

Meeting Notes

Project 2007-11 Disturbance Monitoring Standard Drafting Team

March 25-28, 2013

Waltham, MA

Administrative

1. Introductions – chair remarks

The meeting was brought to order by the (Outgoing) Chair, Jeff Pond at 1:00 p.m. ET on Monday, March 25, 2013. Participants were introduced and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)			
			3/25	3/26	3/27	3/28
Lee Pedowicz (Chair)	NPCC	Observer	W	IP	IP	
Jeff Pond (outgoing Chair)	National Grid	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Frank Ashrafi	Southern California Edison	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Alan D. Baker	Florida Power and Light	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Daniel J. Hanson	NRG	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
H. Steven Myers	ERCOT	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Jack Soehren	ITC Holdings	Member	W	W	W	
Richard Ferner	Western Area Power Admin.	Observer	W	W	W	
Kasia Kulback	National Grid	Observer	IP		IP	
Robert Grabovickic	National Grid	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Ryan Quint	Bonneville Power Admin.	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Ken Hubona	FERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Bob Cummings	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Observer		IP	IP	IP

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)			
			3/25	3/26	3/27	3/28
Barb Nutter (Standard Developer)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Natara Bierria	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Eric Allen	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Observer	W	W		
Joseph Krisiak	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Observer		W	W	

2. Determination of quorum

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT or Team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as all of the members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by Barb Nutter. There were no questions raised. The participants were reminded of the NERC Antitrust Guidelines.

4. Review Team roster

Barb Nutter reviewed the Team roster.

5. Review meeting agenda and objectives

- a. Project progression – workshop, industry webinar, 45 day comment period and ballot

Barb Nutter discussed the benefits of having the workshop prior to the comment period. Since this project has been in informal development for the past two years the workshop would enable the Drafting Team to build consensus and increase awareness in the industry and to receive industry feedback in order to make revisions prior to the comment period. Holding the industry webinar prior to the comment period and ballot would also increase awareness. Jeff Pond told the group that he agreed with the benefit of holding the workshop prior to the posting. Mr. Soehren expressed that he would prefer to go directly into the comment period and ballot but would defer to the Team. The remainder of the Team was in agreement with the project progression.

Several members expressed concern over the ability to Team to complete the work within the project schedule completion of 2013 with only six Drafting Team members including the Chair. The Team requested the addition of another two Team members. Barb Nutter took the action item to request the Standards Committee to approve a posting for nominations for two Drafting Team members.

Agenda

1. Overview

a. Industry comments (Consideration of Comments)

Steve Myers had performed a final review prior to the meeting. The Team reviewed Steve's comments and updated the consideration of comments as needed. Barb Nutter to make a final pass then the document will be ready for posting.

b. PRC-002-2

The Team began the standard discussion by reviewing the Purpose statement. Bob Cummings suggested removing the reference to the BES in order for the Standard to be applicable to the entire system. Discussion around the intent of Standard ensued – it was acknowledged the intent is to ensure that entities are capable of providing the requirement data not how to collect the data or the types of devices. The Team decided to make other updates to the Purpose statement.

The Team discussed the Functional Entities in the Applicability section. The Planning Coordinator was the entity to determine the location of the Dynamic Disturbance Recording (DDR) locations and triggers. The Team discussed that all regions do not have a Planning Coordinator to make this determination.

Lee Pedowicz noted that PRC-002-NPCC-01 used the Reliability Coordinator to make the DDR determination. The Drafting Team recognized that there are Regions where either the Planning Coordinator or Reliability Coordinator would be applicable.

In order to have the appropriate entity make the DDR determination continent-wide, the Team decided to revise the applicability section to the following:

4.1 Responsible Entity

The Responsible Entity to determine the Dynamic Disturbance Recording location and triggers, where applicable, for the Transmission Owner and Generator Owner is either the: Should Responsible Entity be capitalized?

4.1.1 Planning Coordinator

4.1.2 Reliability Coordinator

In order to consolidate several requirements the Team decided to continue the use of term responsible entity throughout the Applicability section by making the revision below:

4.2 Transmission Owner is the responsible entity to determine the location for Fault Recording and Sequence of Event Recording, and triggers for facilities that it owns.

4.3 Generator Owner, in conjunction with its Transmission Owner, is the responsible entity to determine the location for Fault Recording and Sequence of Event Recording, and triggers for facilities that it owns.

The original SAR, dated March 2007, lists the responsible entity's as the Transmission Owner, Transmission Operator, Generator Owner, and Generator Operator. With the addition of the Planning Coordinator and Reliability Coordinator the SAR will be updated to reflect the additional responsible entities.

The Team reviewed and updated the newly defined terms and reviewed, updated, and consolidated Requirements R1 through R18.

Add to issues tracking spreadsheet:

- Current requirement R11.3 (former requirement R16.3) - the Team noted R16.3 may need rewording. The question was asked – does this apply to FR and DDR?
- Current requirement R20 (former requirement R26) Bob Cummings felt that 10 days was too short. FR is different than DDR. Normally 90 days for DDR but 30 days is acceptable.
- Point of Interconnection issue – Either monitor units individually or collector bus aggregate or all the lines.

c. Discussion of PRC-002-2 and PRC-002-NPCC-01

- i. After additional discussion about PRC-002-NPCC-01, the Team determined that the Regional Standard was too prescriptive for a continent-wide standard and determined that a standard that directs the industry to collect the appropriate data for analysis without directing how would enable the standard to be applicable continent-wide. If a Region determines that it needs to develop a more stringent standard they can develop a Regional Standard such as the NPCC Regional Standard.

d. MVA Analysis Technical Document

- i. Not Addressed
- ii. The Team put together an outline for a technical reference document. During the discussion Jeff Pond stated that fault recording was the responsibility of the utility and that the PC is in the position to select the DDR locations. National Grid would oppose the Standard if they are not able to select the location for fault recording. The Team determined that utilities can use any device that provides the required data – PMU data, legacy devices (within certain parameters – can't use paper recorders.)

Team discussion – the PC has a wide area perspective of system stability to select the location of DDRs. The PC should not select fault recording and sequence of event recording locations. Typically the PC does not have the expertise and knowledge of the relay system at this level. There are situations where the PC is also the TO but this is the exception.

FR and SOE do not need a “wide area” coordinated perspective – this means the TO and GO can determine the location of their own FR and SOE.

Bob Cummings noted the technical document needs to explain to the industry what is trying to be answered by obtaining the disturbance monitoring data – what tripped and why did it trip. The Team will continue work on the technical document.

e. Issues and Directives

- i. Not addressed

2. **Discuss Outreach**

a. Workshop

- i. Tentative –June 4 from 1 – 5 PM and June 5 from 8AM - noon. The Team will decide at the April meeting if they are prepared for the workshop in June.

b. Industry webinar

c. Outreach Opportunities

- i. Events Analysis Subcommittee (EAS) June 10, Atlanta – ?
- ii. System Protection and Control Subcommittee (SPCS) June 25-26 – Bob Cummings will dial in and give update. A Team member should be on the call also.
- iii. I Subcommittee of the Power System Relay Committee May 13 -16 Jeff Pond will amend agenda and provide outreach.

3. **Review and Finalize**

a. Consideration of Comments

b. PRC-002-2

- i. Planning Coordinator as Applicable entity

c. MVA Analysis Technical Document

4. **Next steps**

a. Develop workshop material

b. Hold workshop

5. **Assignments**

a. Barb Nutter

- i. Consideration of Comments
- ii. Request approval from Standards Committee to add two Drafting Team members

6. Future meeting(s)

- a. April 16 to April 19, 2013 – NERC Headquarters – Atlanta, GA
- b. June 4 to June 7, 2013 – NERC Headquarters – Atlanta, GA

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m. ET on March 28, 2013