

Minutes
EQR Users Group
July 11, 2003

Action Items

1. FERC staff will schedule a meeting for the week of August 10 to discuss standardizing Product Name and Control Area fields
2. FERC staff will provide a summary of the current Product Names and how frequently they are currently used
3. Members of the EQR UG will provide possible valid Product Names and definitions
4. FERC staff will circulate NERC Control Area names from NERC website to identify whether the list reflects the appropriate level of granularity
5. FERC staff will circulate develop a proposed policy for timing of re-filings
6. FERC staff will circulate develop a proposed policy to address day ahead/real-time issues

Agenda Item 1. Further Standardization of EQR Fields

Steve Reich of FERC staff discussed the problems associated with lack of standardization for two key fields in the EQR form.

Product Names: 48 valid options with no set definitions and some apparent overlap

Point of Delivery/Receipt, Control Areas: Over 1,200 entries for field intended to allow regional aggregation

Mr. Reich introduced Rae McQuade, Executive Director of the North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB), to discuss how NAESB works with industry to determine standards. Ms. McQuade provided a detail description of the NAESB process designed to develop an industry-wide consensus on standards. In the discussion, Mr. Reich suggested that the EQR UG work with NAESB to develop the standards. It was the sense of the group, however, that:

The EQR UG could develop the standards without the assistance of NAESB

The starting point for the Control Area standards should be the list provided on the NERC website (<http://www.nerc.com/~filez/rs.html>)

Members of the EQR UG will provide possible valid Product Names and definitions for discussion at a meeting during the week of August 10.

Agenda Item 2. Other Issues

ISOs and the EQR: Barbara Bourque (FERC Staff) discussed an issue raised by Steve Smith (Connective) regarding whether the EQR data could be available from the ISOs

Mr. Smith suggested that:

- 2...1. ISOs don't report transactions to their members at the level of detail requested. He also indicated that ISOs have all the information themselves. Additionally, many of the transactions were for small

amounts of money and would likely be of little value to people looking at the data

Ms. Bourque indicated FERC Staff's sensitivity to the burden, but also expressed the Commission's overriding interest to fulfill its statutory requirements. She suggested that the EQR UG was a step toward addressing these issues.

During the discussion, members of the group made clear that getting the ISOs to supply EQR information would require FERC action

Day-Ahead/Real-Time Reporting

Ms. Bourque suggested a solution to the problem of how to report a day-ahead sale of 100 MWh at \$50/MWh with a real-time delivery of 90 MWh at a time when the price is \$55/MWh. The suggested solution was an ENERGY sale of 90 MWh at \$50 and an ENERGY IMBALANCE of 10 MWh at \$55/MWh. Alternatively, the 10 MWh is a bookout.

During the discussion, it was suggested that this solution is onerous.

Several of the participants indicated that ISOs provide only overall net positions so matching individual hourly shifts in the net is difficult.

Ms. Bourque indicated that she and Mr. Reich will revisit the question and endeavor to post an answer on the EQR web page.

Refiling Timing: A few participants have raised the issue that final settlement with their ISO occurs after the EQR filing deadline. They have asked what the policy is regarding deadlines on filing EQR data that has been changed after the EQR due date.

Ms. Bourque indicated that the Commission's interest is to have quality data. She also raised the possibility that delay in the initial filing deadline to accommodate the settlement process may give rise to a monthly, rather than a quarterly, filing requirement

PJM doesn't go to settlement until 60 days after the end of the quarter.

CA-ISO sends initial settlement data after 45 days. Final settlement data is sent after 90 days.

Agenda Item 3. Web Queries

Mr. Reich discussed the web queries that were sent to the EQR UG. He indicated that some users had asked for some way to query across a given customer. He also showed how the Contracts by Company query could be used to help search for customers. He indicated that the queries would be made available shortly on the EQR web page.

Agenda Item 4. Value of the EQR UG

Mr. Reich asked whether this meeting and this sort of meeting is useful in the format in which it was held

Participants suggested that the meetings should only be held for a specific purpose. As for the timing, meetings should be held shortly after filing instead of just before. There was also some problem with remote users in getting recognized to speak.