

Meeting Notes

Project 2015-02 EOP Periodic Review

February 18, 2015 | 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Mountain
February 19, 2015 | 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. Mountain
February 20, 2015 | 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Mountain

WECC Offices:
155 North 400 West Suite 200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103

Meeting Dial-in Information:
Phone: 1-866-740-1260 | Access Code: 7686935 | Security Code: 0218

Click here for: [Webinar Access – February 18, 2015](#)
Click here for: [Webinar Access – February 19, 2015](#)
Click here for: [Webinar Access – February 20, 2015](#)

Administrative

1. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement, PRT Participant Policy, PRT E-mail List Policy
2. **Team Introductions**
Each participant introduced themselves, stating the company they work for, etc.

Participants:

Richard Cobb - MISO	✓	Mark Atkins - VELCO	✓	Nick Henry - FERC	✓
Charles Jen – CenterPoint Energy Houston	✓	Bobby Crump – Luminant Generation Company	✓	Michael Gildea – FERC (By Phone)	✓
Matthew Beilfuss – WE Energies	✓	David Mahlmann – New York ISO	✓	Sam Chanoski - NERC	✓
David McRee – Duke Energy (By Phone Feb. 18 for partial day)	✓	Stephen Crutchfield – NERC (Feb. 18 & 19)	✓	Laura Anderson - NERC	✓
Connie Lowe – Dominion Resources Services, Inc. (By Phone Feb. 18 for partial day)	✓	Ken Goldsmith (Alliant Energy) – PMOS Liaison (By Phone)	✓	Scott Barry – Indiana Power Municipality (By Phone Feb. 18)	✓
Sean Bodkin - NERC		Joe DePoorter – Madison Gas & Electric (By Phone Feb. 19)	✓	Jack Thomas – PJM (By Phone Feb. 19)	✓
Sean Cavote – NERC (Feb. 18)	✓	Robert Station – Xcel Energy (Feb. 19 & 20)	✓	Observer	

Agenda Items

- 1. Periodic Review Team Training** – Sean Cavote, NERC
 General overview of the governing principles and structure of Periodic Review Teams (PRTs). Standards’ tools and processes are living documents in the sense that they refine them based on lessons learned from previous projects.
- 2. Overview of Project Management Oversight Subcommittee (PMOS)** – Ken Goldsmith
 PMOS, under the Standards Committee (SC), facilitates standards development and reviews, acting as a liaison between the SC and Standard Drafting Teams (SDTs)/review teams. PMOS mainly interfaces with the NERC facilitator and the SDT Chair. PMOS role is to try to resolve roadblocks, ensure realistic schedules, and coordinate projects between one another.
- 3. Restoration and Recovery** – Steve Crutchfield, NERC

An overview presentation of the Restoration and Recovery Review in progress (led by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) and supported by NERC, selected Regions, and industry participants), covering EOP-005-2 (plus CIP standards not related to the PRT). No entity names were shared. The review looked at comparing and contrasting restoration plans, use of control center and field resources, initial assessment of conditions, effectiveness of plans from simulations, exercises, and drills. Assessment given of EOP-005-2 and its potential relation to the reality of system restoration, and Independent Experts Review Team report recommendations dealing with System restoration. All entity information gathering is complete and the final report is in drafting; it will be shared with participating entities for review in April (with verification of anonymity) and to the Commission in May. The Commission is expected to consider the efficacy of the standards involved; any other actions, if any, are still TBD.

4. Review of the Periodic Review Templates and recommendations for each standard listed below.

a. EOP-004-2

No outstanding FERC directives.

IERP suggested combining Requirements R1 and R3. The PRT decided to leave them separate for cleanliness, ease of VSLs, and also generally decided amongst themselves that Requirements R1 and R3 were not purely administrative (the Commission rep provided input that there are administrative-type requirements that do indeed support reliability).

There is a pending filing from NERC to FERC as an errata to remove the terms “SPS” and “Special Protection Scheme” and use only “Remedial Action Scheme” or RAS” following the NERC definition change for Remedial Action Schemes.

Discussion over the need to include reporting to ES-ISAC for EOP-004-2; due to internal NERC processes (NERC shares all EOP-004-2 reports with ES-ISAC without delay to support ES-ISAC’s security-related analyses) that is not necessary by apparent consensus.

Discussion over relationship between EOP-004-2 and OE-417; consensus was that it is clear as-is (not clearly understood by all, but clearly and cleanly written).

Does “control center” need to be “Control Center” as a defined term? Further discussion agreed to recommend looking at the term and deciding if it should be revised to encompass applicable entities.

Discussion over thresholds in Attachment 1 over copper theft, whether it’s copper stored in the substation or cut from power system equipment, or as a potential cover for nefarious activity. There was a suggestion to include some more information in the guideline and technical basis regarding the good practice of physically and digitally surveying control rooms following a

breach, and add the “Do not report theft unless...” criteria from Physical Threats to a Facility, to Damage or Destruction of a Facility.

Discussion about adding additional clarification, such as a survival time for the island over System Separation (islanding) as a reporting criteria; consensus was that a time threshold was not needed. There was an additional question over whether the EOP PRT needed to specify that this was BES islands (as opposed to islanding from a subtransmission system); consensus was that this would be an appropriate clarification to make in the attachment to include “BES”.

Discussion held about MW thresholds for generation losses and whether the GOP or BA should report under what possible circumstances with various combinations of “who lost what generation, and when”; no consensus outcome clearly reached, but it could be placed in the guideline and technical basis.

Discussion about raising generation loss threshold from 1000 MW to 2000 MW for Quebec; generally seen as a good idea - but for process, will need technical justification from NPCC and HQTE.

Discussion over whether “load” should be the defined term “Load,” which would create inconsistencies with EOP-011. The defined term “Load” was generally agreed to recommend for revision, and use the defined term in EOP-004-2.

Based on all the discussion, the EOP PRT has an initial recommendation to revise the standard for a number of clarity and cleanup issues, which will require a SAR to be drafted at the next EOP PRT meeting.

Initiating entity is responsible for reporting from page 9 – look at EOP-011.

b. EOP-005-2

Discussion over whether Requirement R8 is duplicative of Requirements R1.3; Requirement R12 duplicative of PER-005 R3; and Requirements R10 and R11 may be better suited for moving to a PER Standard. Nick Henery provided some background. Discussion over these requirements being “unique events;” and, as such, are appropriate for inclusion in the EOP standard versus the PER standard (Not a training exercise. This is testing – drill, exercise or simulation necessary to determine what kind of training is necessary for personnel). Rationale boxes in the standard could better explain these requirements and how there is not a conflict with the PER standard.

Question raised: With NUC-001-2 R 9.3.5, does that mean EOP-005-2, Requirement R 1.2 is unnecessary? General consensus was to leave Requirement R1.2 in the standard, as it supports overall restoration efforts.

Discussion over the term “dynamic” in Requirement R6 and what was meant by that; there is some sense that verifying sub-cycle transients at every step of the entire blackstart plan is unreasonable, and dynamic was meant to mean frequency and voltage at steady state scan rates. FERC team rep indicated that the team did have an accurate interpretation, and consensus was to add explanation in a rationale box.

c. EOP-006-2

Requirement R10: Initial recommendation by EOP PRT is to add rationale why the requirement should not be retired.

Requirement R2 was recommended by the IERP for retirement, but the EOP PRT consensus was to retain it.

Requirements R7 and R8 discussion of restoration strategies.

Requirement R9 can be retired, as it is duplicative of PER-005.

Requirements R1.2, R1.3 and R1.4: Initial recommendation by EOP PRT is for retirement, as unnecessary, under Paragraph 81.

d. EOP-008-1

Discussion as to whether protection of backup control centers are covered in the CIP standards, so R1.2.5 might be duplicative? Consensus of the EOP PRT was that R1.2.5 needs to remain until CIP-002-5 if universally effective.

“control centers” here needs to remain lowercase.

Requirement R1.1 should be truncated for clarity, and to preclude a possible misinterpretation of needing a tertiary control center.

5. **Develop draft comment form: N/A**

6. **Project Action Plan was reviewed:**

7. **Future Meeting Dates**

- a. Tampa, Florida – March 12 – 13, 2015

5. **The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m. on February 20, 2015.**