



## **Phase III/IV Field Test Conference Call Notes**

May 16, 2007

### **1. Administrative Items**

#### **a. Introductions**

The Chair started the meeting at 10:00 AM central time. Participants in the conference call were:

Bob Millard (Phase 3 & 4 SDT Chair)	Lee Taylor (SERC rep & SDT member)
Peter Mackin (WECC rep & SDT vice-chair)	Vance Beauregard (ERCOT rep)
Don Davies (WECC staff & rep)	Farzaneh Tafreshi (ERCOT staff & rep)
Dave Kral (MRO rep)	Tony Jablonski (RFC staff & observer)

#### **b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

Bob Millard provided a brief overview of the antitrust guidelines. There were no questions.

### **2. Reports from the Regions**

As was discussed on the 4/18/07 conference call, the focus of this month's call was to establish the format and expectations for the face to face meeting on June 18 & 19 in Tampa and the regional reports on the field test. Since the four regions had previously reported that they were into the generator verification stage and the group was so close to preparing a report, there did not seem to be a need to discuss status on this call.

### **3. Regional field test report format and expectations.**

Just prior to the call, Bob Millard sent out a draft format for the regional field test report. Bob described each item in the draft and explained the intent and purpose for each. Bob emphasized that the intent of the report was not to create an elaborate and technically detailed document; but, rather to develop a friendly and useable document that an experienced utility engineer could read for the first time, not having been part of the field test, and understand the results and findings of the field test in each region. The higher level descriptions could be backed by more detailed attachments/appendices/exhibits that were part of the report but placed in the back. Bob explained that the report should be a simple summary of the work that each region had gone through and what they felt needed modification and at what cost for the value added or whether value was added. The region is

not expected to develop detailed costs but is to provide a rough estimate of cost, time and manpower to achieve value added modifications.

Since it is expected that the reports would be posted as part of the field test, Bob cautioned the group not to detail any sensitive items/issues but to provide a more general view to help the observer understand the test and findings/results. Bob gave the example of listing the generator participants. The region or the generator owner may not want to have a specific company name listed; however, it is more important that the number, type and size of units that participated in the test/verification and the number of companies would provide the information necessary to judge the validity of the field test. Information such as this will show the extent that the participants worked on this project and the level of seriousness.

After Bob's explanation and general discussion by the group, it was felt that the draft format was reasonable and sufficiently understandable to be accepted as drafted (the draft format is attached and shown as final). The format document states all the information that is needed for the report as well as simple format structure.

There was concern that some of the field test information will not be available for writing the report if it is to be submitted for review prior to the Tampa meeting. Bob stated that it would be desirable that the reports to sent out Monday June 4 but no later than Monday June 11. Bob asked that the report contain as much information as was available at the time of writing and provide placeholders where additional information could be provided at the Tampa meeting.

Since the field test covered four standards, the question was asked whether there should be one or more reports. Since this is more a matter of style and not content, it was decided that each region would provide the report(s) in a manner that was most convenient for them but would provide all the information mentioned in the attached format document.

Since the field test participants only have addresses for each other and the reports will be discussed at the face to face meeting in Tampa, Bob stated that either himself or Dave Taylor will make sure that the new SAR drafting team formed to work on the field test standards and MOD-024 and MOD-025 will be sent all the related information.

#### **4. Face to face meeting and expectations**

It was previously announced that there will be a face to face meeting of the field test participants and a new SAR drafting team formed to work on the field test standards and MOD-024 and MOD-025 on Monday, June 18 from 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM and Tuesday, June 19 from 8:00 AM to 2:00 PM at the FRCC's offices in Tampa, FL. It is expected that each region will go over their report(s), add any additional information they obtained subsequent the writing of their report(s), provide an overall summary of their field test experience to date and answer any questions from the other attendees.

Based on the reports and any additional information, obvious similarities between regions can be discussed and confirmed by the drafting team. This will all be used as input to answering any questions received from the SAR posting and provided as input to the Standard Drafting Team.

## **5. Schedule Next Meeting**

- a.** Face to face - Monday, June 18 from 1:00 PM to 5:00 PM and Tuesday, June 19 from 8:00 AM to 2:00 PM at the FRCC's offices in Tampa, FL

## **6. Adjourn**

The Chair adjourned the call at 11:30 central time.

Notes by Bob Millard

# **Regional Phase 3-4 Field Test Report Format**

The following is the basic format and content requirements for the Phase 3&4 field test report(s) written by each participating region. The region may discuss the four field test standards in one or more reports as they deem appropriate for their circumstances.

## **I - Background**

This is intended to be a high level brief (no more than one page) description of the following:

1 – Documents/procedures in place at start of field test participation – references to more detailed documents/procedures can be attached as appendices or attachments

2 – Action plan of how the region attacked the task/project, including the following as applicable:

A – Who was going to do what – committee involvement, solicit members, solicit entities in region, etc?

B – Extent of formality of actions taken – did these remain as drafts, able to process as approved documents/procedures, complete committee/regional board approval as final or draft

C – Was action taken different from “normal” process?

D – How was actual “testing, verification/checking” done – did generators perform new “tests” or was past good enough?

## **II - Executive Summary of Field Test Results**

# **Regional Phase 3-4 Field Test Report Format**

This is intended to be at a reasonably high level with references to detailed descriptions continued in appendices/attachments.

This would describe the following:

1 – Names and brief highlights of documents/procedures that the region feels would be compliant (as much as possible) to the draft standards as originally proposed.

2 – Status of references in #1 – approved, draft, evolving, near complete, etc.

3 – Did the documents/procedures differ from the proposed requirements – meet, exceed, fell short, etc.

4 – Extent of actual checking to see if documents/procedures are feasible, reasonable, worthwhile, etc. – number of generators, past performance, new performance, in progress, etc.

5 – Did “tests/verifications/checking” show that the region procedures were feasible, reasonable, worthwhile, etc?

6 – Were the “tests/verifications/checking” valuable (did the results show that the requirements in the procedures did in fact provide overall cost effective valuable for supporting reliability – were models improved sufficiently to justify the effort, were verifications worth the effort in general, such as checking generator coordination, etc.

7 – What is the anticipated cost and time necessary to have ALL entities in region follow regional procedures – assume time would start when regional procedures are region board approved.

8 – What changes are needed for the draft standards so that they: (a) are more explicit/clearer, (b) have unnecessary,

# **Regional Phase 3-4 Field Test Report Format**

redundant or unreasonable requirements removed, (c) have additions made to improve reliability outcomes or (d) have changes made for any other reason.

9 – As envisioned in #8, what sort of implementation plan seems real and appropriate to achieve reliability – what sort of timeline and which units would be “verified” along that timeline?

10 – Any other important point region wants to note.

## **III – Details/Appendices/Attachments**

This section will contain all the detailed references, documents and procedures. The following are required components in this section:

1 – Region documents/procedures as they exist at end of field test

2 – Mapping of #1 to draft standards – it would be good to indicate elements that exceed draft standards

3 – Red-lined draft standards showing how the region feels the standards need to be changed to better support reliability – I would include any deletions of categories suggested in the drafts

4 – List of committee, task force, etc. and entity involvement – this is intended to give a favor of the depth and breath of field test

The region can add as many other items as it feels appropriate to help support future development of the standards.