

REVISIONS TO TOP/IRO RELIABILITY STANDARDS

Conference Call Notes

1. Introduction

The Chair brought the call to order at 2:00 p.m. EDT on Monday, August 4, 2014. Call participants were:

Members		
Dave Bueche, Center Point	Jim Case, Entergy	Allen Klassen, Westar
Jason Marshall, ACES	Andy Pankratz, FPL, Vice Chair	Bert Peters, APS
Robert Rhodes, SPP	Eric Senkowicz, FRCC	Dave Souder, PJM, Chair
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		
Observers		
Mike Gildea, NERC	Vic Howell, Peak Reliability	Mark Olson, NERC
Darrell Piatt, FERC	Phillip Shafeei, Colorado Springs	

2. Determination of Quorum

With 9 of 12 members present, quorum was achieved.

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

The NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement were delivered.

3. SDT Participant Conduct Policy

Participants were advised of the participant conduct policy.

4. SDT E-mail List Policy

The e-mail list policy was explained.

5. Membership Changes and Roster Updates

There were no changes to the membership information.

6. Review Agenda and Objective – Dave Souder

The agenda was approved as distributed.

The objective of the call was to review comments received from the Quality Review (QR).

7. Discuss Revisions to Proposed IRO-017-1

a. **Purpose Statement**

Questions were raised in QR about the addition of specific entities to the Purpose Statement. The reviewers wanted to know why the Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, and Balancing Authority were spelled out, but the Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner that showed as applicable entities in Requirement R4 were not.

The SDT agreed that the Purpose Statement needed to cover all the requirements. However, the SDT decided not to add to the list of entities, but to change the approach to encapsulate the timeframes involved in the standard. The SDT believes that this provides greater clarity as to the intent of the standard.

b. **Role of Reliability Coordinator in Requirement R4**

Reviewers wanted to know the justification for moving the Reliability Coordinator from the beginning of the requirement to the middle of the requirement. Normally, all applicable entities are shown at the beginning of the requirement. Questions were raised as to whether this structure indicated a change in the responsibility of the Reliability Coordinator in the outage coordination process. Some reviewers felt that the Reliability Coordinator had moved to a passive role with the revised sentence structure.

The SDT stated that the structure change did not alter the Reliability Coordinator's role or responsibilities. The change was to place the emphasis on the Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner as the Planning Assessment starts with them and any changes to that document will have to be made by them. Therefore, the SDT believes that the structure change more aptly describes the real-world scenario.

FERC staff expressed its concerns with the revised sentence structure echoing the review comments described above. In addition, they pointed out that the NOPR wanted a definitive entity in charge of outage coordination and that it pointed to the Reliability Coordinator as the best choice due to its Wide Area view.

The SDT responded by stating that there was an entity in charge of the process – the Planning Coordinator/Transmission Planner and that was the correct choice given the timeframe of the process. The SDT also pointed out that the Reliability Coordinator was still an equal partner in the conflict resolution process and that its Wide Area view would be part of that resolution. The SDT believes that the revised language remains much stronger than any existing requirements on the topic and that the words now properly reflect current practices, which the SDT believes is the correct approach.

Since a Planning Coordinator/Transmission Planner can have more than one Reliability Coordinator that it deals with, the SDT pluralized Reliability Coordinator in the requirement language.

8. **Other Concerns for Second Posting**

Vic Howell pointed out that the revised wording in Requirement R2 didn't capture the true intent of the requirement. The SDT agreed and changed the wording accordingly.

FERC staff mentioned that the deletion of Requirement R1, Part 1.5 is a concern. The SDT responded that it believes any timing issues are addressed in Requirements R1 and R4 and that the deletion of Requirement R1, Part 1.5 should not be an issue.

Bert Peters pointed out that the SOL White Paper needed to be updated to show the revised definitions of Operational Planning Analysis and Real-time Assessment.

9. Next Steps and Schedule

The QR Team has finished the review of the standards and is now moving to the supporting documents. The project is on schedule for the second posting to occur on Wednesday, August 6, 2014.

10. Future Meetings

- a. 3rd Technical Conference – Tuesday, August 12, 2014 from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Sacramento, CA at SMUD

The slide deck for the conference is being developed. Any SDT member present may be asked to participate by presenting a section.

- b. Face-to-face meeting – (tentative based on posting date) week of September 29, 2014 at APS in Phoenix, AZ

Details for this meeting will be distributed after the posting takes place.

11. Action Item Review

There were no action items developed during the call.

12. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the call at 3:00 p.m. EDT on Monday, August 4, 2014.