

Scheduling WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF December 9, 2003	NEXT STEPS
1. Intermediate transfer party included in tag should have say so/deny tag.	This issue is NERC policy and outside the control of TBL. TBL has notified NERC of this issue. Interested customers should directly request this change of NERC via established NERC channels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Move to “Closed.”
2. Long-term requests cannot be submitted over the OASIS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The ability to submit long-term transmission requests over the OASIS is currently under consideration for funding in FY 2004. ● Funding for the ATC calculator (part of the TAP project) is needed to enable OASIS to reflect long-term commitments, and is also under consideration for funding in FY 2004. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Await TBL funding decisions and report back to BP Forum.
3. Customers notified by TBL when they are about to exceed their transmission demand.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “PATH DEMAND” feature of the Scheduling Automation Project provides this.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Path Demand will be available when scheduling automation is operational. ● Move to “Closed.”

Scheduling WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF December 9, 2003	NEXT STEPS
<p>4. Concern on system changes. Continuing discussions of a number of issues such as NERC timelines, SW timelines, seams issues, buying all transmission on OASIS. BPAT is exploring a concern regarding the ability to tie up non-firm transmission sold over the OASIS due to charges being based on schedules rather than reservations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of scheduling systems status provided. • BPAT pilot project to post OTC and total schedules by hour at the end of pre-schedule for the Southern Intertie was terminated due to lack of customer interest. • Summary of Control Area timelines under development.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On November 12, 2003, TBL posted its ATC methodology. The Scheduling Practices workgroup may contact John Anasis if further discussion within the work group is desired. • Scheduling Automation Conference calls and workshops will continue.
<p>5. In-hour schedule changes for those that supply reserves across BPA's system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue was transferred from the Operating Reserves Work Group to the Scheduling Practices Work Group. • This issue involves firm and non-firm definitions by WECC, and is appropriate for the ISAS committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A special group with ISAS and MIC is working on this definition. • Move to "closed". Continuing discussions need to occur within the WECC forum.

Scheduling WG Report Out (Closed)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
Passive approval of tags and accepted schedule of tag is not accepted by TBL.	Unable to identify sponsor to get clarification of what this item is.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable.
TBL elimination of “inactive” accounts is a problem.	New policy that TBL will contact the TCH to get approval before deleting an account.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice was posted and passed out at Business Practice Forum # 3. http://www2.transmission.bpa.gov/business/techforum/Decisions_Resolutions/AccountDeletion52303.pdf
Account building after hours	Expanding account building hours in two phases – one has been implemented, and one to be implemented on October 1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice was posted and passed out at Business Practice Forum # 3, and updated in Sept. 2003. http://www2.transmission.bpa.gov/business/techforum/Decisions_Resolutions/AccountBuildHours52303.pdf
Internal constrained paths	John Anasis gave a presentation on the current and possible future constrained paths and how they affect available transmission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable
CAISO supplemental market schedule	This will have to be done with dynamic schedules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current postings are available on dynamic scheduling. Dynamic scheduling link added to work group web site.

Scheduling WG Report Out (Closed)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
Reconciliation process behind billings.	BPAT will provide communication to customers if process is 30 or more days behind the end of the billing month.	●E-mail updates to BP Forum participants if process is 30 or more days late.

Real Power Losses WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF December 9, 2003	NEXT STEPS
1. Financial losses (ability to settle losses financially through TBL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •TBL and PBL have met to discuss viability of settling losses financially. PBL has determined the option is not viable. PBL will sell losses at their posted rate to any requesting BPAT customers. Customers must sign a a contract with PBL. •TBL is exploring the option of settling losses financially <i>only</i> in the event settlement of loss obligations does not occur within required timeframes. PBL has agreed in principle to accept payment at their posted losses rate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to “closed”. • TBL will need to revise the Real Power Losses business practice to accommodate the proposed practice of charging for losses under limited conditions.
2. Frequency with which customers may change loss providers/ability to designate loss provider by schedule (E-tag)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •TBL will provide customers the option to change loss providers quarterly. This change will be effective March 1, 2004. •The ability to change more frequently than quarterly (i.e., by e-tag) requires that TBL move loss calculations off of RODS which is unlikely until at least 2005. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize revised BP providing for quarterly changes to loss providers. • Continue to report on status of ability to make more frequent changes to loss providers.
3. Reconciliation of losses	Workgroup is developing a paper on a process and timelines for reconciliation of losses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work group is reviewing draft proposal and should be ready for posting early in 2004.

Real Power Losses WG Report Out (Closed)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
For Transmission Contract Holders, BPA Power Business Line purchases with losses bundled in the price, the ability to have a loss provider other than the PBL for other transmission contracts.	This capability already exists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not applicable.
Concurrent losses	Real Power Losses workgroup has determined that this capability is not desired at this time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not applicable.

Operating Reserves WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF December 9, 2003	NEXT STEPS
<p>Flexibility Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One supplier per transmission customer ● Allowing generators to self-supply ● Rules for arranging for interruptible exports ● Ability to choose split between spinning and supplemental reserve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The flexibility issues were discussed and it was generally agreed they could not be implemented in the near future due to rate case, tracking, and systems issues. ● It was agreed that the ultimate flexibility would be for the customer to select the Operating Reserve supplier by schedule. Development of TBL Scheduling systems should not limit future implementation of this flexibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Customers to identify and prioritize a list of flexibilities they would like to see in the future. ● Discussions need to occur within the WECC forum to address tracking of Operating Reserves when a Tag is the schedule.
<p>150 MW floor on Self-Supply</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TBL incorporated customers' suggested criteria for enforcing the 150 MW floor into its most recent Operating Reserves business practice, effective 9/22/03. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Move to "Closed."
<p>Allow small Slice Customers who did not meet TBL's 150 MW criteria on an individual basis to self supply reserves from their Slice Output.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TBL provided an alternative solution to the small Slice Customers' issue on May 29 which included the aggregation of the Slice Customer's resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Slice Customers met with PBL Slice team during the summer and worked out administrative Slice issues resulting in TBL being able to allow small Slice Customers to supply Op Reserves effective 10/1/04. The next task is for TBL, PBL, and the Slice Customers to develop implementation procedures, which we are currently doing. ● Move to "Closed."

Operating Reserves WG Report Out (Closed)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
One supplier per transmission customer	N/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined into Flexibility Issues
Allowing generators to self-supply	N/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined into Flexibility Issues
Rules for arranging for interruptible exports	N/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined into Flexibility Issues
Ability to choose split between spinning and supplemental reserve	N/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined into Flexibility Issues
For L-shaped schedules/ charges, capture rules in Business Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBL provided a list of generic rules for determining OR charges. These rules were designed to avoid double charging for L-shaped schedules. Customers agreed that this works for most cases, but there are some special cases that are not correct. The special case occurs when the generator is pre-scheduled on. During real-time the unit is dispatched off and the original schedules are not re-sourced; instead, power is purchased and scheduled to the generator to cover the pre-schedule commitments. • Work group is satisfied the bulk of normal scheduling practices work well. The exceptions will be documented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The generic rules for determining OR charges are posted on OR work group website.
In-hour schedule changes for those that supply reserves across BPA's system	Agreement that issue should be transferred to Scheduling practices Work Group.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue moved to Scheduling practices Work Group.

Operating Reserves WG Report Out (Closed)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
Selling firm power over non-firm transmission requires operating reserves.	Agreement that this issue should be deferred to the WECC group working on seams issues.	Issue will be handled through established WECC ISAS work groups, not BP Forum.

Curtailment WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF December 9, 2003	NEXT STEPS
Curtailment in real-time based on reservations vs. schedules.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•The TBL has provided the customer proposal to systems staff for a cost estimate for implementation in the 2005 rate period.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advise BP Forum of cost estimate when obtained.

Curtailement WG Report Out (Closed)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
Documentation of curtailement procedures (CAISO, TBL) and minimize seams/differences.	At the February 7, 2003 Business Practices Technical Forum, TBL presented procedures developed in consultation with the CAISO for mid-hour emergencies involving the AC Intertie or the private NOB portion of the DC Intertie.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TBL/CAISO procedures presented on February 7, 2003, are documented and available at the Business Practices Technical Forum Website (see “TBL Curtailement Procedures”) at: http://www2.transmission.bpa.gov/Business/techforum/WorkGroups/Curtailement.cfm
Timeline of Business Practices or issues that other entities (WECC, ISAS) are developing.	At the February 7, 2003, Business Practices Technical Forum, the Curtailement Work Group recommended, and the Business Practices Technical Forum agreed, that there was nothing for the work group to address until WECC’s ISAS committee finished their work. This issue will be reopened in the event outside discussion creates a need for further review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This “Closed Curtailement Work Group Issues” matrix provides documentation regarding workgroup efforts on this issue.

Wind WG Report Out (Inactive)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
<p>Wind/Intermittent Generation Scheduling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •At the February 7, 2003, Business Practices Technical Forum, the Wind Work group reported that there was a lack of unanimity within the work group about the FPL energy proposed scheduling format. The FPL format came from CAISO and SMD, and was not a perfect fit in the Northwest. •The work group intends to revisit the scope of issues to be discussed, and will present new ideas at a future Business Practices Technical Forum. This work group is “inactive” until new issues are brought forward to the forum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This “Inactive Wind Work Group Issues” matrix provides the documentation regarding work group efforts on this issue.
<p>Alternatives for scheduling.</p> <p>FERC proposal: Wind generator tied to forecast schedule and settled monthly aggregated amount.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •At the February 7, 2003, Business Practices Technical Forum, the work group reported that a better understanding of integration costs is needed to advance these issues. Also, they would seek more wind forecast data to develop a proposal(s), and obtain input from TBL on various forecast methods. •The work group intends to revisit the scope of issues to be discussed, and will present ideas at a future Business Practices Technical Forum. This work group is “inactive” until new issues are brought forward to the forum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This “Inactive Wind Work Group Issues” matrix provides the documentation regarding work group efforts on this issue.