Project 2007-06 System Protection Coordination

Unofficial Comment Form

2nd Draft of PRC-027-1: Protection System Coordination for Performance During Faults

Please **DO NOT** use this form for commenting. Please use the [electronic comment form](https://www.nerc.net/nercsurvey/Survey.aspx?s=62607360c3524e2ab3f01410b12413cf) to submit comments on the 2nd draft of the standard for Protection System Coordination for Performance During Faults. Comments must be submitted by 8 p.m. Eastern **December 17, 2012**. If you have questions please contact Al McMeekin at [al.mcmeekin@nerc.net](mailto:al.mcmeekin@nerc.net) or by telephone at 803-530-1963.

<http://www.nerc.com/filez/standards/System_Protection_Project_2007-06.html>

**Background Information:**

The Project 2007-06 System Protection Coordination Standard Drafting Team (SPCSDT) posted an initial draft of the Standard PRC-001-2 on September 11, 2009 for comments. In that draft, the SPCSDT attempted to address the planning and non-operational issues identified in the assessment of PRC-001-1 performed by the NERC System Protection and Control Task Force (SPCTF) as well as the operating time frame issues identified in FERC Order 693. These operating time frame requirements involved detecting Protection System failures, informing operators and taking quick corrective actions; consequently, the SPCSDT transferred the Order 693 directives associated with Requirements R2, R5 and R6 to Project 2007-03 Real-time Operations for inclusion in the revisions of the appropriate operating standards associated within that project. Additionally, the SPCSDT determined that the training aspects of PRC-001-1 Requirement R1 are more appropriately addressed by Reliability Standard PER-005-1 with revision to its Applicability section to include the Generator Operator. Therefore, PRC-001-3 was created to retain Requirement R1 only, as identified in the implementation plan for PRC-027-1. The two remaining requirements, Requirements R3 and R4 of PRC-001-1 address the coordination of new and existing protective systems. These aspects of coordination are incorporated in the proposed standard PRC-027-1 Protection System Coordination for Performance During Faults.

Draft 1 of PRC-027-1 was posted for a 45-day formal comment and initial ballot from May 21 – July 5, 2012. The SPCSDT has responded to stakeholder comments and incorporated pertinent suggestions into the standard. The SPCSDT is presenting the second draft of PRC-027-1 for stakeholder review and comment.

For questions 1-5, please provide specific comments related to the individual question.

**You do not have to answer all questions. Enter All Comments in Simple Text Format.**

*Insert a “check” mark in the appropriate boxes by double-clicking the gray areas.*

1. Based on stakeholder comments, the drafting team modified the Purpose of this standard to “To coordinate Protection Systems for Interconnected Elements, such that the least number of power system Elements are isolated to clear Faults.” Do you agree with this Purpose? If not, please provide specific suggestions for change in the comment area.

Yes

No

Comments:

1. The drafting team is proposing two definitions for use only with PRC-027-1 as follows:

**Interconnected Element**: An Element that electrically joins separate Functional Entities, including those Functional Entities that are a part of the same Registered Entity

**Protection System Study**: A study that demonstrates existing or proposed Protection Systems operate in the desired sequence for clearing Faults.

Do you agree with these definitions, if not please provide specific suggestions for change in the comment area.

Yes

No

Comments:

1. In Requirement R1, the drafting team modified the time frame to allow entities 48 months to have a documented Protection System Study completed for each Interconnected Element if no Protection System Study exists. Note, the drafting team has allowed inclusion of all previously performed Protection System Studies whose summary of results include, at a minimum, the protective relay settings reviewed, contingencies evaluated, Fault currents used, any issues identified, and any revisions proposed. Do you agree with this approach? If not, please provide specific suggestions for change in the comment area.

Yes

No

Comments:      

1. In Requirement R4, the drafting team replaced the need to ‘reach agreement’ with ‘confirming acceptance.’

Do you agree with this change? If not, please provide specific suggestions for change in the comment area.

Yes

No

Comments:

1. The requirements and associated measures were modified to indicate that information was ‘provided’ instead of ‘demonstrating that each affected entity received notification.’ Do you agree with this change? If not, please provide specific suggestions for change in the comment area.

Yes

No

Comments: