

Conference Call Notes Underfrequency Load Shedding SDT – Project 2007-01

March 4, 2009 | 1–3:30 p.m. EST
Dial-in Number: 732-694-2061 | Conference Code: 1228030409
WebEx Site: <https://nerc.webex.com>
Meeting Password: standards

1. Administrative

a) Roll Call

Stephanie Monzon welcomed the members and guests of the Standard Drafting Team for Project 2007-01 Underfrequency Load Shedding (see Roster — **Attachment 1a**).

- Philip Tatro — National Grid (Chair)
- Paul Attaway — Georgia Transmission Corporation
- Brian Bartos — Bandera Electric Cooperative
- Jonathan Glidewell — Southern Company Transmission Co.
- Gerald Keenan — Bonneville Power Administration
- Robert W. Millard — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Steven Myers — Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.
- Mak Nagle — Southwest Power Pool
- Robert J. O'Keefe — American Electric Power
- Robert Williams — Florida Municipal Power Agency
- Brian Evans Mongeon – Utility Services, LLC
- Stephanie Monzon — NERC

Observers

- Anthony Jablonski — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Scott Sells – FERC Staff
- Scott Berry – Indiana Municipal Power Agency

b) NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines provided in **Attachment 1b**. It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the

antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition. It is the responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

2. Draft Standard (Performance Characteristics)

The team met in person February 11-13, 2009 and completed a first pass of the draft standard. The team tabled one discussion related to the generation level as stated in **Requirement R6.4**. The team could not come up with the right alternative to the BES but suggested wording that is consistent with the registration criteria. The team will have to come back to this requirement and finalize the wording prior to posting.

Phil indicated that he would be proposing language for R6.4 after a regional meeting. This will be discussed at the next conference call (scheduled for 3/13/09).

The team reviewed the proposed definitions and decided that none of the terms proposed by Dave including island, annually, and coherent generation groups were needed as defined terms. While island is used in the standard there is enough industry understanding of the term not warranting a definition. The term coherent generation groups is not used in the proposed standard and annually is the collegiate definition of the term; therefore, the team will not propose definitions for these terms.

3. Response to Comments – Summary Responses

Summary Responses to each question will be reviewed during this call.

The team completed a second pass of responses to all questions in the comment report. In addition, the team reviewed Summary Considerations for Questions 1-2.

The team will review Summary Considerations for Questions 3-9.

The team reviewed Summary Consideration section for Question 7 as Phil had flagged a possible fundamental issue that required team attention. As a result of the discussion the team re-worded point #2 in the summary consideration to clarify that the continent wide standard will not be specifying a format for the data because a specific format is not needed to support reliability of the BES.

The team decided to not review the Summary Considerations on the conference calls because it is time consuming and because a review can take place over email. Stephanie emphasized that the team must be responsible for reviewing the documents thoroughly before posting such that everyone is on the same page and has no issues with the content of the summary considerations. Stephanie will prepare another version of the comment report and distribute for review.

4. Mapping Document

The team will review the mapping document that will indicate how the characteristics posted during the first posting were incorporated/included in the first draft standard.

The team briefly reviewed the mapping document that Phil sent out over e-mail (and revised on March 4, 2009). Jonathan volunteered to look over the mapping document for quality assurance purposes before posting.

5. Comment Form

The team decided to begin brainstorming on the questions to be included in the second posting of the standard. The team made several individual assignments to complete a first draft of the comment form (for review on the 3/13 call):

- Stephanie to draft the background
 - Include a description of the decision process for change in approach – including the inability to assign requirements to the Regions.
 - Include an explanation of the planning coordinator “group” – the intent is to preserve what is in place today. Historically planning coordinators in a region have formed groups for assessments.
- Phil to work on Question 1
- Bob M. to work on Question 2
- Rob to work on Questions 3 and 4
- Phil to work on Question 6
- Stephanie to add the tariff and catch all questions (Questions 7 and 8)

6. Project Schedule

Stephanie Monzon did not review the project schedule during the call if time permits.

7. Action Items

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the actions that were open at the end of the meeting March 2, 2009.

Action Items:	Status:	Assigned To:
The remaining questions for the comment report: Question 6: Phil T. and Jonathan Question 7: Gary K. Question 8: Larry B. and Bob M. Question 9: Rob O.	Completed	See first column
Stephanie will compile the draft responses and send out to the SDT prior to the next meeting (October 22–23).	Completed	Stephanie

Action Items:	Status:	Assigned To:
Stephanie will draft the first draft of Option 3 and distribute to a sub group for review. Stephanie will use the description of Option 3 to facilitate her initial discussion with Gerry Adamski and Dave Cook. Stephanie will be expecting Dana, Rob, Phil, and Bob to weigh in on the draft description.	Completed	
Stephanie will follow up with the team via email regarding her initial discussion with NERC Management on the feasibility of Option 3.	Completed	
Stephanie to follow-up with Compliance and Standards to determine if the draft standard can require that the group of PC's use their regional standards development processes to develop the UFLS program.	Created 2/11 By 2/20 conference call	Stephanie
Standard: The team needs to finalize the language in Requirement R6.4 – generator level	Created 2/11 To be discussed on the 2/20 conference call	All
Response to Comments: Question 6: Phil and Jonathan have a draft for the 2/20 conference call (by 2/19) Completed Question 7: Rob and Brian M. to have a draft for the 2/20 call (by 2/19) Completed Question 8: Brian Bartos to have a draft for 2/27 conference call (by 2/24) – Phil provided a first pass to Question 8 - completed Question 9: Rob to have a draft for the 2/27 conference call (by 2/24) Completed	Closed	Rob, Brian B., Phil, Brian M.
General Response to Comments (Find/Replace) – Jonathan at the final pass of the comment report (March 4 th) Jonathan emailed out a version of the comment report for review on the 3/4/09 call.	Completed	Jonathan
General Response to Comments – Summary of Comments – Stephanie and Phil to have a draft	Created 2/11	Stephanie, Phil

Action Items:	Status:	Assigned To:
2/27 (by 2/24)		
Mapping Document (characteristics to the draft standard) – Phil to create first draft by 2/24/09 (to be reviewed on the 2/27 call) - Completed	Completed	Phil
Comment Form – Stephanie to have a draft for the 3/4 conference call	Created 2/11	Stephanie

8. Next Steps

Date	Location	Comments
January 30, 2009 1 p.m.–3 p.m. EST	Conference Call	Complete 1/13/09 agenda
February 11, 2009 from noon-5 p.m. Lunch February 12, 2009 8 a.m.-5 p.m. Lunch February 13, 2009 8 a.m.-noon	Austin, TX ERCOT Offices	ERCOT to host – confirmed with Steve
February 20, 2009 1-3 p.m. EST	Conference Call and WebEx	To discuss Question 6 and Question 7 (response to comments) and to discuss Requirement R6.4
February 27, 2009 1-3 p.m. EST	Conference Call and WebEx	To discuss Question 8 and Question 9, General Response to Comments (summary) and the Mapping Document.
March 2, 2009 2-5 p.m. EST	Conference Call and Webex	To complete Question 9, Review Summary Responses to Comments and the Mapping document.
March 4, 2009 1-3 p.m.	Conference Call and	To discuss the Comment

EST	WebEx	Form and one final review of the response to comments.
March 13, 2009 1-3:30 p.m. EST	Conference call and WebEx	To discuss the comment form, a final pass (by exception) of the mapping document and the response to comments and a review of the draft standard.
April 29 – 30, 2009 8 a.m.–5 p.m. 8 a.m.–5 p.m.	Atlanta	Jonathan confirmed Southern Co.’s availability

Things that need to get completed before the second posting:

Comment Form – Stephanie to have a draft for the **3/4 conference call**

Response to Comments

Question 5 – Completed on 2/13/09

Question 6 – Phil and Jonathan have a draft for the **2/20 conference call (2/19) - Completed**

Question 7 – Rob and Brian M. to have a draft for the **2/20 call (2/19) - Completed**

Question 8 – Brian Bartos to have a draft **for 2/27 conference call (2/24)**

Question 9 – Rob by 2/24 have a draft for **the 2/27 conference call**

General Response to Comments (Find/Replace) – Jonathan at the final pass of the comment report (March 4th)

General Response to Comments – Summary of Comments – Stephanie and Phil to have a draft **2/27 (by 2/24)**

Mapping Document (characteristics to the draft standard) – Phil to create first draft by February 24, 2009 (to be reviewed on the **2/27 call**) - Completed

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m.