

Meeting Notes Project 2010-13.2 Phase 2 of Relay Loadability: Generation

June 29, 2012
Conference Call

Administrative

1. Introductions

The meeting was brought to order by the chair, at 11:00 a.m. ET Tuesday, June 29, 2012. The team meeting was hosted by NERC's advisor via a ReadyTalk web and conference call. The chair described the revised draft PRC-025-1 standard relative to the May 22-24, 2012 in-person team meeting in Atlanta. Following the meeting, it was revealed that the standard, although in the Results-Based Standard (RSB) template document, did not employ the RBS concepts. This meeting was to discuss the revised standard with RBS concepts implemented. Roll call and introductions were made and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Matthew Adeleke	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC staff
Ena Agbedia	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC staff
Scott Barfield-McGinnis (Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC staff
Jeff Billo	ERCOT	Member
S. Bryan Burch	Southern Company	Member
Sam Ciccone	ReliabilityFirst Corporation	Observer
Steven Hataway	Florida Power and Light	Observer
Mike Jensen	Pacific Gas and Electric Company	Member

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Charles W. Rogers (Chairperson)	Consumers Energy	Member
Xiaodong Sun	Ontario Power Generation Inc.	Member
Phil Tatro	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC staff
Joe T. Uchiyama	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Member
Benson Vuong	Salt River Project	Member
David Youngblood	Luminant	Observer

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 seven of the ten total members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by the advisor. There were no questions raised. The participants were reminded each day they are working under the NERC Antitrust Guidelines.

4. Roster Updates

The advisor presented the team roster and that no changes have been made. There were questions about the resignation of member Michael Putt, which brings the team to ten members and the nomination submittals of possible team members. The advisor noted that the nominees were being processed and references checked.

Agenda

1. Approval of Meeting Notes from Previous Meetings

The notes of the May 22-24, 2012 meeting were not brought before the team for approval as quorum was not met.

2. Review of Results-Based Standard (RBS) Development Guidance

The advisor reviewed the RBS guideline document found on the NERC website noting there are three basic concepts of RBS requirements; performance-based, risk-based, and competency-based. Further explanation was given that a standard may have one, two, or all three types. In the case of the current draft of PRC-025-1, all three are present and would be discussed during the meeting.

3. Discussion of the RBS Draft Standard

General – The advisor described the concept of the draft PRC-025-1 standard and that R1 was competency-based requiring the entity to have knowledge of the applicable relays and the associated settings for each. Requirement R2 was risk-based meaning that the entity has a specific implementation time to address the risk. Finally, R3 was performance-based requiring the entity to not have any generator trips due to improperly set protective relays.

Requirement R1 – The chair continued the discussion beginning with Requirement R1. There were no substantive comments.

Requirement R2 – Some discussion was held about the words “...shall set each protective relay in accordance...” in Requirement R2. Suggestions were made and the requirement was revised to read, “...shall ensure each protective relay is set in accordance...”

Applicability – A concern was raised about the expanded Facilities section from the Atlanta meeting. Based on discussion, the usage of “relay” was made plural. The most substantive discussion concerned applicable facilities regarding auxiliary transformers. Members were concerned that industry would be confused as to the specific equipment to which the standard is referring. The applicability for auxiliary transformers was structured and a footnote added to the draft standard. The footnote acknowledges that industry has variability in the terms for auxiliary transformers; therefore the team provided example terms.

Additionally, a reference was inserted in the footnote to direct the reader to the Guidance and Technical Basis section for more detail. The advisor confirmed that the NERC Board of Trustees adopted standard FAC-003-3 included its Guidance and Technical Basis section. Since it appeared the Guidance and Technical Basis section remains with the standard upon adoption/approval, the team agreed to work on details and diagrams addressing auxiliary transformers in the Guidance and Technical Basis section.

Further applicability concerns were raised that protective relays for auxiliary transformers may not be applicable to the standard PRC-005-2 which received 79% industry consensus on June 27, 2012 in a successive ballot. The team agreed this concern needs thorough review to determine whether auxiliary transformer relays are included in PRC-005-2. If so, then everything is fine; otherwise, the team may need to determine a solution.

Requirement R3 – There was concern that having a double negative in this requirement is confusing and may be difficult to understand if translating from English. No change was made to R3 during the meeting.

The Attachment 1 – Concerns were raised about whether an entity would understand how to apply the criteria, specifically because of the index numbering. Some clarifying words were inserted in the introductory paragraph. Minor corrections were made to the Reactive Power reference by noting MVAR, rather than MW. In the Reactive Power Output column of the table, the words “of nameplate MW” were added for clarity to the percentage values.

Due to concerns that the team had about the application of auxiliary transformers in the applicability section, inconsistency with the draft PRC-005-2, and other minority concerns, the team agreed that it would be best to continue work in-person.

4. Discussion of Questions for the Comment Period

No discussion was held concerning the comment form for the 30-day formal posting due to time constraints and that it could be deferred to the next meeting.

5. Action Items

All members – By July 16, 2012 thoroughly review the new RBS standard, including requirements, measures, and attachment. In addition, review the new rationale statements made in the blue rationale boxes and the Guidance and Technical Basis section to address the issue of how to describe the protective relays pertaining to auxiliary transformer facilities. Comment form suggestions or changes are also needed for the formal comment period. Return all comments, redlined documents, or other notes to the advisor by July 16, 2012 for consolidation and re-distribution to the team.

Advisor and August 2012 meeting host – To work out the meeting logistics, post meeting to the NERC website calendar and announce the meeting as soon as possible. A passport is required for travel into Canada.

Advisor – Distribute the team roster, the most current draft of the RBS standard, and comment form to the team.

Mike Jensen – Develop diagrams/sketches of auxiliary transformer connections and provide these to the advisor to create the electronic versions for insertion into the Guidance and Technical Basis section of the standard.

6. Review of the Schedule

The advisor noted that the schedule did not represent of how the team was progressing due to the extended time it was taking to get to posting draft 1 for a first formal 30-day comment period. As of the meeting, progress of the project was four weeks behind the approved Standards Committee schedule based on meeting a September 30, 2013 filing. Additionally, having to meet in-person in August 2012 will place the standard’s progress an additional 11 weeks further behind the planned schedule. Discussion was held concerning the impacts of the delays. It was noted that opportunities to compress the schedule would be sought before requesting an extension. Should the team need additional time, a further analysis could be done when the project has progressed further and if an

extension of time should be requested. If so, having reportable progress would be desired to support making such a request.

7. Future meeting(s)

There is a meeting scheduled for August 21-23, 2012 in Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada to finalize the draft 1 posting for a 30-day comment period.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m. ET on June 29, 2012.