

Meeting Notes Underfrequency Load Shedding SDT — Project 2007-01

Friday, December 12, 2008

1. Administrative

a) Roll Call

Stephanie Monzon welcomed the members and guests of the Standard Drafting Team for Project 2007-01 Underfrequency Load Shedding (see Roster — **Attachment 1a**).

- Dana Cabbell — Southern California Edison Co. (Chair)
- Paul Attaway — Georgia Transmission Corporation
- Brian Bartos — Bandera Electric Cooperative
- Larry E. Brusseau — Midwest Reliability Organization
- Jonathan Glidewell — Southern Company Transmission Co.
- Gerald Keenan — Bonneville Power Administration
- Robert W. Millard — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Steven Myers — Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.
- Mak Nagle — Southwest Power Pool
- Robert J. O'Keefe — American Electric Power
- Philip Tatro — National Grid
- Robert Williams — Florida Municipal Power Agency
- Stephanie Monzon — NERC

Observers:

- Brian Evans Mongeon — Utility Services, LLC

b) NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines provided in **Attachment 1b**. It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition. It is the

responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

2. Review and Meeting with NERC Staff on the Overall Approach

A sub-team discussed the options with Gerry Adamski, VP and Director of Standards at NERC, and the challenges with the options with the intent on getting guidance from NERC staff. The sub-team reported back to the team on what was discussed and the outcome of the discussion.

- a) Much of the meeting in Princeton was a review of the options that SDT had contemplated (including the directive). Gerry asked many questions that the team had explored and understood the main issues facing the team including the issue with the assigning applicability of the standard.
- b) The team had earlier on identified that Option 2 (the cws without regional standards) was not the best technical approach. Option 1 (the directive) is not supported by the ROP section 312 because the directive to create regional standards can only occur if there is an existing continent wide standard. Option 3 (hybrid) was discussed but not at great length because the focus was on how to "package" the characteristics.
- c) The sub-team provided Gerry with some of the "givens" established by industry comments and/or SDT deliberation including:
 - i) The technical ending point for UFLS is regional standards or regional criteria containing the UFLS program (since a uniform continent wide program is not technically advantageous).
 - ii) The performance characteristics themselves are philosophically good and the team will continue to work on developing the "envelope".
 - iii) The main issue facing the team is how to achieve the goal of establishing uniform performance characteristics that are implemented at a regional level and at the same time ensuring that coordination of these programs is taking place. In addition, the end result should leverage the existing programs in place which are generally good products/processes.
- d) The sub-group explored creation of a continent wide standard and talked through the issues with assigning the PC the requirements. The team indicated that this was not favorable because in many cases a given PC alone does not have the wide area view to design a program that is technically advantageous. In addition, there is difficulty with enforcing the PC's coordinate their activities with other PC's. Bob M., Dana C., and Phil T. discussed the ways their regions come up with their UFLS programs and in many instances described the role of the Region as a facilitator to the PCs and other entities that are interested parties. This lead to the idea as proposed in Option 4:

Option 4: Continent Wide Standard (with Regional Standards if necessary)

This approach would propose a continent wide standard that is applicable to Planning Coordinators and **would require Planning Coordinators to join a group made up of other Planning Coordinators within their Region** to either design or develop a program that follows the performance characteristics. The performance characteristics would form the requirements of this continent wide standard.

- This option does not preclude the development of regional standards

3. Overall Approach

The team discussed the next steps for the overall approach and the performance characteristics.

- How does do you enforce that a planning coordinator joins a group? This is a question for Compliance.
- Are there any requirements that apply to the group (the intent is for this not to be the case) but we would have to keep this in mind while we are developing the requirement language.
- The team agreed to use the continent wide standard that was drafted based on the performance characteristics by Dave Taylor while in Portland as a starting point to their discussion in Austin, TX.
- The team agreed that Option 4, of all options, is the best approach. The team also agreed to pursue this approach and post the standard for comments after the team has discussed the performance characteristics and the comment report. The next posting will most likely not occur until late February 2009.

4. Response to Comments

The team discussed the plan to take a second pass at the comment report (try to get sub-teams looking over the report, if it makes sense, prior to the in person meeting).

- Stephanie took an action item to prepare a summary of all the tabled issues with the performance characteristics that require discussion prior to finalizing the comment report. The comment report does not have to be posted at any given time but must be posted prior to the next posting of the standard.

5. Action Items

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the actions that were open at the end of the November 2008 meeting of the drafting team:

Action Items:	Status:	Assigned To:
The remaining questions for the comment report: Question 6: Phil T. and Jonathan Question 7: Gary K. Question 8: Larry B. and Bob M.	Completed	See first column

Action Items:	Status:	Assigned To:
Question 9: Rob O.		
Stephanie will compile the draft responses and send out to the SDT prior to the next meeting (October 22–23).	Completed	Stephanie
Stephanie will draft the first draft of Option 3 and distribute to a sub group for review. Stephanie will use the description of Option 3 to facilitate her initial discussion with Gerry Adamski and Dave Cook. Stephanie will be expecting Dana, Rob, Phil, and Bob to weigh in on the draft description.	Completed	Stephanie
Stephanie will follow up with the team via email regarding her initial discussion with NERC Management on the feasibility of Option 3.	Completed	Stephanie
Stephanie will prepare a summary of action items based on the comment report that involve discussion on the performance characteristics. Stephanie will prepare this prior to the in person meeting in Austin.		Stephanie
Stephanie will follow up with NERC Compliance to determine if requiring PC's to join a group of PC's is auditable. Stephanie will get Compliance feedback prior to the meeting in Austin.		Stephanie

6. Next Steps

The team will be meeting in person on January 13–14, 2009 for two full days in Austin, TX at the ERCOT offices for the next SDT meeting.

7. Adjourn

The team adjourned at approximately 11:15 a.m. EST.