

Meeting Notes

Project 2009-02 Real-time Monitoring and Analysis Capabilities Standard Drafting Team

August 25, 2015 | 10:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Mountain August 26, 2015 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Mountain August 27, 2015 | 8:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. Mountain

Xcel Energy 18201 W. 10th Ave Golden, CO

Dial-in: 1.866.740.1260 | Access Code: 6251541 | Security Code: 200902

Web Access: www.readytalk.com | Access Code: 6251541

Administrative

1. Introductions

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Mountain, August 25, 2015. Participants were:

Members				
Name	Company	Name	Company	
Saad Malik	Peak Reliability	Alan Martin (Remote)	Southern Company Transmission	
Andrew Pankratz	Florida Power & Light	Bert Peters	APS	
Charles Abell	Ameren	Scott Aclin	SPP	
Phil Hart	AECI	Sarma Nuthalapati	ERCOT	
		Mark Olson	NERC	
Observers				
Name	Company	Name	Company	
Darrell Piatt	FERC	Bruce Larsen (Remote)	WE Energy	
Lauren Perotti	NERC	Joe Uchiyama	USBR	
Robert Staton	Xcel Energy	Ali Miremadi (Remote)	CAISO	

RELIABILITY | ACCOUNTABILITY



Members				
Name	Company	Name	Company	
Antonio Grayson (Remote)	Southern Co	Chris de Graffenried (Remote)	ConEd	
Dan Roethemeyer (Remote)	Dynegy	David Bueche (Remote)	Centerpoint	
Michal Cruz-montes (Remote)	Centerpoint	Chris Colson	WAPA	
Dennis Sauriol (Remote)	AEP	Sean Bodkin (Remote)	NERC	
Jennifer Richardson (Remote)	Dynegy	Jim Kleitsch (Remote)	ATC	
John Fontenot (Remote)	Bryan Texas Utilities	Michelle Corley (Remote)	Cleco	
Robert HIrchak (Remote)	Cleco	Sing Tay (Remote)		
Tom Buhler (Remote)	ORU	William Berry (Remote)	Owensboro Municipal Utilities	
Darryl Boggess (Remote)	WFEC	Vincent Le (Remote)	FERC	
Guy Zito	NPCC			

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 with 8 of 10 total members participating.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by Mark Olson. There were no questions raised. Participant conduct policy was reviewed.

Agenda

1. Chair Remarks

Saad Malik opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda.

2. Review SAR comments and consider draft responses



Participants reviewed all comments submitted during the formal comment period. Draft responses were reviewed and discussed. The team agreed the SAR Type should indicate 'Revisions to Existing Standards' in addition to 'New Standard'. The team agreed that the project did not need to address operator notifications during unplanned loss of analysis capabilities because TOP and IRO standards address this through requirements to ensure Real-time Assessments are performed at least once every 30 minutes. The SAR was modified accordingly. Participants discussed a commenter's suggestion to include requirements to monitor weather. SDT members believe monitoring weather information is common practice and as a result such requirements would not improve reliability. The team agreed upon draft comment responses and the redline SAR with changes as above.

3. Review initial draft standard, definition, Violation Risk Factors (VRFs), and Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)

- **a.** Participants discussed a description of real-time monitoring to incorporate acquisition, visualization, and alerting. The description was added to the Guidelines and Technical Basis section. The team determined that it was not necessary or beneficial to develop a definition for the NERC Glossary.
- **b.** Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for RCs to have operating procedures to address quality of data used in monitoring and analysis. They considered whether requirements were already addressed in IRO-010-1a / IRO-010-2. The SDT determined that existing and proposed standards did not necessarily address data quality. A rationale box was developed to explain the SDT's understanding.
- **c.** Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for RCs to provide System Operators with data quality indications. The team considered adding support personnel but determined that they would not necessarily be involved with all Real-time data quality issues.
- **d.** Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for TOPs and BAs to have operating procedures to address quality of data used in monitoring and analysis. They considered the situation where a TOP uses a third party to perform the Real-time Assessment. The SDT adopted wording for the requirement that is aligned with proposed TOP-001-3 for consistency. All TOPs will need to have an operating procedure addressing data quality, regardless of whether they perform Real-time Assessments, or have them performed by a third party.
- **e.** Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for TOPs and BAs to provide System Operators with data quality indications. The SDT determined that all TOPs should comply with this requirement, regardless of whether they perform Real-time Assessments themselves, or have them performed by a third party.
- f. Participants discussed a draft requirement for RCs and TOPs to have an operating procedure to maintain the quality of the analysis used in Real-time Assessments. The team agreed that the project scope is not aimed at addressing the quality of the resulting Real-time Assessments because proposed TOP and IRO standards from project 2014-03 have already addressed the performance of Real-time Assessments. Rather, the requirement will address the quality of the analysis used in Real-time Assessments. Analysis could be coming from state estimation, real-time contingency analysis, human analysis, or other methods capable of evaluating system conditions. The SDT did not support requiring entities to include notification provisions in the operating procedure because these actions are required by existing and proposed TOP and IRO standards.
- **g.** Participants discussed a draft requirement for RCs and TOPs to provide System Operators with indications of the quality of the analysis used in Real-time Assessments.



- **h.** Participants discussed a draft requirement for RCs, TOPs, and BAs to use an independent alarm process monitor, such as a watchdog or heartbeat monitor, for EMS alarms.
- i. The team accepted proposed VRFs of Medium for all requirements. The requirements meet the FERC and NERC guideline criteria for Medium because they relate to the ability to effectively monitor and control the BES. A detailed justification will be developed and posted with the proposed standards.
- **j.** The team agreed that the requirements should be written into two new reliability standards as follows: IRO-018-1 applicable to RCs, and TOP-010-1 applicable to TOPs and BAs.
- **4. Review implementation plan.** The team discussed necessary timelines to implement the proposed requirements. It was agreed that items 3b-e and 3g above would require 12 months following regulatory approval. Items 3f-g would require 18 months. Factors affecting implementation include implementation of data specification requirements from TOP-003-3 and IRO-010-2, which are pending FERC approval, coordination among applicable entities to obtain data quality indications, and smaller entity readiness to meet the requirements.
- 5. The project schedule was reviewed.
 - a. Detailed project plan was reviewed.
 - **b.** NERC arranged for a Quality Review during the week of August 31.
 - **c.** The SDT agreed to hold a conference call on September 8, 2015 for final review of material.
 - d. The SDT will seek Standards Committee authorization to post in September
- 6. Communications plan was discussed.
 - **a.** Items were added to the communications plan. The team discussed engaging regional standing committees, NERC EMS working group, and the NERC Operating Reliability Subcommittee. Opportunities to discuss the project with IEEE were discussed.
- 7. The chair adjourned the meeting at 11:45 am August 27, 2015.