

Meeting Notes

Project 2012-INT-02 Interpretation of TPL-003-0a and TPL-004-0 for SPCS

December 18 and 20, 2012

Conference Call and ReadyTalk Webinar

Administrative

1. Introductions

Doug Hohlbaugh (chair) opened the meeting with a summary of the common stakeholder concerns. Concerns included:

- Use of the word "evaluate" in the interpretation response appears to expand its meaning within the standard and removes "engineering judgment" to select the contingencies evaluated
- Some believe there is a need for an implementation plan
- Concerns over a perception that the interpretation requires the study of a DC Supply or battery failure

Attendance was taken and the list is provided below.

Name	Company	Member/Observer	12/18	12/20
Doug Hohlbaugh (Chair)	FirstEnergy Corp.	Member	Yes	Yes
R. W. Mazur	Manitoba Hydro	Member	Yes	Yes
Bill Middaugh	Tri-State Generation and Transmission	Member	Yes	Yes
Bob Pierce	Duke Energy	Member	Yes	Yes
Patrick Sorrells	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Member	Yes	No
John Zipp	ITC Holdings	Member	Yes	No
Eugene Blick (staff)	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Observer	Yes	Yes

Name	Company	Member/Observer	12/18	12/20
Tom Bradish (staff)	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Observer	Yes	Yes
Scott Barfield-McGinnis (Standard Developer)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Observer	Yes	Yes
Phil Tatro (Technical Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	Observer	Yes	Yes

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 on the first meeting as six of the seven total members were present; however, quorum was not achieved on the second day as only four of the seven were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

Scott Barfield read the NERC Antitrust Guidelines and disclaimer to the team, there were no questions raised. On the second meeting day, Mr. Barfield advised the participants the antitrust and disclaimer remains in effect.

4. Review current team roster

Mr. Barfield noted that no members were added or removed.

5. Review meeting agenda and objectives

Mr. Barfield reviewed the agenda and objectives.

Agenda

1. Review of meeting notes

Mr. Barfield advised the meeting notes from October 9, 2012 were posted on October 16, 2012 which allowed sufficient time for members to review. Doug Hohlbaugh advised the group that the notes would be considered accepted by the team at the conclusion of day two of the meeting. There were no questions or changes regarding the meeting notes. The notes were accepted as posted.

2. Review of action items from last meeting

Mr. Barfield – Issue documents from the close of this meeting. (Complete)

3. Respond to comments from 45-day posting and initial ballot

The team during the two-day meeting responded to most comments from the second posting of the draft interpretation. Mr. Barfield and Mr. Hohlbaugh provided initial responses for the team to consider. Most items were not an issue, except four comments regarding or suggesting the interpretation needed an interpretation plan. The team debated the issue and was concerned about the implications of providing an implementation. Mr. Barfield pointed to the September 5, 2012 meeting notes where NERC Compliance provided feedback. The response to the action item from September 5, 2012 reads:

“Advisor – Reach out to NERC Compliance regarding compliance with an interpretation implementation plan by those entities which discover their performance must change based on the interpretation of TPL-003-0a and TPL-004-0. (Complete – The advisor noted that an Implementation Plan cannot provide a “safe harbor” for entities to begin complying with the standard that is already effective. The implementation should only be used if it is obvious the interpretation identifies a performance than was not clear)”.

Mr. Barfield expressed his opinion that it seemed like an entity would not be subject to backward looking compliance upon the effective date of the standard. The team was concerned about the period of time following the approval of the interpretation, if approved, that an entity might be out non-compliant until such time the entity went through its planning review cycle. The standards currently require each Planning Authority and Transmission Planner to review its assessments annually. Four commenters from the 45-day formal comment period suggested an implementation plan ranging from 18 months to five years.

Mr. Hohlbaugh suggested that Mr. Barfield confer with NERC Compliance and Legal staff to determine what options the team had available and report back to the team on the meeting’s second day. At the start of the second day, Mr. Barfield provided an update. After conversing with NERC Compliance and Legal staff between meeting days, the opinion was that the interpretation upholds the standard. In other words, the standard’s performance did not change; therefore, each Planning Authority and Transmission Planner must be compliant on past, current, and future assessments. The standard is clear on the basis that the footnote includes components from both a protection system and stuck breaker. Additionally, the parenthetical (protection system failure or stuck breaker) would be considered, “for example,” in conjunction with the footnote because the standards require the Planning Authority and Transmission Planner for Requirement R1.5 in TPL-003-0a to – “Consider all contingencies applicable to Category C” and for Requirement R1.4 in TPL-004-0 to – “Consider all contingencies applicable to Category D.”

The team discussed further and formulated responses to the four commenters; however, the team was unable to achieve consensus because quorum was not met. The chair suggested that Mr. Barfield send out the documents with a Friday, January 4, 2013 return date to Mr. Hohlbaugh. The team agreed to have a follow up conference call on Monday, January 7, 2013 to complete the responses to comments and finalize any edits to the interpretation.

4. **Revise interpretation response**

The team made clarifying changes to the interpretation without, in their opinion, making substantive changes. Mr. Barfield has forwarded the current edits to NERC staff for review and feedback.

5. **Review of schedule**

The project advisor noted the project remains about two weeks ahead of schedule.

6. **Next steps**

The next step includes holding a final conference call on Monday, January 7, 2013 from noon to 2:00 p.m. ET to complete the consideration of comments responses and reach consensus on the implementation issue. Following the January meeting, the interpretation and other documents will be turned over for quality review by January 14, 2013. The team expects the interpretation to have a 10-day recirculation ballot the week of January 21, 2013. Once approved, the standard will be presented at the February 2013 NERC Board of Trustees meeting.

7. **Action Items or Assignments**

a. Mr. Barfield

- i. Engage NERC compliance on a discussion of having an implementation plan. (Done during the one day recess between meeting days).
- ii. Issue documents to the team for review and return to Mr. Hohlbaugh by Friday, January 4, 2013.
- iii. Coordinate quality review for January 14, 2013 posting.
- iv. Post and issue an announcement for January 7, 2013 meeting from noon to 2:00 p.m. ET.

b. All team members – review documents and provide Mr. Hohlbaugh revisions or suggestions not later than January 4, 2013.

8. **Future Meeting(s)**

A conference call is scheduled for Monday, January 7, 2012 | Noon-2:00 p.m. ET

9. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. ET on December 20, 2012. Note: no meeting was held on December 19, 2012.