

## Meeting Notes Underfrequency Load Shedding SDT — Project 2007-01

February 11, 2009 | 1–5 p.m. Central  
February 12, 2009 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. Central  
February 13, 2009 | 8 a.m.–noon Central

### 1. Administrative

#### a) Roll Call

Stephanie Monzon welcomed the members and guests of the Standard Drafting Team for Project 2007-01 Underfrequency Load Shedding (see Roster — **Attachment 1a**).

- Philip Tatro — National Grid (Chair)
- Paul Attaway — Georgia Transmission Corporation
- Brian Bartos — Bandera Electric Cooperative (Day 2 and on)
- Jonathan Glidewell — Southern Company Transmission Co.
- Gerald Keenan — Bonneville Power Administration
- Robert W. Millard — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Steven Myers — Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.
- Mak Nagle — Southwest Power Pool
- Robert J. O'Keefe — American Electric Power
- Robert Williams — Florida Municipal Power Agency
- Brian Evans Mongeon — Utility Services, LLC
- Stephanie Monzon — NERC

Observers:

- Anthony Jablonski — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Scott Sells — FERC Staff
- Scott Berry — Indiana Municipal Power Agency (Day 2)

#### b) NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines provided in **Attachment 1b**. 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.

## **2. Draft Standard (Performance Characteristics)**

The team met via conference call on January 30, 2009 to complete a first pass of the draft standard. The team completed its review of the standard; however, tabled several discussions for this meeting. They are as follows:

- The purpose section of the standard will have to be discussed and agreed to by the team.
- The applicability section of the standard requires discussion regarding whether the DPs belong in the standard.
- Requirement R5 requires more discussion.
- Requirement R12 requires more discussion as the team was not able to properly vet the language the Phil proposed in his e-mail.

The team began by discussing Requirement R7 and Requirement R8. The team had deferred a decision on whether to keep R7, R8 or both until this meeting.

Brian M. indicated that he has had discussions with others that have led him to believe that Requirement R8 would be in some way covered in PRC-024 Generator Verification. Others in the team felt uncomfortable with assuming that it is covered without seeing it as a requirement/written. It may be implicit but not explicit.

Brian made another point that the relationship between R7 and R8 is an if/then statement: if R8 then R7. Using this logic the accountability falls with R7 because you cannot enforce the "if" R8 when the only required action is with the "then" R7.

(Note taken from the standard): January 30, 2009 — the team will defer deciding whether to keep R7 or R8 or both to the Austin meeting on February 11, 2009. The team identified these options but cannot resolve how R7 could be proved (how it is measurable). Brian M. has a concern that the requirements are silent on the timing requirements that are at play between R7 and R8. Some preferred to delete R7 to ensure the burden is on the GO. Others preferred to keep R7 because it implies R8 (and ultimately the program must be designed to comply with the performance characteristics) and deleting R8 (because R8 introduces the need for a contractual obligation). In addition, this contractual obligation is an OPTION but not a necessity to ensure that the program meets the performance characteristics.

February 11, 2009 — the team discussed R7 vs. R8. A suggestion was made to include a requirement for the generator to provide set-points to the pc to be able to do

R7 but others indicated that this requirement should be captured and is most appropriate for PRC-024 (and we should be verifying with that team that this requirement will be captured to include this information in the posting).

The team dropped the “If necessary” part of R7 because we are not requiring the entity to achieve the goal in this specific way. The team proceeded to reword R7 and eliminate R8. The team reviewed and revised the Purpose statement. The team reviewed and revised the Applicability section. The team revised Requirement R3 and made minor edits to keep it consistent with the other requirements. The team deleted “system operations” from the list of ways to identify islands because it seemed redundant and covered by with “historical events” based on system operations.

The team revised Requirement R5 and Requirement R5.1 to make it consistent with the other requirements and to add clarity.

The team revised Requirement R6 by including the equation and definition of “imbalance” in the requirement. The team also clarified in Requirement R6.2 that “events” is per simulated event, the team had received many comments about this being unclear in the first posting.

The team discussed **Requirement R6.4 at length. The comments had indicated that the Regions should be allowed to identify the specific locations that are applicable to this requirement, that the “net” cast by specifying the BES is not necessarily correct. The team deliberated on several ways to make this requirement more specific and address these comments. The team could not finalize the wording but decided that it might be best to reference the specifications in the registration criteria for generators BUT the team did decide to give this more thought and finalize the language during the next calls.**

### **3. Response to Comments — Second Pass**

The team conducted a second pass of the response to comments. After having made several decisions regarding the technical elements of the standard the team can now provide responses to the comments based on these technical decisions (and the requirements in the proposed standard).

The team completed a second pass of questions Q1–Q5. The team decided to set up several conference calls to complete their second pass of questions (Q6–Q9). The team assigned the remaining questions to sub-teams to provide/review responses to Stephanie for review during the conference calls. This will facilitate the completion of the second pass to the response to comments.

### **4. Project Schedule**

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the project schedule with the team. The schedule indicated a completion date of late Q4 2009. The team made one modification to the

second posting date which was scheduled to start in February 2009 but will not be possible given the time spent on deliberating on the overall approach. The team will be working towards a 30 day posting beginning in March 2009.

## 5. Action Items

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the actions that were open at the end of the meeting January 30, 2009.

| Action Items:  | Status:   | Assigned To:                     |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| The remaining questions for the comment report:<br>Question 6: Phil T. and Jonathan<br>Question 7: Gary K.<br>Question 8: Larry B. and Bob M.<br>Question 9: Rob O.  | <b>Completed</b>  | See first column                 |
| Stephanie will compile the draft responses and send out to the SDT prior to the next meeting (October 22–23).  | <b>Completed</b>  | Stephanie                        |
| Stephanie will draft the first draft of Option 3 and distribute to a sub group for review. Stephanie will use the description of Option 3 to facilitate her initial discussion with Gerry Adamski and Dave Cook. Stephanie will be expecting Dana, Rob, Phil, and Bob to weigh in on the draft description.  | <b>Completed</b>  |                                  |
| Stephanie will follow up with the team via email regarding her initial discussion with NERC Management on the feasibility of Option 3.   | <b>Completed</b>  |                                  |
| Stephanie to follow-up with Compliance and Standards to determine if the draft standard can require that the group of PC's use their regional standards development processes to develop the UFLS program.   | <b>Created 2/11</b><br><b>By 2/20 conference call</b>                     | Stephanie                        |
| Standard:<br>The team needs to finalize the language in Requirement R6.4 – generator level   | <b>Created 2/11</b><br><b>To be discussed on the 2/20 conference call</b> | All                              |
| Response to Comments:<br>Question 6: Phil and Jonathan have a draft for the <b>2/20</b> conference call (by 2/19)<br>Question 7: Rob and Brian M. to have a draft for the <b>2/20 call</b> (by 2/19)<br>Question 8: Brian Bartos to have a draft <b>for 2/27</b> conference call (by 2/24)<br>Question 9: Rob to have a draft for <b>the 2/27</b> conference | <b>Created 2/11</b>   | Rob, Brian B.,<br>Phil, Brian M. |

| Action Items:  | Status:      | Assigned To:    |
|--|--------------|-----------------|
| call (by 2/24)   |              |                 |
| General Response to Comments (Find/Replace) – Jonathan at the final pass of the comment report (March 4 <sup>th</sup> )                    | Created 2/11 | Jonathan        |
| General Response to Comments – Summary of Comments – Stephanie and Phil to have a draft <b>2/27 (by 2/24)</b>                              | Created 2/11 | Stephanie, Phil |
| Mapping Document (characteristics to the draft standard) – Phil to create first draft by 2/24/09 (to be reviewed on the <b>2/27 call</b> ) | Created 2/11 | Phil            |
| Comment Form – Stephanie to have a draft for the <b>3/4 conference call</b>  | Created 2/11 | Stephanie       |

## 6. Next Steps

The group will identify next steps.

| Date   | Location                    | Comments   |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
| January 30, 2009 from 1–3 p.m. EST   | Conference Call             | Complete January 13, 2009 agenda   |
| February 11, 2009 from noon–5 p.m. with lunch<br>February 12, 2009 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. with lunch<br>February 13, 2009 from 8 a.m.–noon | Austin, TX<br>ERCOT Offices | ERCOT to host — confirmed with Steve   |
| February 20, 2009 from 1–3 p.m. EST  | Conference Call and WebEx   | To discuss Question 6 and Question 7 (response to comments) and to discuss Requirement R6.4            |
| February 27, 2009 from 1–3 p.m. EST  | Conference Call and WebEx   | To discuss Question 8 and Question 9, General Response to Comments (summary) and the Mapping Document. |
| March 4, 2009 from 1–3 p.m. EST  | Conference Call and WebEx   | To discuss the Comment Form and one final review of the response to comments.                          |

|   |         |  |
|---|---------|--|
| April 29–30, 2009<br>8 a.m.–5 p.m. on both days | Atlanta | Jonathan to confirm<br>Southern Co.'s availability |
|---|---------|--|

**Things that need to get completed before the second posting:**

Comment Form — Stephanie to have a draft for the **March 4<sup>th</sup> conference call**

Response to Comments

Question 5 — Completed on 2/13/09

Question 6 — Phil and Jonathan have a draft for the **2/20** conference call (2/19)

Question 7 — Rob and Brian M. to have a draft for the **2/20 call (2/19)**

Question 8 — Brian Bartos to have a draft **for 2/27** conference call (2/24)

Question 9 — Rob by 2/24 have a draft for **the 2/27** conference call

General Response to Comments (Find/Replace) — Jonathan at the final pass of the comment report (March 4<sup>th</sup>)

General Response to Comments — Summary of Comments — Stephanie and Phil to have a draft **2/27 (by 2/24)**

Mapping Document (characteristics to the draft standard) — Phil to create first draft by 2/24/09 (to be reviewed on the **2/27 call**)

**7. Adjourn**