

Meeting Notes

Protection System Maintenance & Testing SDT – Project 2007-17

July 29–30, 2008
Maple Grove, MN

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

Charles Rogers, Chairman, brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EDT on July 29, 2008. The attendees were:

Members:	Charles Rogers (Chair)	John Anderson	Bob Bentert
	Merle (Rick) Ashton	Richard Ferner	Carol A. Gerou
	Roger D. Green (day 1)	John Kruse	Mark Peterson
	Russell C Hardison	Dave Harper	Al Calafiore

Guests: Sam Francis, Jeff Laninga, and Jim Kenney

Eleven members of the drafting team and 3 guests were present.

2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Al Calafiore and Charles Rogers reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and there were no questions raised.

3. Standards Comments and Revisions

Discussion continued on line by line wording of the combined document. Review of Table 1 continued with everyone requested to provide either suggestions or corrections.

The team has decided to expand the draft FAQ. The FAQ is a collection of questions and answers as developed that the PSMSDT believes could be helpful to those implementing a new NERC standard for protection system maintenance.

The following issues were carried over from previous meetings, are still unresolved, and are to be carried over to the September meeting:

- Should there be an allowance or extension of the maintenance period due to such events as natural disasters? The discussion included the use of

self reporting of failure to meet schedule (due to the extenuating circumstances) and include a mitigation plan and also the fact that the Regions and NERC will know of the “events” on the system and will make allowances.

The proposed solution for this issue is to put a discussion about “non-compliance due to storms or other extenuating circumstances” in the FAQ and will 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 program for sometime, discovers some concerns that would significantly reduce its maintenance cycle. Then, 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 will further consider this issue as part of detailed discussions of RCM at a future meeting.
- Should there be a FAQ that describes where DME Maintenance requirements will be found? 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 through PRC-018 for Maintenance requirements for other DME.

4. Action Items

The following are assignments from the meeting:

1. Rick Ashton is to do further work on Note 7 for the tables.
2. Sam Francis is to develop a FAQ on DC Grounds.
3. Rick Ashton is to look for any discussions about CT Circuit Grounds in the Reference Paper and FAQ.
4. Carol Gerou is to develop FAQs discussing Level 2 monitoring on DC Circuits and on Communications.
5. Rick Ashton will re-write the Level 3 monitoring definition and Table 1d activities for DC Circuits.
6. Charles Rogers will restructure R2 and the footnote on generator protection systems to get the footnote in the requirements themselves.
7. Al Calafiore will check on how we proceed with revising the SAR to remove "testing" from the title.

8. Team members are being asked to bring back comments and input from their peers on the current draft of the standard.
9. Team members are being asked to review the FAQ and provide, in marked-up form, answers to any questions that you feel you can address. Also, please review any answers that already exist and make any modifications to those that you feel inclined to do. Please provide these to the chairperson, and he will merge them into a master document.
10. Team members also continue to review the draft standard and provide any markups that are appropriate. Please provide these to the chairman, and he will merge them into a master document. Again, the sooner, the better.

5. Outstanding Assignments

Below are the outstanding assignments that were made to the small teams to bring back to the entire team for consideration:

- a. Develop improved verification activities for the DC Control Circuit Verification.
- b. Develop an improved description of the verification activities for the communication circuit testing. Rick Ashton is working on this.
- c. Develop appropriate verification activities for Station Battery Capacity Testing. Rick Ashton is working on this as well.

The discussion on how to assure the provisions of the SAR, any FERC directives that apply to this project, and any assessments or other recommendations (such as from the SPCTF) are considered. Also how do we make sure that we have captured all of the requirements from the 4 previous standards? Al developed an Excel spread sheet which he will update and provide to the Chairman.

6. Next Steps

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 3 and 4 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. local time at the Oncor Offices in Fort Worth, Texas.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at noon on July 30, 2008.