

Meeting Agenda

Protection Systems Maintenance & Testing SDT — Project 2007-17

February, 10, 2009 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EST

February 11, 2009 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EST

Georgia Power Company

Atlanta, GA

Administrative

1. Introduction — Charles Rogers

2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Al Calafiore

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.

3. Determination of Quorum

The rule for NERC working groups is that half of the members (that are entitled to vote) of the working group constitutes a quorum, and a motion passes if it receives two-thirds affirmative votes of the votes cast.

4. Standards Comments and Revisions — Continue Drafting Process

The drafting team has finished the first pass. The DT will review to make sure that all requirements and issues were addressed.

5. Objectives for This Meeting.

- a. Address the inserted comments from the beginning of the document through the Requirements clause (including the Tables),
- b. Develop "final" proposed Measures and Compliance Information,
- c. Clean up the FAQ, and
- d. Cover outstanding issues and reminders from previous meeting.

6. Review and Discuss the Following Issues that are Still Outstanding
Review the following issues outstanding from previous meetings: How do we assure that the actions are carried out?

On the issue of taking out the word “Testing” from the title of the standard, the team decided to proceed with taking “Testing” out of the title. The team has the discretion to "recommend" a modification to the title and ask for feedback from stakeholders through the comment form. Then make sure the team asks a question on the comment form about keeping “Testing” in the title . . . if most stakeholders agree the SDT can change the title. (From Maureen e-mail 8-4-08).

On the issue of “Should there be an allowance or extension of the maintenance period due to such events as natural disasters, it was decided to put a discussion about “non-compliance” due to storms or other extenuating circumstances” in the FAQ and include response received from compliance. Note that compliance said it will take all circumstances into account and in cases such as described above and may not levy fines. However, it will still remain a reportable event but not to be considered a “black mark” on individual entities such as in the case of repeat offenders.

The team will further consider this if necessary to respond to industry comments. A specific question about this on the posting may be worth considering.

An issue that emerged in the April SDT meeting and is still unresolved is how to treat a situation where an entity, after following an RCM programs for sometime, discovers some concerns that would significantly reduce its maintenance cycle, and that entity would switch to a time based program if it has a longer cycle, (presumably to avoid higher cost of the shorter cycle requirements discovered by the RCM program.

The team decided to hold this issue and will further consider it as part of detailed discussions of RCM.

During the December conference calls, it was realized that a TBM, following precisely the Table 1 intervals, may permit some entities to increase their intervals from those that they have previously determined as necessary to achieve their performance goals. This issue will be discussed and determine if it is really the case. Determine if an entity needs to have a basis to extend their current intervals to the Table 1 intervals, and determine if the Table 1 intervals, particularly for level-1 monitoring, should be decreased, and therefore possibly direct more entities to a PBM."

On the issue of should there be an FAQ that describes where DME Maintenance requirements will be found; it was pointed out that there is currently a FAQ that loosely suggests that DME, when also a relay, will be according to PRC-005, and

refers users to PRC-002 and PRC-018 for Maintenance requirements for other DME. **The issue is to be resolved within this FAQ.**

On the issue of continued discussion on different relays types, particularly analog as opposed to digital, with microprocessors that do continuous monitoring and determine if there is a problem and provide alarms or information. **The SDT did not fully respond to the concerns and will need to have additional discussion. The team wants to keep this item in the agenda as a reminder that although there is a FAQ, they need to make sure the subject is adequately covered. The resolution rests with the level of monitoring definition and the FAQ.**

On the continued discussion on replacing or upgrading some elements as part of maintenance — should verification of settings etc. on replaced elements (same as commissioning) be required in this standard? Or is it covered in other standards? **This issue is still outstanding, retain as reminder. The team believes some aspects are covered in PRC-001, Sam Francis and Al Calafiore will double check with the PRC-001 team and provide an answer; some aspects are covered in the FAQ.**

7. Review Action Items from December 19 Conference Call and Previous Meetings

- a. Everyone — If you have summary statistics of observed Protection System performance during testing, please provide them to the group to assist in justifying the allowable error rate ("Countable Events") for performance-based maintenance programs. Essentially, we'd like to see a list of defined "segments" (Relay type, model, etc), number tested per year, and number found with out-of-bounds issues. If you have such reports, we'd like them as far back as you can provide them. Charles Rogers will provide this for our program here at Consumers.
- b. Charles Rogers will develop a FAQ on performance-based maintenance to discuss how a problem found during a miss-operation investigation would be addressed. Essentially, that it is an out-of-schedule test to investigate with the result of the testing. Others may contribute as well.
- c. Rick Ashton and Sam Francis are to develop a requirement excluding batteries from PBM for our consideration.
- d. Mark Peterson will develop a FAQ discussing whether Countable Events includes software errors, etc.
- e. Everyone is to review the draft standard and the draft FAQ and provide any additional comments, markups, etc.
- f. The issue/discussion on how to assure that the provisions of the SAR, any FERC directives that apply to this project and any assessments or other recommendations (such as from the SPCTF if any apply) are considered. Also how do we make sure that we have captured all of the requirements from the four previous standards? Al Calafiore developed an Excel spread sheet which he will provide for discussion at the meeting.

8. Review Any New Issues

9. Future Meetings and Conference Calls

The group will discuss and schedule future meetings and conference calls.

10. Adjourn

Note: Request — In PRC-005 R2.1, it states “Evidence Protection System devices were maintained and tested within the defined intervals”.

Several of our clients are confused by this statement and after we explain to them what it means, they understand. We would like to recommend that a single word be inserted by NERC to make it easier for the plant/facility personnel to comprehend what is required. The change would be “Evidence that Protection System devices were maintained and tested within the defined intervals”.