

Meeting Notes Regional Reliability Standards Working Group

January 27, 2009 | 1–5 p.m. CST
January 28, 2009 | 8 a.m.–noon CST
TRE Offices
Austin, TX

Administrative

1. Introductions and Attendance

Judith James	TRE
Peter Heidrich (on phone)	FRCC
Guy V. Zito (phone)	NPCC
Robert W. Millard	RFC
Patrick Huntley	SERC
Kenneth J. Wilson	WECC
Katy Onnen	SPP
Stephanie Monzon	NERC Staff
Gerry Adamski	NERC Staff

Observers:

Nick Henery	FERC Staff
Scott Sells (on phone)	FERC Staff
Lee Pedowicz	NPCC
Steve Myers	ERCOT
Vann Weldon	ERCOT
Sarah Hensley	TRE
Tony Jablonski (on phone)	RFC
John E. Odom, Jr.	FRCC

Mike Brytowski (on phone)	MRO
Stewart Hansen (on phone)	FERC Staff
Amanda Stevenson	E. On Climate & Renewables
M.J Sonnelitter	Next Era Energy Resources
Matt Pawlowski	Next Era Energy Resources
Tom Foreman	Wholesale Power Services
Dana Showalter	ERCOT
Jason Christopher	FERC Staff

2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

Stephanie reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

RRSWG Topics

3. Review of the January 14-15, 2009 Standards Committee Meeting – Pat Huntley

- a. The SC discussed the interpretation process and approved a new process to field test. Gerry will be taking this to the Board to approve the field test.
- b. New standard suggestion form is the concept similar to the standards work plan input form used to develop the NERC standards work plan (development plan). The suggestion form would allow NERC/SC to better prioritize work as opposed to SARs that require response by the SC.
- c. NERC policy statement for SDT when dealing with FERC directives.

4. Discuss Letter to the Regions (fill in the blanks)

- a. Stephanie and a few members of the RRSWG discussed the letter sent to the Regions in early 2007 to develop the fill in the blank standards with Gerry Adamski. Gerry agreed to send an update to that letter.
- b. Gerry and Stephanie reviewed the content of the proposed letter with the group:
 - a. The letter acknowledges that there is inter-dependency between the continent-wide projects and the regional standards projects.
 - b. The letter encourages the continued development of the regional standards (four fill in the blanks) until the industry (through the standards process) agrees that a regional standard is not needed or the region deems it not necessary for reliability.
 - c. The letter encourages continued support of the RRSWG as it adds value in ensuring consistency with the NERC continent wide efforts; provides a forum for discussing standards related issues (FERC directives, etc.); and ensures consistency amongst the regional standards projects.

- c. The RRSWG made several recommendations that Gerry agreed to incorporate into the next version of the letter. Stephanie will distribute the draft letter to the RRSWG for their review. The letter is intended to be addressed to the Regional Managers of the eight regions.

5. Discuss the Proposed VRF/VSL Development Policy (December 12, 2008 version) and impacts to the Regional Standards Process

- a. Gerry summarized the policy that will be presented to the Board. If passed the SC will be authorized to modify the standards development procedure. This would impact the regional standards development procedure and delegation agreements.
- b. Bob Millard pointed out that the 12/12/08 version included a clause that requires VSLs be developed along with the first posting of the standard. This is a concern because it contradicts current standards development process. Gerry responded that the more recent version includes a footnote that addresses this concern.

6. Discuss Summary of RRSWG to Provide the Standards Committee

- a. Stephanie is looking for input from the RRSWG on the content of the RRSWG document to present at the Standards Committee meeting where the SC will discuss their involvement in the regional standards development processes. Stephanie would like to present this document that describes the good work that the RRSWG conducts to coordinate regional standards activities when the SC discusses their concerns and their involvement.
- b. Guy Zito reviewed the issue with the group regarding the SC involvement in the regional reliability standards process. Among the concerns is that SC involvement will lengthen the approval process for a standard.
- c. Gerry provided some history of the issue – the SC has deliberated on governing the regional evaluation process but at the time did not receive sufficient support (March 13, 2007 – SC Minutes).
- d. Ken Wilson does not think that additional oversight by the SC is necessary but did address the consistency issue – the template specifically the use of a VSL table. Ken indicated that the RRSWG should focus on coordinating closely on the evaluation of regional standards.
- e. Bob Millard emphasized that standards development is evolving (format, templates, etc.). Bob doesn't think that SC oversight will help with consistency in regional standards – but suggested a standards drafting team newsletter with the latest development information.
- f. Judith indicated that the SC meetings are helpful forums to find out what is going on with standards but doesn't agree that SC oversight is the right answer to ensure consistency with the national standards.

- g. Pat Huntley indicated that SC oversight would not be the mechanism to ensure consistency but rather the RRSWG was formed for this purpose. He agreed with the others that the SC meetings are helpful.
- h. Lee agreed that SC oversight would not add efficiency. He indicated that knowing what is happening at the cw level would be beneficial to the regions.
- i. Ken Wilson brought up the added confusion of variance vs. regional standard and suggested that NERC coordination would be helpful early on in the process.
- j. Gerry summarized the conversation.
 - a. Early involvement in the standards process is beneficial
 - b. Increased communication – SDT need to be better equipped with the latest information on how to develop a standard
 - c. NERC role – emphasis on success for all standards
- k. Stephanie suggested that discussing the concerns with the SC at a future meeting to explicitly state the concerns would be helpful. Pat suggested a presentation on the RRSWG at the SC.
- l. Pat Huntley and Guy Zito to develop a first draft presentation to be delivered to the SC.
- m. Gerry added that the SC charter does not include regional oversight and if they decided to add it would have to be approved by the NERC BOT.

7. Review of Standards Committee Process Subcommittee – Stephanie

- a. Review and discuss the RDSP and ROP modified language for Regional Variances as discussed at the last SCPS meeting.
- b. Stephanie gave a brief overview of the status.
 - a. The committee met in December but did not meet in Jan. The draft language is still being modified. Gerry emphasized the need to work with FERC staff to ensure consistency with their understanding of variances.

8. Standards Committee Communications and Planning Subcommittee – Pat Huntley

- a. Pat indicated that NERC is soliciting nominations to serve on the committee.

9. Review and discuss the NERC Regional Standards Evaluation Procedure

- a. Finalize the changes to the procedure during the March RRSWG meeting.
- b. Ken Wilson is to provide updates to the language in the evaluation procedure related to the material a region is to submit to NERC with the standard for approval. This additional information is needed to prepare in the FERC filing.

10. WECC Regional Standards Update

- a. Stephanie reviewed the HL plan to file six WECC regional standards with the Commission – these are replacement standards to the current eight FERC approved WECC regional standards

11. RFC Regional Standards Posting – 45 day Resource Adequacy

- a. Jan. 26 – March 12, 2009
- b. Bob provided an overview of the standard

12. Discuss fill-in-the blanks projects and regional progress

- a. Disturbance Monitoring
 - a. Status on the continent-wide effort
 - i. Stephanie gave a brief overview of the status of the cws. The standard has been reviewed by NERC staff for a second time and NERC staff provided comments. The SDT turned these comments around and re-submitted for posting. The standard is in the queue for posting and is expected to be posted within the next two weeks.
 - ii. This standard is a merging of PRC-002 (NERC BOT approved) and PRC-018 (FERC approved)
 - iii. Bob Millard added that the standard will not include maintenance and testing requirements that are included in the PRC-002/PRC-018 standards. The SDT is looking for industry feedback on modifying the scope of the SAR to include the maintenance and testing requirements.
 - b. Status on the regional standard effort
 - i. NPCC – has posted first draft of its DME standard and working through comments
 - ii. RFC – expecting for 3rd ballot this month (pre ballot and ballot period). Potential RFC board approval 2-3 months.
 - iii. FRCC – currently on hold for the NERC standard and will then determine whether or not to move forward with the regional standard
 - iv. SPP – currently on hold for the NERC standard
- b. Under-frequency Load Shedding
 - a. Status on the continent-wide effort
 - i. Stephanie gave a brief overview of the continent wide effort. The team is working on the response to comments but has also been working on the overall approach. Initially the team had proposed a NERC “Directive” to develop regional standards. After significant feedback

the team had to revisit the approach and decided to develop a continent wide standard with the option of regional standards.

- b. Status on the regional standard effort
 - i. FRCC – end of Feb. posting version 8 (eight postings) of the standard and will continue to pursue the regional standard because FRCC feels that the requirements will be more stringent.
 - ii. MRO – is preparing its first posting
 - iii. RFC – fifth posting is underway through Feb. 19th.
 - iv. NPCC – first meeting SDT
 - v. SPP – first draft still in progress
 - vi. TRE – on hold until NERC posting
 - vii. SERC – completed two posting and working on consideration of comment report. SERC is on hold pending the NERC effort.
- c. Special Protection Systems (regional portion of this project was not scheduled to start until 2010)
 - a. FRCC – no standards project
 - b. RFC – There is an approved SAR but it was put on hold – will be resurrected in 2009
 - c. NPCC – will not work on this until 2010 but there is an approved SAR
- d. Operating Reserves (BAL-002)
 - a. RFC – is proposing to the RFC Board that this standard be processed as a criteria
 - b. FRCC – no standards project
 - c. WECC – BAL-002-WECC-1 standard is being filed with the Commission

13. TRE SAR

- a. Judith reviewed the approved SARs SAR 005, 006,007 to remove LSEs from the NERC standards MOD-017 through MOD-021 and EOP-002.
- b. Susan Vincent (Legal TRE)– Distribution Providers in the ERCOT/TRE region cannot perform all the LSE functions making this solution (as proposed in Order 125) is not suitable for ERCOT/TRE.
 - a. The SAR will include an explanation of how the requirements will be met.
 - b. FERC Staff, Nick Henery, indicated concern with these proposed SARs saying that the regional standard process was not the appropriate way to handle this issue----other regions use a joint agreement. Nick and Bob

Millard both mentioned the functional model and that deleting functions from a standard is not keeping in accordance to the functional model.

14. Regional Standards Projects that should be considered Continent Wide Standards

- a. An original TRE SAR to include TO's and GO's in the CIP-001 applicability
- b. Gerry added that the WECC Transmission Maintenance standard could be addressed at a continent wide level since the source of events is mainly caused by equipment failure
- c. Stephanie added that NERC has a suggestion form that allows the industry to submit ideas to NERC Standards staff on revisions/new standards. This form is posted on the website:

http://www.nerc.com/files/Standards_Input_Form_Final_2008June30.doc

Standing Agenda Items

15. Review action items from last RRSWG meeting (November, 2008)

Action Items	Status:	Assigned To:
WECC to provide feedback on the ROP Variance language – particularly the additional information to provide NERC with the submission of the standard for approval	In Progress (updated 1/28/09) – Ken to provide before March RRSWG meeting.	Ken Wilson
Naming convention for regional standards interpretations (check that whatever is being proposed supports the technical solution being used by Compliance)	created November, 2008	Stephanie to follow up with Maureen Long
Guy to send Stephanie proposed language on the Canadian Regulatory involvement in the NERC Evaluation Procedure	created November, 2008	Guy Zito
Stephanie to discuss schedule of the fill in the blank standards in the work plan and the impact on this schedule by the continent	In Progress – 1/27/09	Stephanie

Action Items	Status:	Assigned To:
<p>wide projects. Stephanie will have a discussion with Gerry about the original "directive" and possible ways to address the delay in establishing regional standards as a result of the delay in the continent wide projects.</p> <p>Stephanie to send a revised version of the letter to the RRSWG for review.</p>		
<p>Stephanie to remove the RFC BAL- Operating Reserves from the NERC website since this will be a RFC criteria instead of a regional standard</p>	<p>created January 2009</p>	<p>Stephanie</p>
<p>At what point (procedurally) do we identify a Variance? NERC to identify the appropriate procedure to address the identification of a Variance (as opposed to a Regional Standard)</p>	<p>created January 2009</p>	<p>Stephanie</p>
<p>Guy Zito and Pat Huntley to create a first draft of a RRSWG presentation to the Standards Committee. Stephanie to work with Maureen to add an RRSWG discussion on a future SC agenda.</p>	<p>created January 2009</p>	<p>Stephanie Guy Pat</p>
<p>Ken Wilson to provide language for the NERC Evaluation by March 2009 RRSWG meeting</p>	<p>created January 2009</p>	<p>Ken Wilson</p>

16. Other

17. Review Proposed 2009 RRSWG Schedule:

Date	Location	Comments
January 27-28	TRE - Austin	Confirmed
March 18-19	APS – Phoenix, AZ	Confirmed (Ken Wilson)
May 19-20	SERC – Charlotte	Confirmed
September 16-17	NPCC – New York City	Confirmed
November 10-11	FRCC - Tampa	

18. Action Items and Next Steps

19. Adjourn

- a. The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:46 PM