

Meeting Agenda

Protection Systems Maintenance & Testing Standard Drafting Team

April 28, 2008 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT

April 29, 2008 | 8 a.m.–noon EDT

Georgia Power Co.

Conference Center

241 Ralph McGill Blvd. Atlanta, GA,

Administrative

1. Introduction — Charles Rogers

2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Al Calafiore

It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition. It is the responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

3. Determination of Quorum

The rule for NERC working groups is that half of the members (that are entitled to vote) of the working group constitutes a quorum, and a motion passes if it receives two-thirds affirmative votes of the votes cast.

4. Review PSMTDT Roster

5. Standards Comments and Revisions — Continue Drafting Process

6. Review Action Items

Review and report on action items from last meeting

7. Top Issues

Discussion of top 2 or 3 issues that have emerged during the drafting process and keeping a list as the process proceeds. See Action Items below.

8. **Discussion on how to assure that the provisions of the SAR, any FERC directives that apply to this project, and any assessments or other recommendations (such as from the SPCTF if any apply) are considered.**

9. **Future Meetings and Conference Calls.**

Schedule future meetings and conference calls.

10. **Adjourn**

Standards Comments and Revisions

Continue drafting of standard discussing requirements.

Review areas identified as needing further information and/or research. Review and discuss the information brought back to the team by team members.

It was decided that this team will do a FAQ to tell or describe where DME functions maintenance will be found. Also, it was suggested that the industry be asked where it would prefer DME testing and maintenance be placed. Who will do this? Discuss Details. **Action Item** — [Discuss where we stand on this.](#)

Review discussion on the definition of BES (Bulk Electric System) and the voltage levels that are included. For example, 200 KV and above is common but in some areas 100 Kv lines impact the BES (or are part of it).

Some of the load shedding equipment is on the distribution system; how is this to be captured. **Action Item** — [Discuss where we stand and how do we make sure this is captured.](#) See discussion on responsibilities of Distribution Providers — ascertain how this is captured and made clear in the standard. (See R1.)

Action Items

Review Action items: Several action items were undertaken related to the additional information that was decided was needed.

Issues from last meeting:

Continue discussion and gather information on the need for R9.4 (Extension period following natural disasters). Last meeting several proposals were made to provide from 6 months to 1 year extension. There was no resolution to this issue, this may require gathering more information and/or research on if to allow it, how long to allow, and how to administer. **Action Item** — [How will this issue be resolved?](#)

There was an inquiry from the industry on — will compliance allow being late due to consequences of natural disasters? Or does the standard need a requirement to allow for defer maintenance due to natural disaster occurrences. As an action item, this question was brought to compliance for comments.

Action Item — Discuss answer from Compliance, determine how it will be treated in the standard.

Eric Udren presented a proposal for Reliability-Centered Protection System maintenance (RCM) program. This can also be called a “performance” based maintenance program. The program was explained and was put in a form that can be included in the standard. Much discussion took place and some suggestions for modification of the proposed requirements. Significant discussion took place on what to do if 10% or more failures were found for a group within a period (interval) that is less than the time-based maintenance interval. The proposal is to be reviewed by the team and comments brought back.

Action Item — Determine where we do we stand on this. Review comments. Is there a need for a report? Who will be reporting?

Top issues from Item 7

Action Items — Determine if there are any new issues; determine what the top 2 issues are

Next Steps

The group will discuss and identify the next steps and establish a date to complete the tasks.

Charles Rogers and Al Calafiore will review the action items generated during the meeting and confirm assignments.

The group will discuss the next meeting schedule.