

Meeting Notes Project 2006-06 Reliability Coordination Standard Drafting Team

May 18, 2012

Conference Call

Administrative

1. Chair's Remarks

Mike Hardy (chair) provided opening remarks about the quality review feedback; that the feedback was representative of the quality of effort the team put forth. The chair noted he prepared preliminary responses to facilitate the team's conference call. A member noted his appreciation of the quality review team's comments and that it was clear the reviewers had followed the team's work because the quality review feedback was applicable to the issues. Introductions were made and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member or Observer
William M. Hardy, Chair	Southern Company	Member
James S. Case	Entergy Services, Inc.	Member
Anthony P. Jankowski	WE Energies	Member
H. Steven Myers	ERCOT	Member
Robert C. Rhodes	Southwest Power Pool, Inc.	Member
Eric Senkowicz	Florida Reliability Coordinating Council	Member
Scott Barfield-McGinnis	NERC	Observer
Bob Croes	Florida Regional Reliability Corporation	Observer
Jake Miller	Dynegy	Observer
Dan Woldemariam, FERC Staff (for Darrell Piatt)	FERC	Observer

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 to be physically present. Quorum was achieved as 6 team members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

Scott Barfield-McGinnis (advisor) read the guidelines and public announcement. There were no questions.

4. Review Current Team Roster

The advisor noted there were no updates or revisions to the roster other than a formatting edit made by a NERC staff administrative assistant.

5. Review Meeting Agenda and Objectives

The advisor reviewed the meeting agenda and turned the meeting over to the chair.

Agenda

1. Discuss Quality Review Feedback – COM-001-2

The team gave careful consideration of all the quality review feedback. Several questions had been addressed in the consideration of comments, which the reviewers may not have had access to during the review. Observations were clear and easy for the team to understand allowing them to provide responses for the way the standard had been modified in the last posting. Of the two pages of feedback, two items resulted in minor changes to the standard. The team also updated the consideration of comments Summary, addressing the changes made in response to the quality review feedback. The team provided clarifying language and rationale in the Summary.

2. Consider Changes to Standard COM-001-2

After reviewing the Time Horizon definitions, the team added the “Same-day Operations” Time Horizon to requirement R9 in response to questions raised by quality review. Also, the word “and” was removed from requirement R11 as it was not necessary.

3. Project Schedule

The advisor reviewed the schedule and expressed concern about the lack of margin that was occurring between the anticipated successive ballot end date and the team’s tentative meeting scheduled to respond to comments in the next ballot. The host for the meeting agreed that it would be okay to reevaluate once the posting date was known because it would still be 30 or more days from the meeting. Several members had conflicts if the meeting needed to be rescheduled to the following week. The goal is to make the November 2012 Board of Trustees meeting for approval.

4. Action items – Advisor

- a. Advisor – Review with NERC staff the style/formatting policy for standards with regard to bulleting type formatting of information. For example, the measures in COM-001-2. Second, the use of “dated and time-stamped,” particularly when evidence may not necessarily need to be “time-stamped.”
- b. Advisor – Review the opportunity with NERC staff to get one of the quality reviewers, including the NERC staff coordinator to attend the team meetings. The thought is to help with the explanations and comments.
- c. Advisor – Once Standards Process provides feedback on the Consideration of Comments, review and distribute to the team for review and processing. Depending on the feedback, either communicate and reach consensus via email or hold another call.
- d. Advisor – Once the successive comment period posting date is confirmed, send an announcement for the next team meeting, unless the posting end date does not allow adequate preparation time. If so, the meeting will be rescheduled.

5. Future Meeting(s) – Tentative (based on Successive Ballot posting)

WE Energies in Milwaukee, WI

Wednesday, July 18, 2012 | 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. CT

Thursday, July 19, 2012 | 8:00 a.m. to noon CT

6. Adjourn