

Meeting Notes

Project 2009-02 Real-time Monitoring and Analysis Capabilities Standard Drafting Team

August 25, 2015 | 10:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Mountain
 August 26, 2015 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Mountain
 August 27, 2015 | 8:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. Mountain

Xcel Energy
 18201 W. 10th Ave
 Golden, CO

Dial-in: 1.866.740.1260 | Access Code: 6251541 | Security Code: 200902

Web Access: www.readytalk.com | Access Code: 6251541

Administrative

1. Introductions

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Mountain, August 25, 2015. Participants were:

Members			
Name	Company	Name	Company
Saad Malik	Peak Reliability	Alan Martin (Remote)	Southern Company Transmission
Andrew Pankratz	Florida Power & Light	Bert Peters	APS
Charles Abell	Ameren	Scott Aclin	SPP
Phil Hart	AECI	Sarma Nuthalapati	ERCOT
		Mark Olson	NERC
Observers			
Name	Company	Name	Company
Darrell Piatt	FERC	Bruce Larsen (Remote)	WE Energy
Lauren Perotti	NERC	Joe Uchiyama	USBR
Robert Staton	Xcel Energy	Ali Miremadi (Remote)	CAISO

Members			
Name	Company	Name	Company
Antonio Grayson (Remote)	Southern Co	Chris de Graffenried (Remote)	ConEd
Dan Roethemeyer (Remote)	Dynegy	David Bueche (Remote)	Centerpoint
Michal Cruz-montes (Remote)	Centerpoint	Chris Colson	WAPA
Dennis Sauriol (Remote)	AEP	Sean Bodkin (Remote)	NERC
Jennifer Richardson (Remote)	Dynegy	Jim Kleitsch (Remote)	ATC
John Fontenot (Remote)	Bryan Texas Utilities	Michelle Corley (Remote)	Cleco
Robert Hlrchak (Remote)	Cleco	Sing Tay (Remote)	
Tom Buhler (Remote)	ORU	William Berry (Remote)	Owensboro Municipal Utilities
Darryl Boggess (Remote)	WFEC	Vincent Le (Remote)	FERC
Guy Zito	NPCC		

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. Quorum was achieved with 8 of 10 total members participating.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by Mark Olson. There were no questions raised. Participant conduct policy was reviewed.

Agenda

1. Chair Remarks

Saad Malik opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda.

2. Review SAR comments and consider draft responses

Participants reviewed all comments submitted during the formal comment period. Draft responses were reviewed and discussed. The team agreed the SAR Type should indicate 'Revisions to Existing Standards' in addition to 'New Standard'. The team agreed that the project did not need to address operator notifications during unplanned loss of analysis capabilities because TOP and IRO standards address this through requirements to ensure Real-time Assessments are performed at least once every 30 minutes. The SAR was modified accordingly. Participants discussed a commenter's suggestion to include requirements to monitor weather. SDT members believe monitoring weather information is common practice and as a result such requirements would not improve reliability. The team agreed upon draft comment responses and the redline SAR with changes as above.

3. Review initial draft standard, definition, Violation Risk Factors (VRFs), and Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)

- a. Participants discussed a description of real-time monitoring to incorporate acquisition, visualization, and alerting. The description was added to the Guidelines and Technical Basis section. The team determined that it was not necessary or beneficial to develop a definition for the NERC Glossary.
- b. Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for RCs to have operating procedures to address quality of data used in monitoring and analysis. They considered whether requirements were already addressed in IRO-010-1a / IRO-010-2. The SDT determined that existing and proposed standards did not necessarily address data quality. A rationale box was developed to explain the SDT's understanding.
- c. Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for RCs to provide System Operators with data quality indications. The team considered adding support personnel but determined that they would not necessarily be involved with all Real-time data quality issues.
- d. Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for TOPs and BAs to have operating procedures to address quality of data used in monitoring and analysis. They considered the situation where a TOP uses a third party to perform the Real-time Assessment. The SDT adopted wording for the requirement that is aligned with proposed TOP-001-3 for consistency. All TOPs will need to have an operating procedure addressing data quality, regardless of whether they perform Real-time Assessments, or have them performed by a third party.
- e. Participants discussed a draft requirement and measure for TOPs and BAs to provide System Operators with data quality indications. The SDT determined that all TOPs should comply with this requirement, regardless of whether they perform Real-time Assessments themselves, or have them performed by a third party.
- f. Participants discussed a draft requirement for RCs and TOPs to have an operating procedure to maintain the quality of the analysis used in Real-time Assessments. The team agreed that the project scope is not aimed at addressing the quality of the resulting Real-time Assessments because proposed TOP and IRO standards from project 2014-03 have already addressed the performance of Real-time Assessments. Rather, the requirement will address the quality of the analysis used in Real-time Assessments. Analysis could be coming from state estimation, real-time contingency analysis, human analysis, or other methods capable of evaluating system conditions. The SDT did not support requiring entities to include notification provisions in the operating procedure because these actions are required by existing and proposed TOP and IRO standards.
- g. Participants discussed a draft requirement for RCs and TOPs to provide System Operators with indications of the quality of the analysis used in Real-time Assessments.

