

Meeting Notes for Project 2007-03 Real-Time Operations SDT

Tuesday, June 16 - 18, 2009

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 3:00p.m. CDT on Tuesday, June 16, 2009 in the Entergy office in Southaven, MS. Meeting participants were:

Paul BleussJim Case, ChairAl DiCaprioPhil LavalleeJason MarshallSteve MyersIbrahim Oweis, FERCEd Dobrowolski, NERCObserverObserver

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — Jim Case

The objective of the meeting was to finalize the comment responses from the second posting.

2. Discuss Proposed Responses to Comments

a. Questions 1 – Phil Lavallee

Phil had provided a draft response via e-mail. The SDT reviewed the response and decided that based on industry comments, the phrase "provided that the requesting entity has implemented its comparable emergency procedures" would be retained.

b. Questions 2 – Karl Tammer

Karl did not provide a draft response so Jim Case drafted a response which the SDT reviewed. Since there was no consensus within the industry, the



SDT retained the Generator Operator as an applicable entity for the requirement.

c. Question 3 – Jason Marshall

Jason provided a detailed response which the SDT reviewed. Based on industry comments, the SDT added a new requirement to clarify that a subset of SOLs needs to be reported.

d. Question 4 – Steve Myers

Steve provided a detailed response which the SDT reviewed and accepted. The majority of respondents agreed with the SDT's position and so TOP-004-3, Requirement R2 was deleted. Since there was only one requirement remaining in TOP-004-3, it was decided to move that requirement to TOP-001-2. TOP-004 will be retired.

e. Question 5 – Greg Van Pelt

Greg provided a detailed response which the SDT reviewed and accepted. Based on industry comments, the SDT will not draft a North American wide outage advance notice requirement.

f. Questions 6 – Paul Bleuss

Paul provided a partial response which the SDT reviewed. Numerous requirement changes were made as a result of industry comments.

3. Revise Standards as Required

Changes to the standard requirements were tied to the comment responses and made during the meeting. A new definition for 'Reliability Directive' was also proposed.

4. Develop Questions for Third Posting

There will be one general question for each of the remaining standards: TOP-001-2, TOP-002-3, and TOP-003-1 where all comments on any aspect of that standard will be aggregated.

There will be a specific question regarding the content of the new definition.

There will be one final question to determine if the industry feels that the project is ready to go to ballot.



5. Next Steps — Jim Case

Ed will clean up the documents and distribute them for review. The SDT will have one final chance to comment on the documents during the next conference call.

6. Schedule Next Meetings

A conference call was scheduled for Wednesday, July 1, 2009 from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. EDT. The purpose of the call will be to finalize the documents for the third posting. Details will be distributed.

7. Review Action Items & Project Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

There were no specific action items developed during the meeting.

The project is about one month behind the published schedule.

8. Adjourn

The Chair thanked Entergy for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at noon CDT on Thursday, June 18, 2009.