

Meeting Notes

Project 2007-02 Operating Personnel Communications Protocols Standard Drafting Team for COM-003-01

October 23, 2012

Conference Call with Web support

Administrative

1. Introductions

The meeting was brought to order by Lloyd Snyder (chair) at 1:00 p.m. ET on Tuesday, October 23, 2012. Participants were introduced and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Mike Brost	JEA	Member
Darrell Piatt	FERC	Observer
Robert Rhodes	SPP	Member
Lloyd Snyder (chair)	GSOC	Member
Steve Solis	ERCOT	Member
Howard Gugel	NERC	Advisor
Joseph Krisiak	NERC	Advisor

2. Determination of Quorum

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT to be present. A quorum was not achieved as four of the eight total voting members were present.

3. NERC Disclaimer and Antitrust Guidelines

The NERC Antitrust Guidelines and Disclaimer were reviewed by Joseph Krisiak. There were no questions raised.

4. Review of Roster and Updates

The SDT reviewed the roster and confirmed that it was accurate and up to date.

Agenda

1. Approval of Meeting Notes from Previous Meetings

The notes from the October 1, 2012 meeting were reviewed and approved.

2. Discussion

- Mr. Krisiak reviewed the Agenda and there were no revisions or changes.
- This question before the Operating Personnel Communications Protocols (OPCP) SDT is to agree to submit the redrafted standard COM-003-1 draft 4, 20121023 and the Reliability Standard Audit Worksheet (RSAW) for COM-003-1 draft 4, 20121023 to Quality Review (QR) see attached. This vote replaces a previous request for a ballot to from October 18, 2012 and is based on the discussion amongst the team on October 23, 2012.
- The SDT has made many changes and here are the general features of those changes since the October 4, 2012 OPCPSDT meeting:
 - Reduced the Standard to 2 Requirements that use the same control based language that was utilized in CIP v.5. This was a recommendation made by numerous commenters to draft 3 as being more flexible with industry and consistent among the standards. This also addresses a potential double jeopardy situation between R1 and R3; and R2 and R4.
 - Added section 6 (eliminating the word “sole”), which is an extensive background section to serve as a guide to understanding the approach to control based standards and how the requirements should be implemented.
 - Added language to the definition to clarify the intent of the term Operating Instruction:
“A command by a System Operator of a Reliability Coordinator, or of a Transmission Operator, or of a Balancing Authority, where the recipient is expected to act on the command , to change or preserve the state, status, output, or input of an Element of the Bulk Electric System or Facility of the Bulk Electric System. Discussions of general

information and of potential options or alternatives to resolve BES operating concerns are not commands and are not considered Operating Instructions.”

- Added the Functional Entity to Functional Entity language to R1 and R2.
- Changed the RSAW removing the High Risk bullets using the CIP v.5 format.
- Proposed the following language to M1 and M2:
 “Each Balancing Authority, Reliability Coordinator, and Transmission Operator, shall provide its documented communications protocols developed for Requirement R1 (R2), demonstrating that the protocols have been implemented in a manner that identifies, assesses and corrects deficiencies.”
- Discussed the Violation Risk Factors, Violation Severity Levels and Measures and will ensure they are consistent and mutually supportive within the revised standard and will pose the question again to industry for successive ballot 2.
- The SDT did not change the Parts in R1 and R2 and elected not to add clarifying language to explain the relationship between a “Reliability Directive” and an “Operating Instruction”.

After much discussion the chair called for a team ballot. Since there was not a quorum the chair directed an email ballot. The questions were:

(Y) Submit COM-003-1 draft 4, 20121023 to QR; or

(N) Do not Submit COM-003-1 draft 4, 20121023 to QR

SDT Voting Member	(Y) Submit to QR COM-003-1 Draft 4, 20121023	(N) Do not Submit to QR COM-003-1 Draft 4, 20121023	Comments
Glen Boyle	X		one caveat: I think the word “documentation” in the below statement from the RSAW needs to be changed to “Operating Instructions” in R1 and R2
Mike Brost	X		

SDT Voting Member	(Y) Submit to QR COM-003-1 Draft 4, 20121023	(N) Do not Submit to QR COM-003-1 Draft 4, 20121023	Comments
Michael Cassiadoro	X		
Tom Irvine	X		
Robert Rhodes		X	I believe there is still too much specificity contained in the protocols in R1. More flexibility is needed.
Lloyd Snyder (chair)	X		
Stephen Solis		X	Same objections as in past
John Stephens	X		
Fred Waites	X		

- The OPCPSDT voted by email and the motion passed 2 voting members against, 7 members in favor. COM-003-1 draft 4, 20121023 will be submitted to QR.
- The SDT reached consensus for the posting and elects to go forward.
- The chair concluded the discussion and Mr. Kriasiak briefed the SDT on the QR, posting and future next steps for the project.

3. Action Item Review

Mr. Kriasiak and Howard Gugel will develop the QR package.

4. Future Meeting(s)

- A conference call is scheduled for November 5, 2012 to review QR recommendations.
- A webinar is proposed for November 27, 2012.

5. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m. ET on October 23, 2012.