Meeting Notes
Project 2014-04 Physical Security Standard Drafting Team

March 28, 2014 | 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. ET

Conference Call

Administrative

1. **Introductions**

   The chair called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. EST, March 28, 2014. Participants on conference call were:

Members			
Name	**Company**	**Name**	**Company**
Susan Ivey	Exelon Corporation	Stephen Pelcher	Santee Cooper
Lou Oberski	Dominion	John Pespisa	Southern California Edison
John Breckenridge	Kansas City Power & Light	Robert Rhodes	Southwest Power Pool
Ross Johnson	Capital Power	Allan Wick	Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.
Kathleen Judge	National Grid	Mark Olson (Standards Developer)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation
		Steven Noess (Associate Director of Standards Development)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation
Brian Harrell	NERC Staff	Bob Canada	NERC Staff
Matt Blizard	NERC Staff		

Observers			
Name	**Company**	**Name**	**Company**
Regis Binder	FERC	Ted Franks	FERC
Brian Murphy	NextEra	Holly Hawkins	NERC
Kimberly Mielcarek	NERC	Various listen-only participants	

2. **Determination of Quorum**

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT or team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as 9 of 11 total members participated.

3. **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement**

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by Mark Olson. There were no questions raised. Participant conduct policy was reviewed.

4. **Administrative and Safety**

Not Applicable

Agenda

1. **Chair Introductory Remarks.** Susan Ivey welcomed the drafting team and observers. She reviewed the agenda.

2. **Review Draft Standard**

   a. Applicability section was discussed. Members support using a CIP-Medium criteria.

   b. Effective dates and implementation were reviewed.

   c. The approach to Requirement R3 (reviewing entity) was discussed, including whether to include PC, TP, or RC in the applicability. The team views their approach puts responsibility correctly on the owner throughout the process. This would be a key topic at the technical conference.

   d. It was noted that the way TO and TOP were used together in draft requirements created overlap that was not intended. An action item to redraft language was given to the developer.

   e. The team discussed possible references and additions for expanding the subparts of Requirement R4 (evaluate threats). The team supports using language from CIP Physical Security guidelines.

3. **Technical Conference agenda, objectives, format, and logistics were reviewed**

4. General Review Action plan and milestones/dates

5. **Adjourn**The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. EST on March 28, 2014