Unofficial Comment Form

Project 2007-06.2 Phase 2 of System Protection Coordination
TOP-009-1

**DO NOT** use this form for submitting comments. Use the [electronic form](https://sbs.nerc.net/) to submit comments on draft one of **TOP-009-1 – Knowledge of Composite Protection Systems and Remedial Action Schemes and Their Effects**. The electronic form must be submitted by **8:00 p.m. Eastern, Friday, September 11, 2015.**

Documents and information about this project are available on the [project page](http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Pages/Project-2007-06_2-System-Protection-Coordination.aspx). If you have questions, contact Standards Developer, Scott Barfield-McGinnis, (via email) or at (404) 446-9689.

## Background Information

This draft 1 posting is soliciting formal comment through a 45-day comment period and an initial ballot to be conducted in the last 10 days of the comment period.

**Phase 1 (2007-06)**

The System Protection Coordination Standard Drafting Team (SPCSDT) is creating a new results-based standard, PRC-027-1 to address coordination of Protection System performance during Faults This standard incorporates and clarifies the Protection System coordination aspects of Requirements R3 and R4 contained in PRC-001-1.1 that is proposed for complete retirement.

**Phase 2 (2007-06.2)**

Phase 2 is addressing the remaining Requirements R1, R2, R5, and R6 in PRC-001-1.1 that is proposed for complete retirement. See the Mapping Document for a complete explanation on how Requirement R1 is being addressed by TOP-009-1 (*Knowledge of Composite Protection Systems and Remedial Action Schemes and Their Effects*) and how the reliability objective of Requirements R2, R5, and R6 are addressed by TOP/IRO standards that are awaiting regulatory approval.

The proposed TOP-009-1 standard incorporates PRC-001-1.1(ii), Requirement R1 into individual requirements for the Balancing Authority, Generator Operator, and Transmission Operator. Splitting the three applicable entities from PRC-001-1.1(ii) into individual requirements by entity improves clarity concerning the reliability objective of each function.

## Questions

1. As the Transmission Operator, do you agree that TOP-009-1, Requirement R1 addresses the reliability need of the first requirement in the existing PRC-001-1.1(ii) for the Transmission Operator? If not, please explain why or why not.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. As the Balancing Authority, do you agree that TOP-009-1, Requirement R2 addresses the reliability need of the first requirement in the existing PRC-001-1.1(ii) for the Balancing Authority? If not, please explain why or why not.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. As the Generator Operator, do you agree that TOP-009-1, Requirement R3 addresses the reliability need of the first requirement in the existing PRC-001-1.1(ii) for the Generator Operator? If not, please explain why or why not.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. Do you agree with the proposed Violation Risk Factors (VRF) and Violation Severity Levels (VSL) for the proposed requirements? If not, please provide a basis for revising a VRF and/or what would improve the clarity of the VSLs.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. Does TOP-009-1, Application Guidelines provide sufficient guidance, basis for approach, and examples to support performance of the requirements? If not, please provide specific detail that would improve the Application Guidelines.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. Do you agree with implementation period (i.e., 12 months) of the proposed standard based on the considerations listed in the Implementation Plan? If not, please provide a justification for changing the proposed implementation period.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. Are you aware of any conflicts between the proposed standard and any regulatory function, rule, order, tariff, rate schedule, legislative requirement, or agreement? If so, please identify the conflict here.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. Are you aware of the need for a regional variance or business practice that should be considered with this project? If so, please identify it here.

[ ]  Yes

[ ]  No

Comments:

1. If you have any other comments on this Standard that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide them here:

Comments: