

# Minutes

## Reliability Issues Steering Committee

April 9, 2018 | 3:00–4:00 p.m. Eastern

Kristin Iwanechko took attendance and verified a quorum with the following Reliability Issues Steering Committee (RISC) members on the phone: Mark Ahlstrom, Lisa Carrington, Carol Chinn, Jeff Cook, Tim Eckel, Brian Evans-Mongeon, Donald Holdsworth, Patti Metro, Dave Osburn, Katherine Prewitt, Chris Root, Mark Rothleder, Herb Schrayshuen, Brian Slocum, and Dave Zwergel. Additional stakeholder observers were in attendance as well. NERC staff attendees included Tina Buzzard, Mark Lauby, and Mike Walker.

### Introduction and Chair's Remarks

Mr. Lauby chaired the meeting in Peter Brandien's absence. He welcomed RISC members and observers and reviewed the agenda.

### NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

Ms. Iwanechko called attention to the NERC antitrust guidelines in the agenda package.

### Agenda Items

#### 1. March 16, 2018 Meeting Minutes

The March 16, 2018, meeting minutes were approved on a motion by Mr. Ahlstrom and seconded by Mr. Schrayshuen.

#### 2. Resilience Framework

##### a. NERC Standing Committee Input

Standing Committee representatives provided an overview of their comments submitted in response to the RISC's request for input on the resilience framework. Mr. Evans-Mongeon stated that the Planning Committee (PC) supports moving forward with the framework as presented. Mr. Zwergel reported that the Operating Committee (OC) identified current activities and categorized into the four constructs of the resilience framework. The OC also identified and suggested other activities that could be undertaken to enhance resilience even further. Ms. Carrington stated that the Critical Infrastructure Protection Committee (CIPC) evaluated the activities in their work plan and categorized them into the four constructs. She also noted that the CIPC suggested including detection in the definition of resourcefulness. Ms. Metro stated that for the Compliance and Certification Committee (CCC), most of the RISC recommendations are outside the CCC's purview and do not impact their work plan. She noted that the CCC discussed the adequate level of reliability and were supportive of the direction of the resilience framework. Guy Zito stated that the Standards Committee (SC) discussed the SC's processes and how they support the definition of resilience. The SC generally agreed that

the standards address many of the framework elements of resilience and identified some suggested process improvements. Mr. Zito noted that the SC is supportive of the direction of the resilience framework.

Mr. Lauby highlighted the following suggestions from the standing committee comments which RISC members agreed to make: (1) add detection to the description of resourcefulness; and (2) add “coordinated and controlled manner” in the description of rapid recovery.

b. Relationship Between Reliability and Resilience

Mr. Lauby reviewed the presentation that was included in the agenda package which outlines how the resilience framework relates to NERC’s reliability construct. He stated that NERC’s view of reliability has two fundamental concepts: adequacy and operating reliability. Mr. Lauby reviewed the definition of an adequate level of reliability noting that a system with an adequate level of reliability is resilient. He reviewed a chart showing that within a band which is deemed acceptable, at some point there will be an event that brings reliability down until rebounding to a recovered steady-state. He mapped the chart with the resilience framework and suggested the following resilience indicators: robustness, amplitude, degradation, recovery, and recovery state. Mr. Lauby added that the resilience definition proposed by FERC appears to not capture lessons learned by industry. RISC members were supportive of the concepts in the presentation and offered the following suggestions:

- Consider showing the robustness line between optimal and ALR-Nadir.
- Add something to reflect the time of recovery, acknowledging that at some point the recovery time is too long.
- Consider an additional line below ALR-Nadir to show a lower level of acceptable reliability during a major system upset.
- From a public safety point of view, consider how long is acceptable to live without critical infrastructure components.
- Consider whether the ‘Improved’ line should be moved down to the ‘R Optimal’ line.
- Replace “optimal” with “target”.
- Capture improvement for detectable events prior to a disturbance.

Mr. Lauby stated he would adjust the charts based on the feedback received and recirculate to the committee.

**3. 2019 Reliability Leadership Summit**

Mr. Lauby noted that NERC is working on confirming a date for the 2019 Reliability Leadership Summit and asked RISC members for thoughts on potential agenda topics. Members made the following suggestions:

- Distributed energy resources and batteries;

- Fuel security;
- Dynamic models with storage;
- Planning models; and
- Include regional and international perspectives on unique or common things that exist on certain topics.

#### **4. Future Meeting Dates**

Ms. Iwanechko will reach out to the committee to schedule the next call for June.