

Meeting Notes

Protection System Maintenance & Testing Standard Drafting Team

April 28–29, 2008
Atlanta, GA

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

Charles Rogers, Chairman, brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EDT on April 28, 2008. The attendees were:

Members:

Al Calafiore — NERC Coordinator		
Charles Rogers — Chair	John Anderson	Bob Bentert
Merle (Rick) Ashton	Richard Ferner	Carol A. Gerou
Dave Harper	John Kruse	Russell C Hardison
Mark Peterson	John Ciufu	Phil Winston
Eric A. Udren	John A. Zipp	
Roger D. Green (day 1)	Leonard G. Swanson, Jr.	

Guests: Sam Francis Jeff Laninga

All members and 2 guests were present.

Charles Rogers asked that the roster for the team be sent to the members for review of their information since some changes have taken place.

2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Al Calafiore and Charles Rogers reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and there were no questions raised.

3. Standards Comments and Revisions

Since a strong consensus had been reached to fold the 4 existing standards (PRC-005, PRC-008, PRC-011, and PRC-017) into one standard, discussion continued on line by line wording of the combined document. The bulk of the time was spent in finalizing Table 1 which is an integral and important part of the standard.

Since it had been decided that this team would do a FAQ to tell or describe where DME (demand monitoring equipment) function maintenance will be found, the FAQ additional questions and answers were added during this meeting. The team is urged to propose answers to currently unanswered questions.

It had also been suggested that the industry be asked where it would prefer DME testing and maintenance to be placed. No further discussion of this took place. The team needs to determine how to accomplish this.

A recurring issue at the meeting (carried over from previous meetings) was “should Distribution Owners that have protection systems that impact the BES be included”? Also, what should the wording be that has impacts on it? Or, what should it be that they are a part of? And should there be a common definition of BES (as opposed to each region having its own).

It was noted that the Functional Model does not define Distribution Owners but rather defines Distribution Providers. They have responsibilities for providing and coordinating protection equipment and load shedding equipment. Note, these two were not discussed; however at a previous meeting (Juno Beach) the decision was NOT to add these items to our standard. We will probably not discuss this item until or unless other factors (outside our group) cause us to need to discuss it.

There was further discussion on the issue carried over from previous meetings on “should there be an allowance or extension of the maintenance period due to such events as natural disasters. The discussion included the use of self reporting of failure to meet schedule (due to the extenuating circumstances) and include a mitigation plan and also the fact that the Regions will know of the “events” on the system and will make allowances.

The proposed solution for this issue is to put a discussion about “non-compliance” due to storms or other extenuating circumstances” in the FAQ (will be #29 on the FAQ) include response received from compliance.

Note that compliance said it will take all circumstances into account and in cases such as described above will not levy fines. However, it will still remain a reportable event but not to be considered a “black mark” on individual entities such as in the case of repeat offenders. The team will further consider this if necessary to respond to industry comments. A specific question about this on the posting may be worth considering.

Eric Udren presented a clean version of a proposed requirement for Reliability Centered Protection System Maintenance (RCM) program. This can also be called a “performance” based maintenance program. After much discussion it was proposed that it be included in the standard as R8, replacing the current (R8) requirement that is considered as vague and not specific to be enforceable.

One new issue that emerged, and is still unresolved, is how to treat a situation where an entity after following an RCM program for sometime discovers some concerns that would significantly reduce its maintenance cycle. This would than make that entity switch to a time based program if it has a longer cycle, (presumably to avoid higher cost of the shorter cycle requirements discovered by the RCM program). The team will further consider this issue.

4. Action Items

Team members are being asked to bring back comments and input from their peers on the current draft of the standard.

Team members are being asked to review the FAQ and provide a markup form of answers to any questions that you feel you can address. Also, please review any answers that already exist and make any modifications to those that you feel inclined to do. Please provide these to the chair, and he will merge them into a master document.

Also, continue to review the draft standard and provide any markups that are appropriate. Please provide these to the chair, and he will merge them into a master document. Again, the sooner, the better

During the meeting, several assignments were made to small teams; these will bring back their findings to the entire team for consideration. Assignment areas included:

- Develop improved verification activities for the DC Control Circuit Verification.
- Develop an improved description of the verification activities for the communication circuit testing.
- Develop appropriate verification activities for Station Batter Capacity Testing

5. Next Steps

The next meeting will be on June 17 (1–5 p.m. EDT) and June 18 (8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT) in Atlanta, Georgia

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at noon on April 29, 2008.