

Meeting Notes Protection System Maintenance & Testing SDT

March 5–6, 2008
Atlanta, GA

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

Charles Rogers, Chairman, brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EST on March 5, 2008. The attendees were:

Members:	Charles Rogers (Chair)	John Anderson	Bob Bentert
	Merle (Rick) Ashton	Richard Ferner	Carol A. Gerou
	Roger D. Green (day 1)	Dave Harper	John Kruse
	Mark Peterson	Leonard G. Swanson, Jr.	
	Eric A. Udren (day 2)	John A. Zipp	Phil Winston
	Al Calafiore, NERC		

Guests:	Sam Francis	Jeff Laninga
---------	-------------	--------------

2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Al Calafiore reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and there were no questions raised.

3. Standards Comments and Revisions

Since a strong consensus had been reached to fold the 4 existing standards (PRC-005, PRC-008, PRC-011, and PRC-017) into one and an initial draft (straw-man) had been presented at previous meetings discussion continued on line by line wording of the combined document.

Since it had been decided at the last meeting that this team would do a FAQ to tell or describe where DME (demand monitoring equipment) functions maintenance will be found, the FAQ is being circulated for comments among the team. It had also been suggested that the industry be asked where it would prefer DME testing and maintenance be placed. No further discussion of this took place; the team needs to determine how to accomplish this.

A recurring issue at the meeting (carry over from previous meetings) was “should distribution owners that have protection systems that impact the BES be included”? (Also, what should the wording be that have impacts on? Or, should it be that are part of?) Also, should there be a common definition of BES (as opposed to each region having its own)?

It was noted that the Functional Model does not define distribution owners but rather defines Distribution Providers; these have responsibilities for providing and coordinating protection equipment and load shedding equipment.

R1 was revised to include Protection Systems that are applied on, and are designed to provide protection for, the BES — this should cover all.

There was further discussion on whether to allow extension of the maintenance period due to such events as natural disasters. The discussion included the use of self reporting of failure to meet schedule (due to the extenuating circumstances) and include a mitigation plan and also the fact that the Regions will know of the “events” on the system and will make allowances. This discussion was a carryover from the previous meeting when there was a suggestion to add R9.4 for allowing maintenance extension after a natural disaster such as hurricanes. Much discussion followed, several proposals were made from 6 months to 1 year extension. There was no resolution to this issue, this may require gathering more information and/or research, if to allow it, how long to allow, and how to administer.

There was a discussion on whether there is a need to define the sizes (MW) of generators (or aggregate generators such as a wind farm) that are a part of the BES system. Some regions may not define this. There was no specific resolution to this issue other than the regions who will also do the audits are best able to define this.

Eric Udren presented a proposal for Reliability-Centered Protection System Maintenance (RCM) program. This can also be called a “performance” based maintenance program. The program was explained and was put in a form that can be included in the standard. Much discussion took place and some suggestions for modification of the proposed requirements. Significant discussion took place on what to do if 10% or more failures were found for a group within a period (interval) that is less than the time-based maintenance interval. The proposal is to be reviewed by the team and comments brought back.

Question remains — will compliance allow being late due to consequences of natural disasters? Or, does the standard need a requirement to allow for defer maintenance due to natural disaster occurrences. This question is to be brought to compliance for comments. See action items below:

4. Action Items

Continue with the discussions on issues for drafting of the standard in preparation of the next meeting. Provide comments to the standard document and the FAQ to Charles Rogers.

Al Calafiore is to contact Compliance on the issue of allowing extension of maintenance following a natural disaster.

5. Next Steps

The next meeting will be on April 28 (8 a.m.–5 p.m.) and April 29 (8 a.m.–noon EDT) in Atlanta, Georgia.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at noon on March 6, 2008.