

Meeting Notes

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

April 8-10, 2013

Atlanta, GA

Administrative

1. Introductions

The meeting was brought to order by the Chair at 1300 EST on Monday, April 8, 2013. Those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In Person	Conference Call/Web
Tom Irvine	Hydro One	Member	X	
Tom Schneider	WECC	Observer		X
Darrell Piatt	FERC	Observer	X	
Lloyd Snyder (Chair)	GSOC	Member	X	
Steve Solis	ERCOT	Member		X
Howard Gugel	NERC	Advisor		X
Glen Boyle	PJM	Member		X
Joseph Krisiak	NERC	Advisor	X	
Michael Gandolfo	FERC	Observer		X
Fred Waites	Southern Co	Member		X
John Stephens	City Utilities of Springfield	Member		X
Robert Rhodes	SPP	Member		X

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In Person	Conference Call/Web
William Edwards	NERC	Observer	X	
Erika Chanzas	NERC	Observer		X

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 achieved as seven of nine total voting members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Guidelines and Public Disclaimer

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

4. NERC Antitrust Guidelines

NERC Antitrust Guidelines was reviewed by Mr. Kriasiak. There were no questions raised.

5. 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 February 20 and 21, 2013 meeting were reviewed and approved.

2. Discussion

- Mr. Kriasiak reviewed the Agenda and there were no revisions or changes.
- Mr. Kriasiak initiated a discussion on the COM-003-1, draft 5, April 5, 2013 ballot results:
 - There is a quorum of 78%. The draft did not achieve approval with a 57% yes vote; up from 53% approval for draft 4.
- Main Commenter Concerns
 - Concerns with COM-003-1 requirements (Parts) dealing with “all calls” and the absence of “all call” requirements under COM-002-3 causing confusion.
 - Concerns over the term “Reliability Directive” appearing in COM-003-1 requirement parts. The commenters had concerns over confusion and double jeopardy.
 - Concerns over compliance with communication protocols still remain at issue.
 - Concerns with the lack of formal ERO doctrine for internal controls. The concerns are without formal guidance there is greater CEA subjectivity and increased compliance uncertainty.
 - Commenters wished to eliminate R2 and R4 because the “assess and correct” language implied internal controls and the potential for undue auditor subjectivity.
- Mr. Kriasiak pointed out that many commenters provided suggestions that could be incorporated in draft 6. Mr. Snyder opened the floor for discussion. Many SDT members agreed with some of the changes which extended greater flexibility to entities to develop their communication protocols. Other members repeated from the OPCPSDT previous meeting the new version is “watered down” by not making COM-003-1 requirements uniform. After much discussion the Chairman called for an email team vote on several proposed changes and one proposal for COM-003-1 draft 6:

1. **Eliminate protocols that refer to all calls or one way burst messages, R1, Parts 1.7, 1.8 and R3, Part 3.3.** *Yes to eliminate , No to retain*

Rationale: Commenters stated the inclusion of all call protocols in COM-003-1 caused conflicts with COM-002-3 because COM-002-3 was silent on all calls. The SDT believes that it is not a COM-003-1 problem and should have been addressed by COM-002-3. The SDT believes it should not be charged with repairing another standard. The attempt to address all calls, while noble, deviates from the original tasking for COM-003-1.

2. **Eliminate the term “Reliability Directive” from the standard.** *Yes to eliminate , No to retain*

Rationale: SDT members stated the inclusion of Reliability Directives in COM-003 is another ill advised effort to address gaps in COM-002-3. The SDT believes that it is not a COM-003-1 problem and should have been addressed by COM-002-3. The SDT believes it should not be charged with repairing another standard and reasons each standard should stand alone.

3. **Change the wording of R1, part 1.9 from “Coordinate with...” to “Method for distribution of communication protocols and updates within 30 days of the revision to ...”** *Yes to change, No to retain*

Rationale: Commenters stated the term ‘Coordinate’ is ambiguous and would leave too much uncertainty with implementation and would generate compliance concerns. The SDT mimicked similar language from IRO-14, R2.

4. **Change the wording of R1, part 1.5 from “Instances where the issuer” to “A requirement for the issuer”** *Yes to change, No to retain*

Rationale: This proposed reword originated in a team discussion where some SDT members wish to strengthen the language of R1, Part 1.5 and an equal number of others who wish to retain the draft 5 language to provide flexibility for entities.

5. **New Proposal not discussed by SDT: Eliminate R4.** *Yes to change, No to retain*

Rationale: This proposed change is based on comments from several entities that say there is no way to determine or record when an operator (DP and GOP) does not understand an Operating instruction therefore there is no way to assess or correct an operator’s performance. Please consider this and vote accordingly.

Result Table for OPCPSDT Ballot dated 4-10-2013

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	A All call	B Reliability Directive	C R1,Part 1.9	D R1,Part 1.5	E R4 Proposal
Lloyd Snyder (Chair)	GSOC	Member	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Tom Irvine	Hydro One	Member	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mike Brost	JEA	Member	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Steve Solis	ERCOT	Member	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Glen Boyle	PJM	Member	Yes	Yes	Yes, (with removal of 30 day)	Yes	No
Michael Cassiadoro	WECC	Member	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Fred Waites	Southern Co	Member	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
John Stephens	City Utilities of Springfield	Member	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Robert Rhodes	SPP	Member	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
RESULTS			9 Yes	9 Yes	7 Yes 2 No	2 Yes 7 No	2 Yes 7 No

- The vote was among the 9 voting members. The results are posted in the table above and the following revisions will be incorporated:
 - All call requirements will be removed from draft 6,
 - References to Reliability Directives will be removed from draft 6,
 - The word “coordinate” in R1, Part 1.9 will be changed to an alternative term in draft 6,
 - The language contained in R1, Part 1.5 from draft 5 will be retained as is.
 - Even though the OPCPSDT voted unfavorably to removing R4, Chairman Snyder desired to reach out to the voting block of commenters who espoused that recommendation. The vote will hold contingent on the results of discussions with that commenting group. Chairman Snyder requested that Mr. Kriasiak discuss this proposal with NERC Compliance to advise the team. Mr. Kriasiak and Chairman Snyder will reach out to the entities that wish to remove R4.
- The Chairman concluded the discussion and Mr. Kriasiak briefed the SDT future next steps for the project.

3. Action Item Review

- Mr. Kriasiak will complete the response to comments for COM-003-1, draft 6 for review by the team
- Mr. Kriasiak will discuss removing R4 with NERC Compliance
- Mr. Kriasiak and Chairman Snyder will reach out to the entities that wish to remove R4 and report the results to the team.

4. Future Meeting(s)

- Proposing an OPCPSDT Meeting at (*anyone wish to host?*). – May 21, 22, 23, 2013 to prepare documents for Quality Review (QR) and posting. Target date for Posting is May 30, 2013 or sooner.
- There may also be a need for a conference call after the NERC BOT meeting in early May.

5. Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned at approximately Noon, ET, on April 10, 2013.