

## Meeting Notes

### Project 2008-02 Undervoltage Load Shedding Standard Drafting Team

July 12, 2013 | 1:00–3:00 p.m. ET

Conference Call with ReadyTalk Web Access

#### Administrative

##### 1. Introductions and chair remarks

E. Chanzas, NERC brought the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. ET. There were no chair remarks as Chairman G. Vassallo, BPA was unable to attend. Those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member or Observer
Bill Harm	PJM	Member
Brigham Joffs	Luminant	Member
Sharma Kolluri	Entergy	Member
Charles-Eric Langlois	Hydro-Quebec	Member
Manish Patel	Southern Co.	Member
Fabio Rodriguez	Duke Energy	Member
Hari Singh	Xcel Energy	Member
Anthony Sleva	Altran	Member
Matthew Tackett	MISO	Member
Erika Chanzas (Standards Developer)	NERC	Observer
Phil Tatro (Technical Advisor)	NERC	Observer
Juan Villar	FERC	Observer

2.

### 3. 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 9 of the 11 SDT members were present.

### 4. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement, Email Listserv Policy, and Participant Conduct Policy

The NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by E. Chanzas. E. Chanzas also gave an overview of the Participant Conduct and Email Listserv policies.

### 5. Review meeting agenda and objectives

E. Chanzas noted that the goals of the conference call are to see how team members' assignments from the June 24–27, 2013 meeting are developing, review the newly-created project calendar, discuss upcoming outreach events, and discuss dates and locations for upcoming meetings.

## Agenda Items

### 1. Discuss assignments from last meeting

- a. E. Chanzas began by asking the team if there were any overall thoughts about the state of the requirements from the June SDT meeting. It was noted that that Requirements R5 and R8 seemed very similar. In response, it was explained that R5 is to identify UVLS equipment Misoperations while R8 is to identify UVLS program deficiencies.
- b. E. Chanzas then asked C. Langlois, Hydro-Quebec how he was doing on his more complex assignment of further articulating concerns in regard to the ambiguities surrounding centrally-controlled UVLS programs and SPSs. C. Langlois responded that the team needs to address the recommended definition of SPS in the SPCS/SAMS SPS report, and why UVLS is excluded. We also need to address the fact that other standards refer to the different types of UVLS programs as distributed and non-distributed.
- c. A. Sleva, Altran noted that he is continuing to work on the white paper, in which he is addressing the planning solution versus safety net concern. He explained that the point is to have a foundation of common understanding.
- d. It was remarked that we will best serve the industry by clarifying that there is a distinction between the automatic UVLS programs to which this standard will apply and the SPSs that are triggered off of voltage and subsequently take action.
- e. In counter, it was noted that there is no continental-wide agreement on this, so it's best left up to the Regions. This was then questioned, noting that we shouldn't leave it open-ended, as it will cause confusion, especially if an entity operates in more than one Region.
- f. J. Villar, FERC noted that he agrees. The team needs to have a consistent definition. If a Region wants to do it differently, it can introduce a regional variance.

- g. H. Singh, Xcel Energy explained the following: for category B or single Contingency, you would not have a load shedding scheme. For category C, you could have an SPS or UVLS solution. When something like UVLS is a solution for category D, it's clear that it's a safety net like UFLS. So, UVLS straddles category C and D. If it's both, we need to explain when it is a UVLS program and when it is an SPS.
  - h. In agreement, it was stated that if you use UVLS as a planning solution, there might be a lot of requirements that need to be addressed that the SPS requirements dictate. So, if it's both, we need to consider the implications (the robustness—spending money on equipment, for example).
  - i. It was further explained that if an entity has decided that it will use UVLS for category C, an entity would probably call it an SPS. But the SPS definition excludes UVLS. We need to clarify the exclusion.
  - j. The following was raised in response: 1) What is UVLS and what is SPS? That is why we wrote the definition of UVLS. 2) Is UVLS a safety net or a planning solution? We were writing the requirements toward a planning solution.
  - k. It was clarified that it is not an issue of the definition; it is an issue of how we clarify to industry when the solution is characterized as an SPS or UVLS.
  - l. The question was raised: why should UVLS be less stringent than SPS? C. Langlois agreed. He also noted that PRC-005 characterizes non-distributed UVLS as similar to an SPS.
  - m. As the meeting was concluding, A. Sleva indicated that he would use the notes he took during this call to further articulate the concepts and come up with some defining solutions. He will send to the team so they can consider it at the next in-person meeting.
- 2. Outreach message and opportunities**
- a. E. Chanzas went over the upcoming scheduled outreach events, including the PJM RSCS call on July 19 and the SERC DRS meeting on July 24. B. Harm will support the PJM RSCS call and S. Kolluri, M. Patel, and M. Tackett will support the SERC DRS call.
  - b. E. Chanzas also showed the slide deck she was working on that contained the talking points for these events. She noted that she will adjust it accordingly based on this meeting's discussions and send to the team for review.
- 3. Action items or assignments for next meeting**
- a. In light of the meeting discussions, team members should proceed with their assignments.
  - b. A. Sleva will take the notes he captured during the call and apply them to the applicable parts of the white paper. Once he sends that out for review, members can think about how to help develop the thoughts.

- c. E. Chanzas will get the Project Calendar posted to the project page.

#### 4. Review of schedule

- a. E. Chanzas brought up the Excel project calendar she created. She noted the Overview tab, which provides start and end dates of each project phase, a list of SDT deliverables, and a list of completed and projected SDT meetings, including each meeting's tasks. She then noted that the following tabs have a calendar of each month, which feature set meetings and activities and the projected project phase start and end dates. To the right of each calendar month is a list of the set and potential activities. E. Chanzas also noted that this calendar will reside on the Related Files section of the project page and will be updated periodically.
- b. E. Chanzas also noted that the next in-person meeting following the one in Atlanta August 5–8 will be August 26–28 at Xcel Energy in Denver. The meeting will be shorter since we are overlapping with the SAMS meeting at the same location, to allow the shared members to split their time.

#### 5. Next steps

- a. An announcement for the August 5–8 meeting in Atlanta will be coming soon with registration links. At this meeting, the team will need to focus on the UVLS versus SPS discussion and make some decisions, in addition to doing further work on the requirements, measures, rationale boxes, Guidelines and Technical Basis, and the white paper.
- b. The PJM RSCS outreach call is on July 19 (E. Chanzas and B. Harm).
- c. The SERC DRS outreach meeting is on July 24 (E. Chanzas, S. Kolluri, M. Tackett, and M. Patel).

#### 6. Future meeting(s)

- a. August 5–8, 2013 in Atlanta
- b. August 26–28, 2013 in Denver
- c. September 16–19, 2013, to be determined

#### 7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. ET on Friday, July 12, 2013.