

Meeting Notes

Project 2010-05.2 SPECIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

Standard Drafting Team

October 14, 2014 | 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. PT
 October 15-16, 2014 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. PT
 October 17, 2014 | 8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. PT

NV Energy
 Reno, NV

Administrative

- Introductions and chair remarks**

Gene Henneberg, the chair, brought the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. PT on Tuesday, October 14, 2014 and welcomed everyone. Those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member or Observer
Gene Henneberg	NV Energy / Mid-American	Member
Bobby Jones	Southern Company	Member
Amos Ang	Southern California Edison	Member
John Ciufu*	Hydro One Inc	Member
Alan Engelmann	ComEd / Exelon	Member
Charles-Eric Langlois (Oct 14-16 only)	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie	Member
Robert J. O'Keefe	American Electric Power	Member
Hari Singh (Oct 15-16 only)	Xcel Energy	Member
Al McMeekin	NERC	Member
Lacey Ourso (Oct 15-17 only)	NERC	Observer
Syed Ahmad	FERC	Observer
Jonathan Meyer (Oct 15-17 only)	Idaho Power	Observer
*via teleconference		

- **Determination of quorum**

The rule for NERC standard drafting team (SDT or team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as 8 of the 10 voting members were either present or on the teleconference for most of the meeting.

- **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement**

Mr. McMeekin reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement disclaimer. The first day (October 14) was a closed meeting because the ballot for the RAS definition had not closed yet.

- **Review team roster**

The team reviewed the roster and confirmed that it was accurate.

- **Approve meeting minutes**

The meeting notes from the August 12-14 San Francisco meeting and the August 21-22 teleconferences were reviewed. All of the notes were approved.

Agenda Items

1. Discuss comments received

The SDT initially reviewed the comments received from 10 entities prior to the ballot closing on October 14. Gene Henneberg and Phil Tatro had already provided some thoughts regarding the comments. The next day, the full set of comments was received and the team spent much time over the next two days in reviewing the comments. The main issues included the following:

- A commenter asserted that ‘reclosing’ in Exclusion ‘d’ should not be capitalized because it is not a defined term in the Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards.
- A few commenters questioned the general formatting of the definition and the need to contain an exclusion list.
- A commenter questioned the list of objectives in the definition stating that the first objective “Meet requirements identified in the NERC Reliability Standards” should be the only objective. The commenter asserted that the definition of RAS should be limited to applications relevant to the NERC Reliability Standards.
- Several commenters wanted more examples provided in Exclusion ‘e’, which already specified “transformer top-oil temperature”. Commenters suggested other common schemes such as reverse power, transformer winding temperature, and loss of cooling.
- A commenter questioned the inclusion of the BES modifier in the list of objectives. The commenter wanted to include non-BES Facilities as identified by the Reliability Coordinator.
- A commenter questioned the inclusion of the BES modifier in Exclusion ‘a.’ The drafting team agreed that Protection Systems installed for the purpose of detecting Faults on non-BES

Elements do not meet the definition of RAS, and thus are not subject to the RAS-related NERC Reliability Standards.

- Numerous commenters described various scheme scenarios asking the drafting team's opinion on whether or not the scenarios would be deemed RAS based on the definition.
- Several commenters questioned why the RAS definition does not provide delineation between schemes that have different levels of impact on the BES.
- Several commenters raised concerns with the modifications the drafting team made to the Implementation Plans for PRC-024-1 and PRC-025-1.

After the ballot results became known with the definition passing ballot, the SDT did not want to make any substantive changes to the definition unless there was a very good reason to do so. Therefore, only one editorial change was made – replacing a capital R with a lower case r in the phrase “Automatic reclosing”.

2. Develop responses to comments

The SDT spent a lot of time developing individual responses to the comments received. The responses are contained in the Consideration of Comments document.

3. Update FAQ

The FAQ document was updated in many areas to better clarify some of the issues raised in the comments that had been received.

4. Next steps

- a. The definition will be posted for final ballot around October 28th.

5. Future meeting(s)

- a. January 20-23, 2015 | Location to be determined
- b. February 10-12, 2015 | Tampa, FL

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. PT on Friday, October 17, 2014.