISWG discussed the need for Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) for security purposes. The JISWG does not know if any e-Tag vendors are registered for PKI certification. In addition, the working group does not know the NAESB requirements for vendors to register for their own PKI certification. After the discussion, the JISWG decided to defer server-side PKI certificates until the working group is given direction from NAESB and the JISWG is given a list of compliant Certificate Authority (CA) entities.

### **Coordinate Interchange Timing Tables Standard Drafting Team**

Jim Hansen reported that the Coordinate Interchange Timing Tables Standard Drafting Team (CITTSDT) posted the INT-005, INT-006, and INT-008 interchange standards' timing tables for comment. The posting window is open until June 10, 2008. The JISWG highly encourages everyone to review the timing tables and generate comments (which includes supportive/positive comments) on the draft timing tables. The announcement, standards revisions, implementation plan, and comment form can be found on the NERC Standards Coordinate Interchange – Timing Table (Project 2007-14) Web site, as follows:

[http://www.nerc.com/~filez/standards/INT\\_Urgent\\_Action.html](http://www.nerc.com/~filez/standards/INT_Urgent_Action.html)

### **WECC Coordinate Interchange Business Practices (WEQ-004)**

The JISWG addressed the WECC Coordinate Interchange Business Practices (WEQ-004) parking lot issues. The following is the list of items and the resolution:

1. Create a summary document explaining the previous/current revisions  
Resolution: The Coordinate Interchange “Summary of Changes” will be written after the document is completely drafted.
2. Include annual plan reference  
Resolution: The JISWG annual plan is independent of the Coordinate Interchange Business Practice and should not be included in the document. This item is complete.
3. Include reference to the respective rounding standard(s)  
Resolution: The JISWG wrote “rounding” requirements and inserted the requirements into the Coordinate Interchange Business Practice document. This item is complete.
4. Revisit applicability of ramp duration agreement  
Resolution: A parking lot item was created to ask an informal posting question to prompt informal comments on changing the Eastern Interconnection transaction default ramp duration from 10 minutes to 20 minutes. The posting will complete this item.
5. Revise the annual plan items for JISWG which will address the surety assessment finding on NAESB PKI items  
Resolution: The JISWG discussed PKI issues and concerns earlier in the meeting. The JISWG will wait for NAESB direction on the technical PKI issues that need to be addressed. This item is complete until further direction is attained from NAESB.

### **NAESB Confidentiality Agreement**

During the March meeting, the JISWG went through the entire confidentiality agreement and modified it to incorporate non-disclosure requirements of electric system data to be agreed upon by NAESB officials and the respective stakeholders. The draft NAESB Confidentiality Agreement for Electric System Data was forwarded by the JISWG to the NAESB Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee and the Information Technology Subcommittee (ESS/ITS) for their review, processing, legal review, and disposition on the next step in the formalization process. The JISWG will continue to track the confidentiality agreement and will be responsive to the ESS/ITS technical concerns that arise.

### **Electric Industry Registry (EIR) Transition from NERC to NAESB**

The JISWG addressed the Electric Industry Registry (EIR) parking lot issues that remain to be addressed. The following is the list of items and the resolution:

1. Mr. Harshbarger will review FERC Orders for rulings regarding registry funding mechanisms.  
Resolution: Complete. Order 638 had language that stated that a reasonable charge could be assessed to maintain the registry.
2. Mr. Sorensen will draft language regarding a generic deletion of the deactivation notification scheme of the revised EIR System Requirements.  
Resolution: Complete
3. Mr. Hansen will draft language clarifying the NERC Functional Model entities to be included in Section 1 of the revised EIR System Requirements.  
Resolution: Complete
4. Mr. Hansen will draft a definition for Local Balancing Authority to be included in the revised EIR System Requirements.  
Resolution: Complete
5. The JISWG may review the EIR System Requirements depending on the RFP timeline.  
Resolution: The JISWG will support the EIR as deemed necessary and upon request from NAESB and NERC. This item is complete until JISWG support is requested.

### **NAESB and NERC EIR Registry Oversight Committee**

The JISWG discussed and began defining the roles and responsibilities of an EIR Oversight Committee, including:

- Oversight and coordination of enhancement requests and their processing
- Determination of EIR overlap relationship between NERC and NAESB
- Potential make-up of the EIR Oversight Committee

The discussion led to a decision to table further discussion on the EIR Oversight Committee until NAESB issues the EIR Request for Proposal (RFP) and NAESB requests additional JISWG assistance.

### **e-Tag 1.8.1 Specifications - Comments and JISWG Responses**

The JISWG posted the proposed e-Tag 1.8.1 specifications for comment on both the NERC and NAESB Web sites. The posting closed on May 20, 2008. The JISWG addressed the comments and developed responses. The comments and responses will not be included with the minutes. To view the comments and responses, please visit the NAESB JISWG Web site:

[http://www.naesb.org/weq/weq\\_jiswg.asp](http://www.naesb.org/weq/weq_jiswg.asp)

### **EIR Dunn & Bradstreet (DUNN) vs. Global Location Number (GLN)**

The current e-Tag registry uses Dunn & Bradstreet (DUNN) numbers to track and identify corporate entities. A suggestion was made to consider moving from the DUNN numbers to the Global Location Number (GLN) numbering system in conjunction with the transfer of the EIR from NERC to NAESB. NAESB requested JISWG to give its input regarding the DUNN or the GLN method of coding to identify organizations, a key element in the EIR.

The JISWG discussed the DUNN and the GLN numbering systems to decide which is perceived to be superior. As far as JISWG is concerned, there are not any technical issues that the JISWG can identify to negate either of the numbering systems. Since the issue is a non-technical issue, the JISWG recommends that NAESB choose a numbering system that NAESB is comfortable with using its own criteria. If NAESB requests assistance in the future, JISWG is available to assist utilizing its expertise and support.

### **Dates and Locations of Future Meetings**

The JISWG reviewed the 2009 meetings schedule and chose dates, start/stop times, locations, and NERC/NAESB coordinator/facilitator functions. Look for additional information and meeting details on the NERC JISWG Web site and on the NAESB JISWG Web site.

Additional meetings or conference calls may be scheduled as necessary for the implementation of the e-Tag 1.8.1.

<b><i>JISWG Meeting/Conf Call/Webcast Schedule</i></b>				
	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Meeting Coordinator</b>
Meeting	Wed, Jul 23, 2008 Thur, Jul 24, 2008	1 – 5 pm 10 am – 5 pm	Halifax, NS	NERC
Meeting	Tues, Sep 16, 2008	8 am – 4 pm	Vancouver, BC	NERC Precedes the IS Meeting
Meeting	Wed, Nov 12, 2008 Thur, Nov 13, 2008	10 am – 5 pm 9 am – Noon	Houston	NAESB
Meeting	Wed, Jan 14, 2009 Thur, Jan 15, 2009	10 am – 5 pm 9 am – Noon	Phoenix	NERC
Meeting	Wed, Mar 11, 2009 Thur, Mar 12, 2009	10 am – 5 pm 9 am – Noon	Houston (or volunteer city)	NAESB
Meeting	Wed, May 13, 2009 Thur, May 14, 2009	10 am – 5 pm 9 am – Noon	Monterey, CA	NERC
Meeting	Wed, Jul 15, 2009 Thur, Jul 16, 2009	10 am – 5 pm 9 am – Noon	Toronto	NERC

Meeting	Wed, Sep 16, 2009 Thur, Sep 17, 2009	10 am – 5 pm 9 am – Noon	Houston (maybe Seattle)	NAESB
Meeting	Wed, Nov 18, 2009 Thur, Nov 19, 2009	10 am – 5 pm 9 am – Noon	Houston (or volunteer city)	NAESB

Respectfully submitted,

*Tom Vandervort*

Thomas J. Vandervort  
NERC JISWG Secretary

## Parliamentary Procedures

Based on Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, 10th Edition, plus "Organization and Procedures Manual for the NERC Standing Committees"

### Motions

Unless noted otherwise, all procedures require a "second" to enable discussion.

When you want to...	Procedure	Debatable	Comments
Raise an issue for discussion	Move	Yes	The main action that begins a debate.
Revise a Motion currently under discussion	Amend	Yes	Takes precedence over discussion of main motion. Motions to amend an amendment are allowed, but not any further. The amendment must be germane to the main motion, and can not reverse the intent of the main motion.
Reconsider a Motion already approved	Reconsider	Yes	Allowed only by member who voted on the prevailing side of the original motion.
End debate	Call for the Question or End Debate	Yes	If the Chair senses that the committee is ready to vote, he may say "if there are no objections, we will now vote on the Motion." Otherwise, this motion is debatable and subject to 2/3 majority approval.
Record each member's vote on a Motion	Request a Roll Call Vote	No	Takes precedence over main motion. No debate allowed, but the members must approve by 2/3 majority.
Postpone discussion until later in the meeting	Lay on the Table	Yes	Takes precedence over main motion. Used only to postpone discussion until later in the meeting.
Postpone discussion until a future date	Postpone until	Yes	Takes precedence over main motion. Debatable only regarding the date (and time) at which to bring the Motion back for further discussion.
Remove the motion for any further consideration	Postpone indefinitely	Yes	Takes precedence over main motion. Debate can extend to the discussion of the main motion. If approved, it effectively "kills" the motion. Useful for disposing of a badly chosen motion that can not be adopted or rejected without undesirable consequences.
Request a review of procedure	Point of order	No	Second not required. The Chair or secretary shall review the parliamentary procedure used during the discussion of the Motion.

### Notes on Motions

**Seconds.** A Motion must have a second to ensure that at least two members wish to discuss the issue. The "second" is not recorded in the minutes. Neither are motions that do not receive a second.

**Announcement by the Chair.** The Chair should announce the Motion before debate begins. This ensures that the wording is understood by the membership. Once the Motion is announced and seconded, the Committee "owns" the motion, and must deal with it according to parliamentary procedure.

## Voting

Voting Method	When Used	How Recorded in Minutes
Unanimous Consent	When the Chair senses that the Committee is substantially in agreement, and the Motion needed little or no debate. No actual vote is taken.	The minutes show "by unanimous consent."
Vote by Voice	The standard practice.	The minutes show Approved or Not Approved (or Failed).
Vote by Show of Hands (tally)	To record the number of votes on each side when an issue has engendered substantial debate or appears to be divisive. Also used when a Voice Vote is inconclusive. (The Chair should ask for a Vote by Show of Hands when requested by a member).	The minutes show both vote totals, and then Approved or Not Approved (or Failed).
Vote by Roll Call	To record each member's vote. Each member is called upon by the Secretary,, and the member indicates either "Yes," "No," or "Present" if abstaining.	The minutes will include the list of members, how each voted or abstained, and the vote totals. Those members for which a "Yes," "No," or "Present" is not shown are considered absent for the vote.

### Notes on Voting

(Recommendations from DMB, not necessarily Mr. Robert)

**Abstentions.** When a member abstains, he is not voting on the Motion, and his abstention is not counted in determining the results of the vote. The Chair should not ask for a tally of those who abstained.

**Determining the results.** The results of the vote (other than Unanimous Consent) are determined by dividing the votes in favor by the total votes cast. Abstentions are not counted in the vote and shall not be assumed to be on either side.

**"Unanimous Approval."** Can only be determined by a Roll Call vote because the other methods do not determine whether every member attending the meeting was actually present when the vote was taken, or whether there were abstentions.

**Majorities.** Robert's Rules use a simple majority (one more than half) as the default for most motions. NERC uses 2/3 majority for all motions.

## Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

### I. General

It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition.

It is the responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

Antitrust laws are complex and subject to court interpretation that can vary over time and from one court to another. The purpose of these guidelines is to alert NERC participants and employees to potential antitrust problems and to set forth policies to be followed with respect to activities that may involve antitrust considerations. In some instances, the NERC policy contained in these guidelines is stricter than the applicable antitrust laws. Any NERC participant or employee who is uncertain about the legal ramifications of a particular course of conduct or who has doubts or concerns about whether NERC's antitrust compliance policy is implicated in any situation should consult NERC's General Counsel immediately.

### II. Prohibited Activities

Participants in NERC activities (including those of its committees and subgroups) should refrain from the following when acting in their capacity as participants in NERC activities (e.g., at NERC meetings, conference calls and in informal discussions):

- Discussions involving pricing information, especially margin (profit) and internal cost information and participants' expectations as to their future prices or internal costs.
- Discussions of a participant's marketing strategies.
- Discussions regarding how customers and geographical areas are to be divided among competitors.

- Discussions concerning the exclusion of competitors from markets.
- Discussions concerning boycotting or group refusals to deal with competitors, vendors or suppliers.
- Any other matters that do not clearly fall within these guidelines should be reviewed with NERC's General Counsel before being discussed.

### **III. Activities That Are Permitted**

From time to time decisions or actions of NERC (including those of its committees and subgroups) may have a negative impact on particular entities and thus in that sense adversely impact competition. Decisions and actions by NERC (including its committees and subgroups) should only be undertaken for the purpose of promoting and maintaining the reliability and adequacy of the bulk power system. If you do not have a legitimate purpose consistent with this objective for discussing a matter, please refrain from discussing the matter during NERC meetings and in other NERC-related communications.

You should also ensure that NERC procedures, including those set forth in NERC's Certificate of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Rules of Procedure are followed in conducting NERC business.

In addition, all discussions in NERC meetings and other NERC-related communications should be within the scope of the mandate for or assignment to the particular NERC committee or subgroup, as well as within the scope of the published agenda for the meeting.

No decisions should be made nor any actions taken in NERC activities for the purpose of giving an industry participant or group of participants a competitive advantage over other participants. In particular, decisions with respect to setting, revising, or assessing compliance with NERC reliability standards should not be influenced by anti-competitive motivations.

Subject to the foregoing restrictions, participants in NERC activities may discuss:

- Reliability matters relating to the bulk power system, including operation and planning matters such as establishing or revising reliability standards, special operating procedures, operating transfer capabilities, and plans for new facilities.
- Matters relating to the impact of reliability standards for the bulk power system on electricity markets, and the impact of electricity market operations on the reliability of the bulk power system.
- Proposed filings or other communications with state or federal regulatory authorities or other governmental entities.
- Matters relating to the internal governance, management and operation of NERC, such as nominations for vacant committee positions, budgeting and assessments, and employment matters; and procedural matters such as planning and scheduling meetings.

## **Item 2.      Coordinate Interchange Timing Tables Standard Drafting Team**

---

The Coordinate Interchange Timing Tables Standard Drafting Team (CITTSDT) comment window closed on June 10, 2008. The CITTSDT has met or conducted conference calls to address and respond to the comments.

JISWG Co-chair Bob Harshbarger is also the CITTSDT chair. JISWG Co-chair Jim Hansen and other active JISWG members are also members of the CITTSDT. Mr. Harshbarger and the other CITTSDT members will give a status report on the standards revisions.

### **Item 3. NAESB Confidentiality Agreement**

---

The JISWG drafted a request to initiate a NAESB “confidentiality agreement” or “non-disclosure agreement.” The NAESB Executive Committee assigned the initial task of drafting a confidentiality agreement to the JISWG. The JISWG drafted the initial NAESB e-Tag confidentiality agreement. The agreement was forwarded to the Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee and the Information Technology Subcommittee (ESS/ITS) for distribution to the other NAESB subcommittees and working groups for their input and consensus.

**Action:**

Paul Sorenson or Co-chairs Harshbarger or Hansen will give a status on the draft NAESB Confidentiality Agreement/Non-disclosure Agreement.

## **Item 4. NAESB Electric Industry Registry (EIR) Transition from NERC to NAESB**

---

During the May 2008 JISWG meeting, the working group addressed all known open items. The NAESB office has the lead to transition the Electric Industry Registry (EIR) from NERC. The JISWG is ready to assist with its technical expertise and support if requested.

### **Action**

The JISWG requests NAESB staff to give a status report to the working group on the transition of the registry from NERC to NAESB, including a schedule for the future transition timeline, significant action items, milestones, and transition completion date.

## Item 5. EIR Cleanup

---

The Electrical Industry Registry has and will continue to have items identified that need to be revised, enhanced, added or deleted. With the transition of the registry from NERC to NAESB anticipated to be complete in the 2008–2009 time period, only necessary changes will be made by NERC to the registry.

The JISWG will address each item, determine if the EIR should be revised based on the merits of the item, and maintain a list of the items that need to be incorporated into the EIR to create an accurate and user-friendly EIR. It is anticipated that these items will be incorporated into the EIR soon after the registry is transferred to NAESB.

Two items that fall within the “EIR cleanup” are:

1. The JISWG and e-Tag vendors request the “Forward\_URL” field in the CA\_Registry, TP\_Registry, and PSE\_Registry tables be truncated/deleted. The “Forward\_URL” field in the SC\_Registry should remain as is (this is the only place where the “Forward\_URL” field is used).
2. Southern Company Transmission suggests the registry has a field for the URL of a Transmission Provider’s OASIS Web site, this is good. However, the URL for template access for some implementations differs from the TP’s Web site, this is not so good. Southern Company Transmission suggests another field be included in the registry to define the TP’s OASIS template URL. Of course this would not be a problem if the template URL and TP’s Web site URL used the same host name.

### Action

The JISWG will discuss the above two items and any additional EIR items presented during the meeting and determine if the items merit inclusion in the list of on-going EIR cleanup items. The JISWG also needs to determine how these EIR cleanup items will be tracked and incorporated after the EIR is transferred to NAESB.

## **Item 6. e-Tag Specifications Version 1.8.1 Development**

---

During the May, 2008 JISWG meeting, all informal comments were discussed, evaluated, and responses were generated. The comments and responses were posted on both NERC and NAESB Web sites. Also during the last meeting an e-Tag communications motion was made and approved by the JISWG (see the May 21–22, 2008 JISWG meeting minutes).

The JISWG needs to develop a plan to continue developing and implementing the e-Tag specification, version 1.8.1.

### Action Item

Co-chairs Hansen and Harshbarger will lead the discussion and development of the e-Tag specifications, version 1.8.1 revision and implementation.

## **Item 7. Informal Proposal to Transfer e-Tag Specifications from NERC to NAESB**

---

Industry participants have informally proposed transferring the e-Tag specifications from NERC ownership to NAESB ownership. The JISWG would remain the custodian of the e-Tag specifications, that role would not change.

The e-Tag specifications have been identified as a gray area within the NERC reliability standards process. The e-Tag specifications is not a reliability standard, but is significantly more than just a supporting/reference document. Since NAESB already owns and maintains several technical standards such as OASIS Standards & Communications Protocol and gas pipeline Electronic Data Interchange, it might be worth considering having NAESB become the official sponsor of the e-Tag Specifications.

NAESB already incorporates vendor representation, which seems to support NAESB ownership of the e-Tag specifications. The transition from NERC to NAESB would give more weight to the e-Tag specifications as a NAESB Business Practice and would ensure that the specifications and the e-Tag process implementation are reviewed through a process geared toward business practices and software standards.

The concept envisions the JISWG developing the NAESB business practice standard. It is also anticipated that NERC and NAESB would remain as the significant participants in electronic tagging specifications development through the JISWG.

### **Action Item**

Co-chairs Hansen and Harshbarger will lead the discussion on the informal proposal to transfer the ownership of the e-Tag specifications from NERC to NAESB.

## Item 8. Capacity Benefits Margin

---

The NAESB Wholesale Electric Quadrant (WEQ) co-chairs of the Joint Electronic Scheduling Subcommittee Information and Technology Subcommittee (ESS/ITS) and Business Practice Subcommittee (BPS) requests assistance from the JISWG regarding FERC Order 890.

### Background

The co-chairs of the Joint ESS/ITS and BPS need a little help completing its Annual Plan Item 2.b.iii.2, Business practice standards that include an OASIS mechanism to allow for auditing of capacity benefit margin (CBM) usage. The Joint Subcommittee identified after much deliberation that the audit mechanism could be done through the OASIS *scheduledetail*. However, in order to meet this FERC Order 890 requirement something needs to be included in the tag in the e-tagging system to identify the tag as being CBM. For this annual plan item, our scope document states:

**Conclusions:** The Joint BPS-ESS-ITS work scope will include:

- Requesting (of JISWG) that something be added to the e-tag specifications to identify usage of CBM (should verify that the NERC team hasn't already taken care of this and perhaps jointly make the request to JISWG),
- Ensure that the identifier added by JISWG is included in the query parameters *scheduledetail* template,
- Ensure that any changes to the e-tag spec will not impact other NAESB Business Practice Standards

The co-chairs thought the NERC ATCDT may need this information on the tag as well to meet "MOD-004 R.12.1 The CBM is available." Needless to say, we are not sure what path we need to follow to request/get changes made to tags so they can be identified as CBM. However, we are sure that the Joint ESS/ITS and BPS cannot finalize the 890 CBM recommendation until we have a decision from JISWG on how a tag can be identified as CBM. If the decision is to add a new field we'll have to make a change to the *scheduledetail* template. If the decision is to add a code value to an existing field we will need to add that information. Any direction you can provide on how to get things started so these questions are resolved quickly are most appreciated.

### Request

There are two issues for which ESS/ITS and BPS need help from the JISWG. Please remember that we are trying to address the 2008 Annual Plan item 2.b.iii.2, "Business practice standards that include an OASIS mechanism to "allow for auditing of CBM usage."

First, we need to have an identifier added to the tag to indicate that the tag is for CBM. We don't know whether there is an existing field in the tag that can be used, by adding another code value, or whether a new field has to be added. The key is that the data element can be included in the query parameters in the *scheduledetail* template; we would not want to have the data in a free form text field. The Joint ESS/ITS and BPS subcommittee does not want to specify which solution the JISWG should implement (code value in existing element or new element). We think that is best left to JISWG to decide. Based on the JISWG decision we can determine what changes, if any, we need to make to *scheduledetail*.

Second, we need to know if there are any changes required to the NAESB Coordinated Interchange Business Practice (WEQ-004), based on the decision on the first issue.

Also, the Joint ESS/ITS & BPS made a determination not to write standards to include a new transmission product nor to require a TSR be submitted (therefore, no AREF). The Joint ESS/ITS & BPS determined that the usage of CMB could be audited by querying the scheduledetail template. However, to do this, the tag must have an indication that it is CBM being scheduled (the request we're making to JISWG) and that indication of CBM usage must get into scheduledetail as a query-able field (work the Joint ESS/ITS & BPS will do after JISWG informs us of the decision).

The Joint ESS/ITS & BPS meets again on July 8th and 9th. It would be great if we could have an answer for this meeting. If you can't address it by then, we definitely will need the answer by the time you wrap up the JISWG meetings July 23-24. Hopefully, this is enough information for you to proceed with responding to our request.

#### Action

The JISWG will address the ESS/ITS and BPS request and forward its recommendations for their review and concurrence for the ESS/ITS and BPS meeting on July 8–9.

#### Attachment

Standard MOD-004-4 — Documentation of Regional CBM Methodologies

**A. Introduction**

1. **Title:** Documentation of Regional Reliability Organization Capacity Benefit Margin Methodologies
2. **Number:** MOD-004-0
3. **Purpose:** To promote the consistent and uniform application of transmission Transfer Capability margins calculations, Capacity Benefit Margin (CBM) must be calculated in a consistent manner.
4. **Applicability:**
  - 4.1. Regional Reliability Organization
5. **Effective Date:** April 1, 2005

**B. Requirements**

- R1.** Each Regional Reliability Organization, in conjunction with its members, shall develop and document a Regional CBM methodology. The Regional Reliability Organization's CBM methodology shall include each of the following ten items, and shall explain its use in determining CBM value. Other items that are Regional Reliability Organization specific or that are considered in each respective Regional Reliability Organization methodology shall also be explained along with their use in determining CBM values.
  - R1.1.** Specify that the method used by each Regional Reliability Organization member to determine its generation reliability requirements as the basis for CBM shall be consistent with its generation planning criteria.
  - R1.2.** Specify the frequency of calculation of the generation reliability requirement and associated CBM values.
  - R1.3.** Require that generation unit outages considered in a Transmission Service Provider's CBM calculation be restricted to those units within the Transmission Service Provider's system.
  - R1.4.** Require that CBM be preserved only on the Transmission Service Provider's System where the Load-Serving Entity's Load is located (i.e., CBM is an import quantity only).
  - R1.5.** Describe the inclusion or exclusion rationale for generation resources of each Load-Serving Entity including those generation resources not directly connected to the Transmission Service Provider's system but serving Load-Serving Entity loads connected to the Transmission Service Provider's system.
  - R1.6.** Describe the inclusion or exclusion rationale for generation connected to the Transmission Service Provider's system but not obligated to serve Native/Network Load connected to the Transmission Service Provider's system.
  - R1.7.** Describe the formal process and rationale for the Regional Reliability Organization to grant any variances to individual Transmission Service Providers from the Regional Reliability Organization's CBM methodology.
  - R1.8.** Specify the relationship of CBM to the generation reliability requirement and the allocation of the CBM values to the appropriate transmission facilities. The sum of the

CBM values allocated to all interfaces shall not exceed that portion of the generation reliability requirement that is to be provided by outside resources.

**R1.9.** Describe the inclusion or exclusion rationale for the loads of each Load-Serving Entity, including interruptible demands and buy-through contracts (type of service contract that offers the customer the option to be interrupted or to accept a higher rate for service under certain conditions).

**R1.10.** Describe the inclusion or exclusion rationale for generation reserve sharing arrangements in the CBM values.

**R2.** The Regional Reliability Organization shall make the most recent version of the documentation of its CBM methodology available on a website accessible by NERC, the Regional Reliability Organizations, and transmission users.

### **C. Measures**

**M1.** The Regional Reliability Organization's most recent CBM methodology documentation shall meet Reliability Standard MOD-004-0\_R1.

**M2.** The Regional Reliability Organization's CBM methodology shall be available on a website accessible by NERC, the Regional Reliability Organizations, and transmission users.

### **D. Compliance**

#### **1. Compliance Monitoring Process**

##### **1.1. Compliance Monitoring Responsibility**

Compliance Monitor: NERC.

##### **1.2. Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Timeframe**

The most recent version of CBM methodology documentation available on a website accessible by NERC, the Regional Reliability Organizations, and transmission users.

##### **1.3. Data Retention**

None specified.

##### **1.4. Additional Compliance Information**

None.

#### **2. Levels of Non-Compliance**

**2.1. Level 1:** The Regional Reliability Organization's documented CBM methodology does not address one or two of the ten items required for documentation under Reliability Standard MOD-004-0\_R1.

**2.2. Level 2:** Not applicable.

**2.3. Level 3:** Not applicable.

**2.4. Level 4:** The Regional Reliability Organization's documented CBM methodology does not address three or more of the ten items required for documentation under Reliability Standard MOD-004-0\_R1, or the Regional Reliability Organization does not have a documented CBM methodology available on a website in accordance with Reliability Standard MOD-004-0\_R2.

### **E. Regional Differences**

1. None identified.

**Version History**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Change Tracking</b>
0	April 1, 2005	Effective Date	New

## **Item 9. Future Meetings/Conference Calls**

---

### ***Item 9.a* Review Meeting Dates, Start and End Times**

---

To ensure the West Coast is not inconvenienced by early start times on the East Coast; and to ensure the East Coast is not inconvenienced by late stop times on the West Coast, the JISWG needs to review and come to consensus on the future 2008 and 2009 meeting dates, and meeting start and stop times.

### ***Item 9.b* NERC-hosted Meeting Guidelines**

---

TO: NERC Committee, Subcommittee, Working Group and Task Force Chairs

Ladies and Gentlemen:

NERC is taking steps to drive down meeting costs, streamline our internal meeting request process, and accommodate more meeting requests with existing resources. The attached memo from Julie Morgan to the staff explains our endeavor in more detail.

For your information, the cost of Meetings and Travel represents nearly 10 percent of NERC's total annual expenses. In 2007, NERC spent approximately \$2 million on these items and we expect that in 2009 we will spend somewhere near \$3 million. Since meetings and travel are such an important element of our mission and our expense budget, it is critical that we be diligent with respect to these costs.

This note is to ask for your support by making every effort to follow the guidelines in the attached memo as you plan future meetings.

Julie has asked the staff to keep her posted on the pros and cons of the endeavor as well as the sites selected; we welcome your feedback too.

Sincerely,  
Bruce Walencyk  
Chief Financial Officer  
NERC

Attachment  
Memo on NERC Meeting Locations

**Item 9.c NERC-hosted Meeting Guidelines**

---

<b>JISWG 2008 Meeting/Conference Call/Webcast Schedule</b>			
<b>2008 JISWG Conference Call/Webcast Schedule</b>			<b>Host</b>
None Scheduled			
<b>2008 - 2009 JISWG Meeting Schedule</b>			
September 16, 2008	September 16 — 8 a.m.–4 p.m.	Vancouver, BC	NERC
November 12–13, 2008	November 12 — 10 a.m.– 5 p.m. November 13 — 9 a.m.– noon	Houston, TX	NAESB
January 14–15, 2009	January 14 — 10 a.m.–5 p.m. January 15 — 9 a.m.– noon	Phoenix, AZ	NERC
March 11–12 2009	March 11 — 10 a.m.–5 p.m. March 12 — 9 a.m.– noon	Houston	NAESB
May 13–14, 2009	May 13 — 10 a.m.–5 p.m. May 14 — 9 a.m.– noon	Monterey, CA	NERC
July 15–16 2009	July 15 — 10 a.m.–5 p.m. July 16 — 9 a.m.– noon	Toronto	NERC
September 16–17, 2009	September 16 — 10 a.m.–5p.m. September 17 — 9 a.m.– noon	Houston	NAESB
November 18–19, 2009	November 18 — 10 a.m.–5p.m. November 19 — 9 a.m.– noon	Houston	NAESB

## Notes:

1. Schedule additional meetings, conference calls, or Webcasts as deemed necessary to address and accomplish JISWG business.
2. Conduct future JISWG meetings only as necessary: 1) to facilitate necessary face-to-face discussions; 2) to focus on deliverables that cannot be achieved by conference calls or Webcasts; and 3) to initiate consensus building or decision-making forums.

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Staff  
FROM: Julie Morgan  
DATE: April 9, 2008  
SUBJECT: Meeting Locations

Thank you all for your fantastic input regarding meeting locations. I have taken everyone's suggestions into consideration and developed a final list of hotels (attached) to use for 50 percent of NERC's meetings. Additional criteria taken into consideration included: non-stop travel from most North American locations, meeting facilities, proximity to airport, cost, and successful past experience.

Although several of you suggested Washington, D.C., we have not been successful finding one location to meet our needs. It is an extremely expensive and difficult to book city. This doesn't mean you can't meet in D.C., it simply means it's more challenging and didn't make the "top ten" list.

Here are some important things to remember:

1. Strive to hold **half** of your meetings at a site on the attached list, not necessarily the same site each time. The other half of your meeting locations are at your discretion.
2. If your group(s) meets at regional or member company offices, you do not have to schedule your meetings at one of these sites.
3. **Plan as many meetings as possible NOW for the next year or more if possible.**
4. Send Rocio a meeting request form (attached) **by April 30**, or as soon thereafter as possible, for as many meetings as feasible. The plan is for Rocio to book several meetings at one time.
5. Refer to this list when scheduling new meetings.
6. The goals of this endeavor are multi-faceted — to drive down meeting costs, streamline the meeting request process, and accomplish more requests with existing resources.

Thanks again for your help and cooperation. Please keep me posted on the pros and cons of our endeavor.

## Phoenix/Scottsdale, Arizona

### **Arizona Grand Resort (airport)**

8000 S. Arizona Grand Parkway, Phoenix, AZ

Seven miles from Sky Harbor International Airport — Approximate driving time is 13 minutes; shuttle service \$5–15; taxis are \$16–25.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=2774/crti=2/hotel-information>

### **Chaparral Suites Resort (Scottsdale)**

5001 N. Scottsdale Road, Scottsdale, AZ

Eight miles from Sky Harbor International Airport — Approximate driving time is 16 minutes; shuttle service is \$5–15; taxis are \$16–25.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=98/crti=2/hotel-information>

## Chicago, Illinois

### **Hilton Chicago (airport)**

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, IL

Located on the O'Hare International Airport property, across from arrivals and baggage claim, connected to the airport by an underground walkway — Approximate driving time is 1 minute; complimentary shuttle service.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=8058/crti=2/hotel-information>

### **Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers (downtown)**

301 East North Water Street, Chicago, IL

20 miles from O'Hare International Airport — Approximate driving time is 35 minutes; shuttle service is \$16–25, taxis are \$26–35.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=12167/crti=2/hotel-information>

## Dallas/Houston, Texas

### **Marriott DFW North (airport)**

8440 Freeport Pkwy, Irving, TX

Five miles from Dallas-Ft. Worth International Airport — Approximate driving time is 10 minutes; complimentary shuttle service.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=20044/crti=2/hotel-information>

### **Hyatt Regency Houston (downtown)**

1200 Louisiana Street, Houston, TX

Twelve miles from Hobby Airport — Approximate driving time is 20 minutes.

Twenty-two miles from George Bush Intercontinental Airport — Approximate driving time is 35 minutes.

Shuttle service is \$16 from Hobby, \$20 from George Bush.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=20005/crti=2/hotel-information>

## Atlanta, Georgia

### **Embassy Suites (airport)**

4700 Southport Road, Atlanta, GA

Three miles from Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport — Approximate driving time is 12 minutes; complimentary shuttle; taxis are \$5–15.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=7345/crti=2/hotel-information>

### **Hyatt Regency Atlanta (downtown)**

265 Peachtree Street NE, Atlanta, GA

Eleven miles from Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport — Approximate driving time is 22 minutes; shuttle is \$16–25, and taxis are \$26–35.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=24736/crti=2/hotel-information>

## Toronto, Ontario

### **Sheraton Gateway Hotel (airport)**

Terminal 3, Toronto, Ontario

Terminal 3 adjoins the hotel with Toronto Pearson International Airport.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=4826/crti=2/hotel-information>

### **Marriott Bloor Yorkville Toronto (downtown)**

90 Bloor Street East, Toronto, Ontario

Sixteen miles from Toronto Pearson International Airport — Approximate driving time is 40 minutes; shuttle service is \$15, taxis are \$40–50.

Hotel details: <http://www.expedia.com/pub/agent.dll/qscr=dspv/htid=11653/crti=2/hotel-information>