

## Meeting Notes for Project 2007-06 System Protection Coordination Standard Drafting Team

**July 21, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. EDT**

**July 22, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. EDT**

Georgia Power Co. Conference Center  
241 Ralph McGill Boulevard  
Atlanta, GA

### **1. Introductions and Quorum**

Start time 8:00 a.m. EDT

Participants:

Art Buanno – Chairman

Aaron Cooperberg

Sam Francis

Bill Middough,

Phil Winston

Al Calafiore – NERC Coordinator

By phone: Dave Cirka, Kevin Wempe

### **2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

Al Calafiore and Art Buanno reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and there were no questions raised.

### **3. Standards Comments and Revisions**

The main objective to the meeting was to make final revisions to the draft revised standard in an effort to move toward initial posting; and to address comments from Maureen Long and David Taylor following an initial review of the draft.

The Drafting Team (DT) continued the process of addressing the comments and moved the document along to be sent to NERC for review for first posting.

One issue from previous conference calls/meetings was the following:

FERC Staff expressed that the statement regarding applicable facilities as proposed by Maureen Long was unacceptable. Maureen's proposal replaced an exclusionary

note on underfrequency and undervoltage load shedding written by the DT. The exclusionary note would also have been unacceptable to the FERC staff since it had the same intention.

The proposed statement under the applicability section was as follows:

- 1. Applicability:**
  - 1.1. Functional Entities:**
    - 1.1.1** Transmission Owners.
    - 1.1.2** Generator Owners.
    - 1.1.3** Distribution Providers that own Transmission Line Protection Systems or that interconnect with Generator Owners.
  - 1.2. Facilities:**
    - 1.2.1** All protection systems except underfrequency load shedding and undervoltage load shedding that are applied on, or are designed to provide protection for the Bulk Electric System (BES).

The concern of the FERC staff was that this standard should apply to all facilities and be an over all standard on protection coordination. Any other standards that may become enforceable in the future can address specifics but this standard should address the over all coordination. Also, part of the concern seems to be that this standard is enforceable now (and by their interpretation it covers everything) and that by putting the proposed statement in the revised standard, it could leave a gap if PRC-001-2 became enforceable before the other applicable standards were approved.

The concern of the drafting team is multiple standards covering the same requirements and double jeopardy.

The DT asked FERC Staff to provide any additional insight it can on how this could be handled as well as identify the coordination gap they are concerned about.

The DT has asked the members to provide suggestions on how to best handle this issue.

At the July 7, 2009 conference call, the DT resolved to change the Applicability Section. The DT made further refinements at the July 21-22, 2009 meeting. The wording was revised to make the standard applicable to a broader set of Protection Systems but the DT still is limiting the scope of coordination to fault clearing. The DT believes that this is justified as the FERC staff's suggestion goes beyond the scope of the original SAR. The System Protection Coordination as defined in the

draft standard is fairly well defined and should be achievable. Other standards are addressing other coordination issues such as PRC-023, PRC-006 and PRC-024.

The Chairman of the DT contacted Bob Millard on July 1, 2009 to discuss coordination with standards PRC-006 and PRC-024. Bob is the chairman of Project 2007-09 on Generator Verification which includes PRC-024. Bob is also a member of the SDT working on PRC-006.

Bob believed that FERC wants PRC-001 to address coordination between different types of Protection Systems such as between the protection in UFLS and UVLS plans. Potentially requiring mitigation if one adversely affects the other. Unfortunately, this analysis is not as much a traditional protection coordination study as it is a planning assessment. He believed that PRC-001 can refer back to the other standards for details. To stretch the scope as FERC staff may desire would probably require an expansion of the DT by adding at least two members with significant planning experience and delay development of the new standard.

#### **4. Next Steps**

The document has been sent to NERC staff for review and first posting. A meeting to address comments and revise the standard will be held following the review or posting.

#### **5. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m. on July 22, 2009.