

## Meeting Notes Real-time Operations SDT — Project 2007-03

March 25–27, 2008  
Carmel, IN

### 1. Administrative Items

#### a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EDT on Tuesday, March 25, 2008 at the MISO Conference Center in Carmel, IN. The following members attended:

Ralph Anderson	Paul Bleuss	Jim Case, Chair
Al DiCaprio	Ryan Johnson	Phil Lavallee
Jason Marshall	Steve Myers	Paul Olson
Greg Van Pelt	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	

#### b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

There were no questions raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

#### c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — Jim Case

The objective of this meeting was to get as far as possible through the revision of the standards.

### 2. Revise Standards

The SDT reviewed all of the standards assigned to this project. Titles and purpose statements will be reviewed once the requirements have been finalized. The following revisions were agreed upon at the meeting:

#### **TOP-001-2** (review based on 3/13 draft)

- R1: Delete — This statement is not needed in a reliability standard. The standards already require the necessary actions. This statement doesn't really protect the operator.
- R2: Delete — Similar reasoning to R1.

- R3: The reference to RC can be deleted as it is covered in the RC Project. (This has been confirmed with Steve Crutchfield.) ‘Without intentional delay’ was deleted but the SDT will pose a question to the industry on this topic.
- R4: The context of this requirement was moved to R3.
- R5: Delete — Load shedding is now an accepted TOP reliability directive.
- R6: Delete — Duplicative of COM-002-2, R1.1.
- R7: Delete phrase where others must have instituted their emergency procedures first as unmeasurable. Delete ‘without intentional delay.’
- R8: Reworded for clarity.
- R8.1: Delete — This is now covered in the newly worded R8.
- R9: Delete — This is now covered in the newly worded R8.
- R10. Deleted.
- R11: Delete — It is duplicative of COM-002-2, R1.

**TOP-002-2** (review based on BOT approved version)

- R1: The BA was deleted as they only need to respond to CPS and DCS so this requirement isn’t applicable to them. Wording was lifted from IRO-007-2, R1 and made applicable to the TOP.
- R2: Delete — This is simply good utility practice and unmeasurable.
- R3: In the first sentence, delete BA as they are covered in IRO-004-1, R4. Also, delete the TSP as they are not applicable for reliability purposes. In the second sentence, wording was lifted from IRO-004-1, R4 and made applicable for the TOP.
- R4: Delete — Duplicated in IRO-005-2, R9.
- R5: Delete — No longer required with the definition of Operational Planning Analysis.
- R6: Delete — The BA is covered in BAL-002-0, R4 and the TOP is covered in the new R2.
- R7: Delete — Duplicative of BAL-002-0, R1.
- R8: Delete — Not applicable to the BA.
- R9: Delete — Duplicated in BAL-001 and BAL-002.
- R10: Delete — BA is not applicable and the TOP is now covered in the new R2.
- R11: First sentence is now covered in R1 and can be deleted. The second sentence is covered in IRO-005-2, R13 and can be deleted. The first half of the third sentence is covered in R1 and can be deleted. The second half of the third sentence was moved to R3.
- R12: Delete — Covered by the ATC Project. (This has been confirmed with Andy Rodriguez.)

- R13: Delete — Verification at request is not needed in this standard. The Generator Verification SDT was notified of this action.
- R14: Delete the two retired sub-requirements. Move the remaining sub-requirement up to the main requirement and introduce a thirty minute time period as well as a 20MW or 5% limit. The SDT will pose this change to the industry in the question set.
- R15: Delete — Covered by the new R5.
- R16: Delete — Covered by IRO-010-1, R3.
- R17: Delete — Covered by IRO-010-1, R3.
- R18: Delete ‘neighboring’.
- R19: Deleted as unmeasurable.

**TOP-003-0** (review based on 3/14 draft)

- R1: Deleted as there are no more sub-requirements.
- R1.1: Delete — Covered by TOP-002-3, R8.
- R1.2: Delete RC as they are covered in IRO-010. Move the remainder to TOP-002-3, R8. The SDT will pose a question on this topic.
- R1.3: Deleted as this was covered in the changes made to TOP-002-3.
- R2: Delete — This is covered in TOP-002-3.
- R3: Delete — This is covered in TOP-002-3.
- R4: Delete — This is covered in the RC Project. (This has been confirmed with Steve Crutchfield.)

**TOP-004-2** (review based on 3/14 draft)

- R1: Delete ‘SOL’ as unnecessary for reliability. The SDT will pose a question on this topic. The SDT will propose new wording for IROL and IROL Tv using ‘exceeded’ in place of ‘violated’ as there are other connotations for violated that don’t fit here.
- R2: Delete — This is covered by FAC-011-1, R2.
- R3: Delete — This is covered by FAC-011-1, R3.
- R4: Delete as unmeasurable and redundant with R1.
- R5: Delete the first sentence as unmeasurable. Delete the second sentence as redundant with TOP-001-2.
- R6: Delete as the sub-requirements are gone.
- R6.1: Delete — Covered in FAC-008 and FAC-009.
- R6.2: Delete — Voltage issues covered in VAR-001-1, R1 and real power covered in the new R2.
- R6.3: Delete — This is covered in the new R7.
- R6.4: Delete — This is covered in TOP-002-3.
- R6.5: Delete — This is covered in FAC-011 and FAC-014.
- R6.6: Delete — This is now covered in TOP-002-3.

- Add in data requirements similar to planning in TOP-002-3.

**TOP-005-1** (review based on 3/14 draft)

- R1: Delete — This is covered in IRO-010-1, R3.
- R1.1: Delete — This has been covered by the RC Project. (This has been confirmed with Steve Crutchfield.)
- R2: Delete — This is not a true reliability issue.
- R3: Delete — This is now covered in TOP-002-3.
- R4: Delete — PSE has no unique data required by the TOP or BA for reliability.

**TOP-006-1** (review based on 3/14 draft)

- R1: Deleted as all of the sub-requirements are gone.
- R1.1: Delete — This is now covered in TOP-002-3.
- R1.2: Delete — This is covered in IRO-010-1, R3.
- R2: Delete the BA as they don't handle this information. Delete real power references as they are now covered in TOP-004-2, R2. Delete the voltage references as they are covered in VAR-001-1, R1 and R6. Delete the RC as they are covered in the RC project. (This has been confirmed with Steve Crutchfield.) Delete the remainder as it is covered in the new TOP-002-3, R8.
- R3: Delete — This is covered in PRC-001-1, R1.
- R4: Delete load pattern as it is covered in TOP-002-3, R8. Delete the remainder as it is not a true reliability issue.
- R5: Delete RC as they are covered in the RC Project. (This has been confirmed with Steve Crutchfield.)
- R6: Delete — This is now covered in TOP-004-2, R2.
- R7: Delete RC as they are covered in the RC project. (This has been confirmed with Steve Crutchfield.) Delete BA as they are covered in BAL-005-0b, R14. Move the TOP requirement to TOP-004-2.

**TOP-007-1** (review based on 3/14 draft)

- R1: Retain but ask a question about retaining 'SOL' with regard to a possible RC overload of messages.
- R2: Lifted wording from IRO-009-1, R4 and made applicable for the TOP. Now, both the RC and the TOP are on the hook.
- R3: Delete — Duplicative of the new R2.
- WECC variance — It is not clear that this variance, TOP-STD-007-0 is still needed. Paul Olson will investigate and report back to the SDT in New Orleans.

**TOP-008-0** (review based on 3/14 draft)

- R1: Deleted — This is now covered in TOP-007-1, R2.
- R2: Delete the second sentence as duplicative of IRO-005-2, R13. Reword the first sentence based on IRO wording of similar requirement.
- R3: Delete first sentence as a bad operating practice as it eliminates operator flexibility. Delete second sentence as it is now covered in TOP-004-2, new R7.
- R4: Delete — This is now covered in TOP-004-2.

**PER-001-0** (review based on BOT approved standard)

- R1: Delete — This statement is not needed in a reliability standard. The standards already require the necessary actions. This statement doesn't really protect the operator.

**3. Next Steps — Jim Case**

Ed will ship out the marked up versions from the meeting. SDT members are to review this material for the New Orleans meeting with emphasis on major changes and including any requirements that may have been missed by a simple review of the existing standard requirements.

In New Orleans, the SDT will concentrate on VRF, Time Horizons, and Measures. If time permits, Compliance will be started in New Orleans.

**4. Schedule Next Meetings — All**

- a. New Orleans, LA (Entergy): Thursday, April 24, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT; Friday, April 25, 2008 from 8 a.m.–noon EDT. Details will be provided.
- b. Conference call and WebEx on May 22, 2008 from 1–5 p.m. EDT. Details will be provided.

**5. Review Action Items & Project Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski**

The following action items were developed at this meeting:

- WECC variance — It is not clear that this variance, TOP-STD-007-0 is still needed. Paul Olson will investigate and report back to the SDT in New Orleans.
- Ed will ship out the marked up versions from the meeting. SDT members are to review this material for the New Orleans meeting with emphasis on major changes and including any requirements that may

have been missed by a simple review of the existing standard requirements.

- The SDT will decide in New Orleans as to when the meeting with FERC staff should take place.

The following items were marked for possible questions in the first posting:

- Q1: Relative to TOP-001, R3 (and other requirements) — Ask the industry about the need for including ‘without intentional delay’.
- Q2: Relative to TOP-002, R13 — Ask the industry about the 30 minute time requirement and the 20MW/5% limits.
- Q3: Relative to TOP-003, R1.2 — Ask the industry about including this in TOP-002-3, R8.
- Q4: Relative to TOP-004-2, R1 — Ask the industry about deleting ‘SOL’.
- Q5: Relative to TOP-007-1, R1 — Ask the industry about retaining SOL due to a possible overload of messages at the RC.

The draft schedule was reviewed and the SDT made the following comments:

- The schedule for this project is highly dependent on the IRO and RC projects. The IRO Project must finish ahead of this project. The RC Project completion needs to be coordinated with this project. Any delays in either of these projects will impact the schedule for these projects.
- Schedule a conference call, WebEx, and another meeting prior to the first posting.
- Place additional time between ballot and re-ballot to allow for review and possible adjustments.
- Schedule for three postings.
- Assume that all standards will move to ballot together.
- Allow sixty days for the first posting due to the volume of changes.
- Schedule a meeting with FERC staff. (The decision as to when this meeting should take place will be made in New Orleans.)

## **6. Adjourn**

The Chair thanked MISO for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m. EDT on Thursday, March 27, 2008.