

Meeting Notes

Project 2010-05.2 Special Protection Systems Standard Drafting Team

April 14-16, 2015 | 8:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. EDT

NERC
Atlanta, GA

Administrative

- **Introductions and chair remarks**

Gene Henneberg, the chair, brought the meeting to order on Tuesday, April 14, 2015 and welcomed everyone. Building and safety information/logistics were provided by Al McMeekin of NERC. Each participant was introduced. Those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In Person	Conference Call/Web
Gene Henneberg	NV Energy / Mid-American	Member	X	
Bobby Jones	Southern Company	Member	X	
Amos Ang	Southern California Edison	Member	X	
Alan Engelmann	ComEd / Exelon	Member	X	
Davis Erwin	Pacific Gas and Electric	Member	X	
Charles-Eric Langlois	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie	Member	X	
Robert J. O'Keefe	American Electric Power	Member	X	
Hari Singh (April 15-16 only)	Xcel Energy	Member	X	
Al McMeekin	NERC	NERC Staff	X	
Lacey Ourso	NERC	NERC Staff	X	
Jonathan Meyer	Idaho Power	Observer	X	
Syed Ahmad	FERC	Observer	X	
Gerry Dunbar	NPCC	Observer	X	

- **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 8 of the 10 voting members were present.

- **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement**

Mr. McMeekin reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement disclaimer.

- **Review team roster**

The team roster was reviewed and confirmed to be accurate.

Agenda Items

1. Review the Standard

The SDT reviewed the latest draft of the standard in great detail. The team agreed to Rob O’Keefe’s proposed revision to the Purpose of the Standard. A discussion was held on what qualifies as a “functional change” to a RAS and what is needed for retiring a RAS. The team made small changes to the Rationales for Requirements R1-R5. The team decided that a 120 day time frame was needed for Requirement R6. The team then reviewed and made small changes to the rationale and requirement language for Requirements R7, R9, and R11. No changes were made to Requirements R8 and R10.

The SDT discussed which types of RAS need to have “dependability” (however that is to be defined). The only issue was whether planning-limited type needed it. Syed advised us to not lower the bar from existing standards. Rob made a motion to make the “dependability” language applicable to planning-limited RAS. Bobby seconded the motion and the team agreed to this. The team then decided to make the dependability language similar to what is in the existing standard – a single RAS component failure does not prevent the system from meeting the performance requirements in TPL-001-4.

The team then discussed what should be required for inadvertent operation. In particular, should “securely designed” RAS be given an exception from any requirements on inadvertent operation? The decision was made to not make an exception at this time.

The team revisited the issue of classifications for RAS. Because the team had decided that any RAS installed for a “planning event” would need to meet the “dependability” requirement, there did not appear to be any reason for having RAS classifications. The only impact that it might have would be on the Reliability Coordinator’s depth of review. It was decided to not have classifications and just write in Attachment 2 the situations for which the RC must do an in-depth review. The situations calling for in-depth review would be those associated with the Glossary definition of Adverse Reliability Impact. Alan E. was given the assignment to write up the FAQ concerning why there are no classifications for RAS.

The team reviewed Attachment 1, 2, and 3 and made several changes. In Attachment 2 several bullet items dealing with compliance to standards were deleted.

The team developed the questions for the upcoming posting.

2. Review FAQ Document

The team looked at an organizational structure for the FAQ suggested by Lacey Ourso. This would have the FAQ divided into four sections: 1) Review; 2) Evaluation Requirements, 3) Testing Requirements, and 4) Analysis of RAS Operations. Questions related to Requirements R1, R2, R3 will go into the Review section. Questions related to Requirements R4, R5, R8 will go into the Evaluate Requirements section. Questions related to R9 will go into the Testing Requirements section. Questions related to R6, R7, R8 will go into the Analysis of RAS Operations section.

3. Next Steps

The standard will be posted for a three-week, informal comment period at the end of April. A webinar will be held on May 7. Slides for the webinar will be developed as follows:

R1 – Gene	R4 – Bobby	R7 – Alan	R10 – Charles
R2 – Hari	R5 – Alan	R8 – Davis	R11 – Charles
R3 – Gene	R6 – Hari	R9 – Jonathan	Att. 1&2 – Gene & Hari

4. Future meeting(s)

- a. June 8 (1:00 -5:00) and 9-11 (8:00-5:00), 2015 | Denver, CO

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned on Thursday, April 16, 2015.