

Meeting Notes

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

February 2, 2016 | 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Eastern
February 3, 2016 | 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Eastern

Florida Power & Light
4200 West Flagler St.
Miami, FL 33134

Phone: 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 1:00 p.m. Eastern, February 2, 2016. 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	Jim Useldinger (Remote)	Gridliance
Tim Kucey (Remote)	PSEG Fossil, LLC	Mark Olson	NERC
Observers			
Name	Company	Name	Company
Darrell Piatt	FERC	Bruce Larsen (Remote)	WE Energy
Lauren Perotti	NERC	Mark Riley	AECI
Chris de Graffenried	ConEd	Jim Kleitsch (Remote)	ATC

Members			
Name	Company	Name	Company
Sean Bodkin	NERC	David Bueche (Remote)	Centerpoint
Steve Crutchfield	NERC	Chris Colson	WAPA

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 9 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. Ballot results. Participants reviewed results from the additional ballots.

	Ballot	Non-binding Poll
Standard	Quorum / Approval	Quorum / Supportive Opinions
IRO-018-1	82.88 % / 72.13%	81.95% / 81.76%
TOP-010-1	82.18% / 68.01%	81.02% / 76.27%

3. Review comments from second posting and consider revisions to the draft standards, Implementation Plan, Violation Risk Factors (VRFs), and Violation Severity Levels (VSLs). Participants reviewed all comments submitted during the formal comment period. Draft responses were discussed. The team discussed the following proposed changes to the standards and supporting material:

- a. **Change resolve to address in several places within proposed TOP-010-1 and IRO-018-1.** The SDT agreed that the change proposed by stakeholders more clearly aligned with the SDT's intent. The SDT recognized that the original wording could be misinterpreted by some to imply that the entity was required to wholly remediate data quality issues when in fact there are examples when resolution of data quality issues may be beyond the entity's control. For example, another entity may be responsible for providing the data. The revision clarifies that the applicable entity's procedures must include "actions to address" quality issues with the entity(ies) responsible for providing the data. The SDT also added examples of actions to address data quality issues to the Guidelines section of the proposed standards. The SDT determined that this is a clarification and non-substantive change to the proposed wording of the requirements.

- b. Clarified meaning of operating personnel as used in Rationale.** The SDT discussed the multiple instances where the term *operating personnel* is used in Rationale and Guidelines sections. The SDT agreed that the Rationale should be clarified to indicate that operating personnel includes System Operators and staff responsible for supporting Real-time operations. The SDT confirmed requirement parts that explicitly call for display of information to System Operators are appropriate. Where not explicitly stated in the requirement parts (e.g. IRO-018-1 R2 Part 2.2), the information could be displayed to other operating personnel instead of the System Operator as specified in the entity's Operating Process or Operating Procedure.
- c. Scope of data to be addressed in the Operating Procedures.** The SDT discussed concerns that the proposed requirements could saturate the operator with information or required actions for data that does not impact reliability. The SDT agreed that previous revisions to the standard (for second posting) addressed this concern. They agreed to add more details to the Guidelines section to promote understanding. The following revision was made to the Guidelines section in IRO-018-1, and corresponding change was made to TOP-010-1.

Requirement R1 Part 1.3 is focused on addressing data point quality issues affecting Real-time Assessments. Other data quality issues of a lower priority are addressed according to an entity's operating practices and are not covered under Requirement R1 Part 1.3.
- d. Clarifications in the Guidelines section.** The SDT discussed stakeholder concerns with certain phrases in the Guidelines section that could imply obligations on entities that are not explicitly included in the requirements. The SDT made several changes to more clearly indicate that the Guidelines section did not imply obligations, but instead contained examples to enhance clarity.
- e. VRFs.** The SDT reviewed all VRFs. The FERC observer provided his opinion that some VRFs should be changed from Medium to High in accordance with FERC guidelines because they could be linked to causes of the 2003 Blackout. The SDT did not agree. They determined that the proposed requirements are not included in the list of "critical areas (from the Final Blackout Report) where violations could severely affect the reliability of the Bulk Power System." The SDT agreed that the proposed VRFs meet FERC and NERC guidelines and the definition of Medium risk requirements because, if violated, they could "directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the Bulk Electric System, or the ability to effectively monitor and control the Bulk Electric System."
- f.** The team considered all other changes suggested by stakeholders in the comment report and agreed upon responses in the Consideration of Comments report.
- 4. Revised draft standards.** The SDT reviewed the revised standards and agreed upon the proposed clarifying changes. No changes were made to the Implementation Plan or supporting material. The SDT agreed to proceed with Quality Review (QR) and final ballot.
- 5. Discuss next steps and project schedule.** The SDT agreed to hold a conference call on February 12 to discuss any feedback from QR. The SDT plans to post for final ballot during the week of February 16.
- 6. Communications plan was discussed.** SDT members agreed on assignments to engage select entities to communicate the revisions and address any outstanding concerns.
- 7. The chair adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm February 3, 2016.**