

# Meeting Notes

## Project 2008-10 Interpretation of CIP-006-1 (Progress Energy)

October 3, 2011 | 2:00–4:00 p.m. ET  
Teleconference and Webinar

### Administrative

1. **Participants were read the NERC Compliance Guidelines; there were no questions**
2. **Attendance**
  - a. Members: Tim Conway (Co-Chair), NIPSCO; Scott Miller (Co-Chair), MEAG; Jeffrey Fuller, DPL/Dayton Power and Light; Trevor MacCrae, Southern Company Transmission; Steven Noess; NERC Staff
  - b. Observers: Matthew Davis, SERC; Summer Esquerre, NextEra Energy; Michael Mertz, PNM Resources; Clayton Stooshnoff, FortisBC; Laurent Weber, WAPA

### Summary

1. **Review of Project 2008-10 consensus input from NERC Quality Review (QR)**
  - a. The team discussed the consensus input from the NERC QR, to include the suggested changes to the interpretation and the response to comments.
  - b. As a general matter, the team agreed that the input from QR was useful and the team integrated suggestions from QR into its documents.
2. **Issues and Discussion**
  - a. The QR suggested to explain even further the distinction between the current interpretation and the Pacificorp interpretation. The team agreed and revised the interpretation to more clearly explain the differences. The two interpretations relate to separate analyses. The Progress interpretation addresses the question of whether the requirement applies (to wire). Analysis under Pacificorp occurs after one has determined that the requirement applies and that a fully enclosed six-wall border cannot be established.
  - b. The team also integrated the suggested edits by the QR team to the response to comments.
  - c. The QR team pointed out that the comment form (which will be presented along with the successive ballot) must have a technical basis or rationale for the interpretation. The team developed and included its rationale in the document.

### 3. Action Items:

- a. Following the meeting, all of the documents to be submitted for posting were sent to the full team for review. Team members to review and respond with suggested changes no later than October 5, 2011. (Upon passage of October 5, there were no suggested changes to the documents for posting for Successive Ballot). The Interpretation Drafting Team process contemplates email communication and development. Through consensus response via email, the Project 2008-10 team approved all of the documents related to the revised interpretation and posting for successive ballot — response to comments from last posting, revised interpretation (redline and clean from last ballot), consideration of QR consensus feedback, successive ballot comment form, and associated standards and other documents.
- b. To obtain approval to post for Successive Review, the Co-Chairs and NERC Advisor must participate in a conference call with the Standards Committee Quality Review Advisory Working Group (QRAWG). A call has been scheduled for October 10, 2011.

### 4. Future Meetings

To be determined. Upon approval to post the revised interpretation for successive ballot, the team will not meet until the ballot period has concluded. Its next meeting will be to consider the results of the successive ballot, to review comments received, and (depending upon the results) to prepare for recirculation ballot.