

Meeting Notes

Project 2007-11 – Disturbance Monitoring Standard Drafting Team

May 21-22, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. ET

May 23, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. – Noon ET

Administrative

Introductions – chair remarks

The meeting was brought to order by Lee Pedowicz, chair at 8:00 a.m. Eastern on Tuesday, May 22, 2013. Participants were introduced and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)		
			5/21	5/22	5/23
Lee Pedowicz (Chair)	NPCC	Member	IP	IP	IP
Frank Ashrafi	SCE	Member			
Alan D. Baker	Florida Power and Light	Member	W	W	W
Daniel J. Hansen	NRG	Member	IP	IP	IP
Tim Kucey	PSEG Fossil LLC	Member	IP	IP	IP
H. Steven Myers	ERCOT	Member	IP	IP	IP
Jack Soehren	ITC Holdings	Member	IP	IP	IP
Vladimir Stanisic	AESI Inc.	Member	IP	IP	IP
Ryan Quint	BPA	Member	IP	IP	IP
Juan Villar	FERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP
Barb Nutter (Standard Developer)	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP
Robert Grabovickic	National Grid	Observer	W	W	W
Phil Winston	Southern	Observer		IP	

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)		
			5/21	5/22	5/23
David Jendras	Ameren	Observer	W		
Zea Flores	WECC	Observer	W	W	
Ericka Chanzas	NERC	Observer		IP	

1. 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 eight of the nine members were present.

2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by Barb Nutter. There were no questions raised. The participants were reminded of the NERC Antitrust Guidelines each morning.

3. Review team roster

The new team members were introduced and they gave the team a short biography.

4. Review meeting agenda and its objectives

Notes

1. Update on Revised SAR

- a. Barb Nutter reminded the team the revised SAR is posted for a 30-day comment period from May 3 – June 3, 2013. The team will respond to comments at the June 4 – 8, 2013 meeting.

2. Webinar

- a. On Tuesday, May 21, the team reviewed and updated the webinar slides and speaker notes. The team ran through several dry runs, as well as having the dial in participants provide questions via the chat feature.
- b. The industry webinar was held May 22 from 1- 3PM EST. Three hundred eighty people registered for the Webinar, of which two hundred sixty-six called in. There were 178 people still connected at the end of the two hour session. All of the 56 questions posted by the audience to the Drafting Team after the presentation were relevant to the

Standard, and able to be answered. The team received numerous positive comments on the webinar.

The general topics from the webinar questions were maintenance, location, data requirements, applicability, data--not equipment, differences between the 2009 version and the current draft.

3. **PRC-002-2** (May 23, 2013 version)

a. **Issue:** Ryan noted that former R1, now R16 is currently written that every SOE/FR/DDR must be time stamped even if not within the 20%.

b. **Issue:** Revised selection criteria for generators to capability based vs. location selected by TO.

TO if 20% is good use then for GO's make a definite MVA value for units.

Tim noted it would be more acceptable to generators if applicable to all GO's with a specific MVA.

Dan – using typical table data below the percentage of generator contribution relative to 10,000 MVA.

Generator Unit MVA	Generator Contribution to Short Circuit			
	kV	Short Circuit kA	Short Circuit MVA	% 10 GVA
20	230	0.179	71.3	0.71%
100	230	0.896	356.9	3.57%
500	230	4.48	1784.7	17.85%
1000	230	8.96	3569.4	35.69%

c. **Issue:** Does the standard, as written, provide an unfair competitive advantage because some GO's will be responsible to provide disturbance monitoring data?

i. Tim discussed the potential issue of unfairness for merchant generators in regards to the standard. For example, if all merchant generators at 100 MVA and above are required to provide DM data then that is fair. If a TO selects only

certain generators in its area to provide DM data then that is unfair because those generators have an extra cost. Vlad agreed.

- ii. Tim – Obligation for acquiring SOE of GO synchronizing breakers should be on the TO because in most, if not all, instances the TO is already monitoring this status. The obligation to upgrade an existing monitoring point versus installing new monitoring system would be the case if the GO were assigned this responsibility. Concurrent with that there must be an obligation for the GO to allow access by the TO in order to meet this responsibility.
- d. Tim is on record that he does not agree with the GO being included in the 20% buses. Generators that are below whatever level picked for all generators **would have to also have SOE attached if connected to a bus in the 20% bus.**
- e. **Issue:** What disturbance on BES is the standard referring to?
 - i. Tim asked what is the purpose of the standard – not the purpose statement. The team discussed the different categories in Appendix E and agreed upon Event Analysis categories 3, 4, and 5.
- f. **Issue:** Does the standard address availability requirements of the recording devices? For example, if a DME uses a windows based PC for recording, is it acceptable to bring the equipment off line on a regular basis to push security updates and restart the PC? Could there be any compliance implications if a data request is not available because the DME was temporarily offline?
- g. Breaker/substation configuration – Dan commented that the owner of the breaker is responsible for reporting the time stamp of the status change – most cases are clear as to who owns the breaker.
- h. Requirement R8 was deleted because FR monitoring of GSU for GO was related to R6 which was removed in April.
- i. Requirements R15– Responsible Entity (RC & PC) was removed because TO/GO own the equipment.
- j. Requirement R19 – Responsible Entity (RC & PC) was removed because the RE is not responsible for acquiring data for the purpose of this standard.
- k. The team agreed to add a requirement that generators will need SOE if at a (TBD) MVA value.

4. Technical Documents – not addressed

5. Discuss Technical Workshop

- a. Include in the workshop
 - i. Trigger Threshold
 - ii. 20%

6. Outreach

- a. Workshop
 - i. July 30 (1-5) and July 31 (8-12) in Tempe, AZ
 - ii. August 6 (1-5) and August 7 (8-12) in Atlanta
- b. Future Outreach Opportunities
 - i. Events Analysis Subcommittee (EAS) June 10, Atlanta – Bob Cummings
 - ii. WECC JSIS June 11-13 in Salt Lake City – Ryan Quint and Frank Ashrafi
 - iii. System Protection and Control Subcommittee (SPCS) June 25-26 – Bob Cummings will dial in and give update. A team member should be on the call also.
 - iv. Regional Entities' Committees

7. Review Meeting Dates Document – did not review

8. Approve Meeting Notes

- a. The team agreed for Lee Pedowicz to do a final review and approve the March 1, 2013, March 25-28, 2013, and April 16-19, 2013 meeting notes.

9. Next Steps

- a. Develop workshop material
- b. Hold workshops

10. Assignments

11. Future Meeting(s)

- a. June 4 to June 7, 2013 - NERC Headquarters – Atlanta
- b. July 15 to July 17, 2013 - ITC Holdings – Novi, MI
- c. July 30 to August 1, 2013 – SRP/PERC Club – Tempe, AZ
- d. August 6 to August 9, 2013 - NERC Headquarters – Atlanta

12. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 AM ET.