

Meeting Notes Regional Reliability Standards Working Group

November 11, 2008 | 1–5 p.m. EST
November 12, 2008 | 8 a.m.–noon EST
FRCC Offices
Tampa, FL

Administrative

1. Introductions and Attendance

Judith James	TRE
Peter Heidrich	FRCC
Larry Brusseau	MRO
Guy V. Zito	NPCC
Robert W. Millard	RFC
Patrick Huntley	SERC
Mak Nagle	SPP (by phone)
Kenneth J. Wilson	WECC (by phone)
Katy Onnen	SPP (by phone day 2)
Stephanie Monzon	NERC Staff

Observers:

Nick Henery	FERC Staff
Lee Pedowicz	NPCC
Steve Myers	ERCOT
Vann Weldon	ERCOT
Sarah Hensley	TRE (by phone)
Tony Jablonski	RFC (by phone day 2)
John E. Odom, Jr.	FRCC

2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Stephanie read the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

3. Meeting Notes

Stephanie took the meeting notes.

4. General Items

Stephanie noted that a change to the roster is needed and she would redistribute the roster.

RRSWG Topics

5. Standards Workshop — Post Mortem

- a. The workshops should focus on one subject area (compliance or standards).
- b. Judith James suggested splitting the workshop to avoid scattered topics and allow people to choose topics of interest.
- c. Stephanie suggested breaking the standards piece into two break outs — one focused on overview and the other addressing detailed standards.
- d. Guy Zito suggested that the workshops should include regional standards (a half hour panel) to keep the industry informed on what the regions are doing with regional standards.
- e. Bob Millard thought it was a good idea to present on the standards work plan but suggests that a questionnaire be sent to the attendees to better focus the standards workshop topics. Bob liked the “What’s coming next”.
- f. Related to the work plan process it was suggested that in the future the posting not reference the existing work plan as it caused confusion.
- g. Guy Zito suggested that NERC should collect feedback from the region membership on topics for future workshops. Guy thinks that one workshop would work given that the regions are holding their own compliance and standards workshops.
- h. Pat Huntley supports moving to once a year for workshops given that NERC carefully coordinate the calendar with the Regions (and plans in advance).

6. Discuss Highlights from October NERC BOT — Stephanie

Stephanie reviewed some of the highlights of the October NERC BOT including the approval of Errata, Interchange Tables (Project 2007-14), and the six of the seven WECC regional standards. Stephanie reviewed other Board actions such as the CGHR recommendations for FERC staff involvement.

7. Review and Discuss the NERC Communication Contingency Plan

Stephanie explained where NERC is with the plan and clarified that NERC Standards will not be implementing the manual procedure as proposed at the RRSWG several months ago. NERC will not ask the Regions to take any action related to this at this time.

8. Standards Committee Process Subcommittee — Status — Bob Millard

- a. Review and discuss the RDSP and ROP modified language for Regional Variances
 - i. Bob discussed the concepts that were presented by Ben Li at the last meeting clarifying variances.
 - ii. With these concepts many of the existing regional standards would become regional variances.
 - iii. Larry identified an issue with the proposed language and process. For a region organized less than an interconnection that develops a regional variance (as opposed to a regional standard) the variance follows the 1- NERC standards process 2- is balloted by the continent. The regional standard would be balloted by the region (not incenting using the variance process as proposed). The NERC team and the group responsible for revising the language had discussed this issue but has not resolved the issue.
 - iv. The group wants to know who at NERC (or somewhere else) decides if it is a regional variance or a regional standard. Some standards drafting teams are developing regional standards that would be impacted if the deliverable becomes a variance.
 - v. Guy pointed out a potential issue is that this proposed language (assuming that the process allows for variances to be developed using the regional standards process) may impact some of the FERC filed and approved regional standards development procedures. Some of these procedures do not mention development of variances and this may have to be added into the procedure (and filed with FERC). Alternately the proposed language for developing variances can be developed to mitigate the need for refilling.
- b. Review and discuss VRF tool/definition
 - i. Terry Bilke is developing a tool to come up with VRFs. Bob reviewed some of the guidelines that the tool offers to assign VRFs. This is being discussed at the process subcommittee. Bob indicated that this is not ready to be shared with individuals as it is still being discussed and developed.
 - ii. Guy Zito — does the tool incorporate the FERC guidelines (for VRFs) or consistent with FERC guidelines. Bob could not confirm.

- iii. The tool/guidelines would be informally comment and would eventually go into the Standards Development Procedure in the ROP (which goes out for public comment). This will be presented at the Standards Committee.

9. Standards Committee Communications and Planning Subcommittee — Pat Huntley and Larry Brusseau

Three standards committee members and have held two meetings to discuss communication plan for standards.

10. Review and discuss the NERC Regional Standards Evaluation Procedure

The team reviewed the proposed language that Pat Huntley distributed to the group last week. His revisions made it clearer that the NERC posting of a regional standard is most appropriate to occur at the anticipated last posting of the regional standard.

The team made a revision to page 9 (under the items to be reviewed at the posting) that clarified that the NERC directives referenced are those that are granted NERC to make under ROP section 312.

11. Discuss Fill-in-the Blanks Projects and Regional Progress

- a. The team discussed the impact of delaying the continent-wide progress. In particular the DME project was supposed to be posted at the end of the summer and has been delayed. For the regions waiting to determine the direction of the standard (for DME this would be the first posting hence the first public “disclosure” of the standard’s approach).
- b. The NERC “directive” was issued by Gerry Cauley and Dave Taylor in the form of a memo. The memo directed the regions to develop regional standards in four areas (the four fill in the blank standards). The RRSWG walked through the history of coming up with these four fill in the blanks. The RRSWG at the time went through the NERC standards projects and anticipated standards that would possibly need regional companions. This is how the four fill in the blanks were established. This recommendation was provided to NERC staff and NERC management created the directive. As a result the regions established goals to develop regional standards some of which are being impacted by the delays to the continent wide projects.
- c. The RRSWG asked that Stephanie discuss with Gerry a possible revision to the “directive” considering that since the time it was issued things have changed such as the potential for the DME project to remove the fill in the blank elements (the current DME effort is proposing a continent wide standard only). In addition it was noted that a number of the Regions have goals written around the production of Regional Standards and reports to respective regional boards have to be made. The letter and status of what the current status of the directive from the ERO as it relates to standards would be helpful.

- d. Stephanie asked the team to provide their thoughts on the reliability need for these four standards. She stated that there were reasons why the group had selected these four as needing regional reliability standards (see note above on how these four were established) and it is unclear to her if there is still a reliability need to develop regional standards.
 - i. SERC: Pat Huntley indicated that he thinks there is a need for a UFLS regional standard and he also indicated that he felt that for the other standards he was comfortable with the drafting teams making recommendations that include something other than developing regional standards.
 - ii. WECC: Ken Wilson indicated that there may be a need for a regional UFLS standard and perhaps SPS. WECC already has an approved standard for BAL-002 (NERC BOT approved BAL-002-WECC-1).
 - iii. NPCC: Guy Zito indicated that his preference is to not have regional standards, provided that the more stringent and specific reliability objectives, envisioned for the NPCC Regional Standards and also that are present in the NPCC criteria, can be effectively incorporated into the continent wide standards.
 - iv. TRE: Judith James indicated that she thinks that there might be a need for a regional UFLS standard. She indicated that she can't confirm the need for the other standards; however, she can anticipate a need for variances.
 - v. RFC: Bob Millard indicated that he would support the preference for not having regional standards.
 - vi. MRO: Larry Brusseau indicated that MRO is in a "wait and see" mode for the SPS and BAL (continent wide projects). He indicated that he thinks there is a need for a regional UFLS standard.
 - vii. FRCC: Peter Heidrich indicated that he thinking there is a need for a regional UFLS standard and that FRCC is taking the same "wait and see" approach to SPS, BAL and DME as MRO.
- e. Disturbance Monitoring
 - i. Status on the continent-wide effort
 - (a). General discussion on the length of projects and impact on the development of regional standards (fill in the blank) (see notes above)
 - (b). Suggestions made to address these issues with extending timeline on a standard with project management tools/processes (see notes above)
 - (c). The DME is targeting a continent wide standard and will not be recommending regional standards

- (d). The team will be documenting the technical analysis
- ii. Status on the regional standard effort
 - (a). The team did not elaborate on the detailed status of their regional projects.
- f. Under-frequency Load Shedding
 - i. Status on the continent-wide effort
 - (a). Limited discussion was held on the continent wide effort for UFLS
 - ii. Status on the regional standard effort
 - (a). The team did not elaborate on the detailed status of their regional projects.
- g. Special Protection Systems
 - i. The team did not elaborate on the detailed status of their regional projects.
- h. Operating Reserves (BAL-002)
 - i. The team did not elaborate on the detailed status of their regional projects.

12. Identify Regional Standards Projects that are transitional until a continent wide standard is developed

Bob Millard and Guy Zito indicated that they think BAL, SPS and DME regional projects may be transitional in nature until a continent wide standard is approved. The regional standards at that point would be retired. They felt; however, that this excludes the UFLS standard reinforcing that there is a need for a regional standard.

Standing Agenda Items

13. Schedule of Upcoming Regional Standards Drafting Team Meetings

- a. Stephanie to send NERC coordinators to drafting team meetings (where possible) to help the regions develop regional standards.
 - i. The team agreed to send Stephanie upcoming drafting team meetings and RSC meetings the last Tuesday of every month.
 - ii. Lauren will send out a reminder and a recurring invitation to the RRSWG.
 - iii. Stephanie will post the calendar at the end of the month (for the next month).

14. Review Action Items from Last RRSWG Meeting (September, 2008)

Action Items	Status:	Assigned To:
--------------	---------	--------------

Action Items	Status:	Assigned To:
WECC to provide feedback on the ROP Variance language	created November, 2008	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 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.	created November, 2008	Stephanie
Ken Wilson to provide language for the NERC Evaluation procedure to address the concern that NERC's recommendations are not timely enough	created November, 2008	Ken Wilson

15. Other

Discuss 2009 Work-plan (fill in the blanks)

16. Propose 2009 RRSWG Schedule:

Date	Location	Comments
January 27–28	TRE — Austin	Confirmed
March 18–19	WECC — Salt Lake	
May 19–20	SERC — Charlotte	
September 16–17	NPCC — New York City	
November 10–11	FRCC — Tampa	

17. Action Items and Next Steps

18. Adjourn