

Scheduling WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF March 18, 2003	NEXT STEPS
2. Long-term requests cannot be submitted over the OASIS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All systems needs are currently undergoing prioritization.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Await TBL funding decisions and report back to BP Forum.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of scheduling systems status provided. 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. Continuation of Scheduling Automation Conference calls and workshops.

Updated 3/17/2004

Real Power Losses WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF March 18, 2003	NEXT STEPS
<p>2. Frequency with which customers may change loss providers/ability to designate loss provider by schedule (E-tag)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBL has provided 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"> • Continue to report on status of ability to make more frequent changes to loss providers.
<p>3. Reconciliation of losses</p>	<p>Workgroup is developing a paper on a process and timelines for reconciliation of losses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work group is reviewing draft proposal and should be ready for posting soon.

Operating Reserves WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF March 18, 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.

Curtailment WG Report Out (Pending)

ISSUES	CURRENT STATUS AS OF March 18, 2003	NEXT STEPS
Curtailment in real-time based on reservations vs. schedules.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TBL systems staff analyzed this request and determined that the initial cost for a site license of the software that provides this capability would be between \$30,000 and \$45,000.• This is the base cost, and does not include customization costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advise BP Forum of cost estimate when obtained.

Wind WG Report Out

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
Wind/Intermittent Generation Scheduling	<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 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 matrix provides the documentation regarding work group efforts on this issue.

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.
1. Intermediate transfer party included in tag should have say so/deny tag.	This issue is NERC policy and outside the control of TBL. This issue has been requested of NERC to no avail. Interested customers should directly request this change of NERC via established NERC channels.	Closed
3. Customer notified by TBL when they are about to exceed their transmission demand.	“PATH DEMAND” feature of the Scheduling Automation Project provides this. Path Demand will be available when scheduling automation is operational.	Closed
5. In hour schedule changes for those that supply reserves across BPA’s system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue was transferred from the Operating Reserves Work Group to the Scheduling Practices Work Group. • This issue gets at 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.

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.	Not applicable.
Concurrent losses	Real Power Losses workgroup has determined that this capability is not desired at this time.	Not applicable.
1. Financial losses (ability to settle losses financially through TBL)	TBL and PBL have met to discuss viability of settling losses financially. PBL has determined the option is not viable.	Move to “closed”. PBL will continue to sell losses to any customer that requests this directly from PBL.

Operating Reserves WG Report Out (Closed)

ISSUES	CONCLUSION SUMMARY	DOCUMENTATION
One supplier per transmission customer	N/a	Combined into Flexibility Issues
Allowing generators to self-supply	N/a	Combined into Flexibility Issues
Rules for arranging for interruptible exports	N/a	Combined into Flexibility Issues
Ability to choose split between spinning and supplemental reserve	N/a	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 instance is 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 fine. The exceptions will be documented 	The generic rules for determining operating reserves charges are posted on the work group website.

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.
150 MW floor on Self-Supply	<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. 	Closed
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.	<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"> • 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. • Closed

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.