

RSC Meeting #13-2, Agenda Item 2.1: Feb 2013 Meeting Minutes



1040 Avenue of the Americas - 10th Floor
New York, New York 10018-3703

NPCC Regional Standards Committee

Minutes--Draft

Meeting # 13-1

Feb. 20, 2013 10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Feb. 21, 2013 8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.

FRCC Offices
3000 Bayport Drive
Suite 690
Tampa, FL 33607

Tel: 813-289-5644

Dress Business Casual

RSC@npcc.org

Call in 719-785-1707, Guest Code 8287#

Note: For reference. [Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards](#) dated Jan. 13, 2013, and the [NPCC Glossary of Terms](#) dated Oct. 26, 2011 included in the Meeting Materials.

Items in red from the Feb. 20, 2013 session.

Items in green from the Feb. 21, 2013 session.

Guy Zito called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Guy Zito called the meeting to order at 08:12 a.m.

Attendees:

(Present both days unless otherwise noted)

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Sector</u>
1.	Guy Zito	Northeast Power Coordinating Council	
2.	Lee Pedowicz	Northeast Power Coordinating Council	
3.	Si-Truc Phan	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie	2
4.	Don Weaver	New Brunswick System Operator	2
5.	David Kiguel	Hydro One Networks Inc.	1
6.	Jim Grant (guest)	New York Independent System Operator	2
7.	Gerry Dunbar	Northeast Power Coordinating Council	
8.	Brian Shanahan	National Grid	1
9.	Brian Robinson (2/20 only)	Utility Services	5
10.	Joel Charlebois (guest)	AESI	
11.	Michael Lombardi (guest)	Northeast Utilities	1
12.	Michael Jones	National Grid	3
14.	Brian Murphy (guest)	Florida Power and Light	
15.	Mike Garton	Dominion Resources Services, Inc.	4
16.	Peter Yost	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.	3
17.	Bruce Metruck	New York Power Authority	5
18.	Ron Falsetti (guest)	AESI	
19.	Juan Villar (guest)	FERC	

On Phone:

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Sector</u>
1.	Brian Robinson (2/21 only)	Utility Services	5
2.	Kathleen Goodman	ISO - New England	2
3.	Carmen Agavrioloai (2/20 only)	Independent Electricity System Operator	2
4.	Diane Barney (2/20 only)	New York State Department of Public Service	6
5.	Paul DiFilippo (guest-	Hydro One Networks Inc.	

-2/20 only)		
-------------	--	--

1. Introductions, Antitrust Guidelines, Agenda, Roster

- a. Attendee introductions.
- b. RSC Roster changes.
- c. Read Antitrust Guidelines.
- d. Review of Agenda--inclusions, deletions.

The attendees introduced themselves.

Guy Zito announced that Michael Lombardi joining NPCC March 1, 2013.

Item 1c--Lee Pedowicz read the Antitrust Guidelines.

Item 1d--Guy Zito reviewed the Agenda. Guy Zito welcomed Brian Murphy, Chairman of the NERC Standards Committee. Paul DiFilippo (TFSP) to call in to discuss the Comment Form for Project 2010-05.1 (see Item 6-Table-1).

2. Review of Previous RSC Meeting Minutes (in Meeting Materials Package)

- a. Approval of Minutes of Nov. 29-30, 2012 RSC Meeting.

Item 2a--Guy Zito discussed the Minutes from the Nov. 29-30, 2012 RSC Meeting. Motion to accept the Minutes as read--Mike Garton.

Seconded by Brian Shanahan. With the exception of one abstention, all were in favor.

3. Action and Ongoing Items List (in Meeting Materials Package)

Description	Owner	Due	Status
Coordination with the Compliance Committee to develop Joint Activity Action List	Greg Campoli	RSC Meeting	Outgrowth of RSC/CC joint session April 21, 2010.
New York Adoption of More Stringent/Specific NPCC Criteria	Diane Barney	RSC Meeting	Ongoing

- a. NPCC Members on NERC Drafting Teams.
- b. Review Executive Tracking Summary.

There was no change in Greg Campoli's item.

Regarding Diane Barney's item, Guy Zito gave the background. The filing needs to be reviewed. There are changes in the Directories, Criteria. Michael Lombardi will work with the NPCC Attorney to file Criteria. If necessary, will have to reach out to Con Edison and National Grid for assistance. These documents have to be included in the filing. Revised documents need to be re-filed. Jim Grant commented that the NYISO has to certify monthly that it is adhering to Criteria, etc. The NYISO does self-certification.

Item 3a--Guy Zito discussed the background behind generating the list. NPCC had a representative on each Drafting Team. The Drafting Team sizes will be reduced (Brian Murphy to discuss). Looking for a NPCC representative on the Undervoltage Load Shedding Drafting Team. The continent-wide Disturbance Monitoring Standard effort will be followed.

Item 3b--Guy Zito said that Michael Lombardi had been following it, and he thanked Michael Lombardi for the work he had done. It had been given to Bruce Metruck at the last RSC Meeting. After Michael Lombardi rejoins NPCC he will take it back. Members have expressed interest in it. Any revisions to be sent to Lee Pedowicz. Lee Pedowicz will give to Michael Lombardi March 1.

4. Items Requiring RSC Approval

a.

5. FERC

a. Issuances below.

b. Sunshine Act Meeting--Feb. 21, 2013. PRC-006-NPCC-01 on the Agenda.

Item 5b--Guy Zito reported that PRC-006-NPCC-01 is on the Agenda for the Meeting.

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
5.1	Comments	RM12-12-000	Reply Comments Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation In Response To Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking	12/11/12
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>	NERC provides these reply comments in response to the comments submitted on November 26, 2012 on FERC's September 20, 2012, NOPR regarding the proposed regional Reliability Standard PRC-006-NPCC-1 (Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding).		
5.2	Letter Order	RD12-6-000	Approval of Interpretation to Reliability Standard CIP-004	12/12/12

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			
5.3	Final Rule	RM12-9-000	Regional Reliability Standard PRC-006-SERC-01- Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding Requirements	12/20/12
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			
			FERC approves Regional Reliability Standard PRC-006-SERC-01 (Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding Requirements). Regional Reliability Standard PRC-006-SERC-01 is designed to ensure that automatic underfrequency load shedding protection schemes, designed by planning coordinators and implemented by applicable distribution providers and transmission owners in the SERC Reliability Corporation Region, are coordinated to mitigate the consequences of an underfrequency event effectively. FERC approves the related VRFs, with one modification, VSLs, implementation plan, and effective date proposed by NERC.	
5.4	Order	RR12-8-000	Order Conditionally Approving Revisions To North American Electric Reliability Corporation Rules Of Procedure	12/20/12
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			
			On May 7, 2012, NERC filed a petition requesting approval of revisions to provisions in Sections 300 (Reliability Standards Development), 400 (Compliance Enforcement), 600 (Personnel Certification), 800 (Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis), 1000 (Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security), 1400 (Amendments to the Rules of Procedure), and 1700 (Challenges to Determinations) of the NERC Rules of Procedure. The petition also sought to revise NERC Rules of Procedure Appendices 2 (Definitions), 3C (Procedure for Coordinating Reliability Standards Approvals, Remands, and Directives), 4B (Sanction Guidelines), 4C (Uniform Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program (CMEP)), 5B	

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
				(Statement of Compliance Registry Criteria), and 6 (System Operator Certification Program Manual). Pursuant to section 215(f) of the Federal Power Act (FPA), FERC conditionally approved the proposed revisions to the Rules of Procedure, with limited exceptions.
5.5 (refer to Item 5.13 below)	Final Rule	RM12-6-000, RM12-7-000; Order No. 773	Revisions to Electric Reliability Organization Definition of Bulk Electric System and Rules of Procedure	12/20/12; 1/4/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			FERC approves modifications to the currently effective definition of “bulk electric system” developed by NERC. FERC finds that the modified definition of “bulk electric system” removes language allowing for regional discretion in the currently effective bulk electric system definition and establishes a bright-line threshold that includes all facilities operated at or above 100 kV. The modified definition also identifies specific categories of facilities and configurations as inclusions and exclusions to provide clarity in the definition of “bulk electric system.” In this Final Rule, FERC also approves: (1) NERC’s revisions to its Rules of Procedure, which create an exception process to add elements to, or remove elements from, the definition of “bulk electric system” on a case-by-case basis; (2) NERC’s form entitled “Detailed Information to Support an Exception Request” that entities will use to support requests for exception from the “bulk electric system” definition; and (3) NERC’s implementation plan for the revised “bulk electric system” definition.
5.6	Comments	RM12-4-000	Comments Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation In Response To Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking	12/21/12
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			NERC provides these comments on the NOPR regarding NERC’s proposed Reliability Standard FAC-003-2 (Transmission Vegetation Management) issued by the FERC in this proceeding on October 18, 2012. In the NOPR, FERC proposes to approve Reliability Standard FAC-003-2, which modifies the currently effective

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
			Reliability Standard, FAC-003-1. FERC also proposes to approve changes in the definition of “Right-of-Way” and “Vegetation Inspection,” the addition of the term “Minimum Vegetation Clearance Distance” (“MVCD”), the implementation plan for proposed FAC-003-2, and the Violation Severity Levels associated with the proposed Reliability Standard. Finally, FERC proposes to direct NERC to revise the VRF for R2, and approve the remainder of the VRFs. In response to FERC’s request for comments, NERC addresses several sections of the NOPR.	
5.7	Informational Filing	RM05-17-000, RM05-25-000, RM06-16-000	North American Electric Reliability Corporation Reliability Standards Development Plan 2013-2015 Informational Filing Pursuant To Section 310 Of The NERC Rules Of Procedure	12/31/12
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>		NERC submits to FERC for informational purposes its Reliability Standards Development Plan in accordance with Section 310 of the NERC Rules of Procedure. The NERC Board of Trustees approved the 2013 Development Plan on December 19, 2012.	
5.8	Petition	RD13-	<u>Petition Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation For Approval Of Proposed Reliability Standard EOP-004-2 – Event Reporting</u>	12/31/12
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>		NERC requests that FERC approve the proposed Reliability Standard - EOP-004-2 - Event Reporting. EOP-004-2 was approved by the NERC Board of Trustees on November 7, 2012. NERC is requesting approval of the proposed Reliability Standard, the associated implementation plan, Violation Risk Factors (“VRFs”) and Violation Severity Levels (“VSLs”), and retirement of the currently effective Reliability Standards EOP-004-1 - Disturbance Reporting, and CIP-001-2a - Sabotage Reporting.	
5.9	Errata Petition	RD13-3-000	Errata to Petition of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation for Approval of	1/4/13

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
			Proposed Reliability Standard EOP-004-2 – Event Reporting Docket No. RD13-3-000	
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>	On December 31, 2012, NERC filed a Petition for Approval of Proposed Reliability Standard EOP-004-2 – Event Reporting. It has come to NERC’s attention that Exhibit B - <i>Proposed Reliability Standard EOP-004-2 Submitted for Approval</i> , contains a minor error. A corrected copy of this Exhibit is attached. The revision is changing “table below” to “standard” in the Note for Attachment A on page 8 of 22 of the Standard.		
5.10	Comments	AD12-12-000	Comments Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation-- Coordination Between Natural Gas And Electricity Markets	1/7/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>	NERC is providing these comments in response to the FERC Notice of Request for Comments and Technical Conference on the Coordination between Natural Gas and Electricity Markets. NERC’s mission, as the FERC-designated ERO, is to ensure the reliability of the Bulk Power System in North America, in part, by developing and enforcing mandatory Reliability Standards. NERC’s reliability mandate under Section 215 of the Federal Power Act does not include authority to monitor and enforce market-based issues. Accordingly, NERC’s comments herein focus on electric and gas industry coordination issues as they relate to electric reliability.		
5.11	Comments	RM12-22-000	Reply Comments Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation In Response To Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking	1/10/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>	NERC provides these comments in response to comments submitted on FERC’s October 18, 2012, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“NOPR”) proposing to direct NERC to file for approval with FERC Reliability Standards that address the risks posed by geomagnetic disturbances (“GMDs”) to the reliable operation of the Bulk Power System, in two stages.		

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
5.12	Order	FA11-21-000	Order Approving Settlement Agreement	1/16/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>	FERC approves the attached Settlement Agreement between the Office of Enforcement (Enforcement) and NERC. This Order is in the public interest because it comprehensively resolves all outstanding issues between the Parties related to Enforcement's findings and recommendations arising out of its 2012 performance audit of NERC.		
5.13 (refer to Item 5.5 above)	Request for Clarification	RM12-6-000, RM12-7-000	Request For Clarification Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation	1/22/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>	NERC requests clarification of FERC's December 20, 2012 Order on Revisions to Electric Reliability Organization Definition of Bulk Electric System and Rules of Procedure ("Order No. 773") (see Item 5.5 above). There are several areas where NERC requests FERC to clarify its interpretation of the BES Definition in Order No. 773. (1) clarification of the FERC directive to revise Exclusion E3; and (2) clarification of the FERC directives to: (a) implement Exclusion E1 so that the exclusions for radial systems do not apply to tie-lines for BES generators identified in inclusion I2, and (b) implement Exclusion E3 so that the exclusion for local networks does not apply to BES generator tie lines operated at or above 100 kV.		
5.14	Quarterly Report	RM06-16-010, RM06-16-011	Quarterly Report Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation On Status Of Development Of Bal-003	1/23/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>	On March 30, 2012, NERC filed with FERC a motion for an extension of time to submit a revised Resource and Demand Balancing ("BAL") Reliability Standard on Frequency Response and Frequency Bias, BAL-003. On May 4, 2012, FERC issued an order establishing a compliance schedule for NERC to submit a revised BAL-003 consistent with the Commission's directives in Order No. 693. FERC established		

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
			a deadline of May 31, 2013, and directed the submission of informational reports on a quarterly basis describing “the progress NERC is making toward completing its analysis and research as well as the progress it is making in completing work on the other issues and filing a revised BAL-003-0 Reliability Standard by May 31, 2013.” The instant filing is submitted in compliance with the Commission’s directive in the May 4 Order.	
5.15	Reply Comments	RD13-2-000	Reply Comments Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation	1/23/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>		On November 21, 2012, NERC submitted a petition for approval of proposed Reliability Standard VAR-002-2b. The proposed VAR-002-2b Reliability Standard ensures that generators provide reactive and voltage control necessary to ensure voltage levels, reactive flows, and reactive resources are maintained within applicable Facility Ratings to protect equipment and the reliable operation of the Interconnection. On January 8, 2013, the PPL Companies submitted comments requesting that the Commission modify the Violation Severity Level (“VSL”) for Requirement R2. Pursuant to Rules 212 and 213 of FERC, NERC hereby provides reply comments in response.	
5.16	Analysis	RR06-1-000, RR09-7-000	Analysis of NERC Standard Process Results, Fourth Quarter 2012	1/31/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>		NERC submits its Analysis of NERC Standards Process Results for the Second Quarter 2012 (“Ballot Results Analysis”). This filing is submitted in response to FERC’s January 18, 2007 Order requiring NERC to closely monitor and report the voting results for NERC Reliability Standards each quarter for three years and FERC’s subsequent Order issued on September 16, 2010, whereby the Commission renewed and expanded on its directive for an additional three years. The Ballot Results Analysis	

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
				addresses ballot results during the October 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 timeframe, and includes NERC's analysis of the voting results, including trends and patterns of stakeholder approval of NERC Reliability Standards.
5.17	Petition	RD13-	Petition Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation For Approval Of Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards Version 5	1/31/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			NERC hereby requests that FERC approve ten proposed CIP Reliability Standards (CIP Version 5"). NERC also requests approval of the proposed definitions of terms used in the proposed CIP Version 5, the associated implementation plan, and the proposed VRFs and VSLs. This filing also addresses all remaining standards-related issues and directives from Order No. 706. Additionally, NERC requests that CIP Version 5 become effective on the first day of the eighth calendar quarter after a final rule is issued in this docket.
5.18	Motion	RM12-4-000	Motion For Leave To File Reply Comments And Reply Comments Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation Regarding Comments Received On Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking	2/5/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			In response to comments submitted to FERC regarding the NOPR issued on October 18, 2012, NERC submits this Motion for Leave to File Reply Comments and Reply Comments. NERC provides these reply comments as the FERC certified ERO responsible for the development and

<u>Item</u>	<u>NOPR, Petition, Final Rule, Other</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Posted</u>
				enforcement of mandatory Reliability Standards, including proposed FAC-003-2. On December 21, 2012, NERC submitted comments addressing several sections of the Commission's NOPR. A number of other entities also filed comments. NERC respectfully requests that FERC consider NERC's reply comments clarifying and responding to certain issues raised by commenters. FERC should accept these reply comments because they provide information to assist FERC in this proceeding.
5.19	Petition	RD13-	Petition Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation For Approval Of Interpretation To Bal-002-1 – Disturbance Control Performance	2/12/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			NERC hereby requests FERC approve a proposed interpretation to Reliability Standard —BAL-002-1– Disturbance Control Performance, which was approved by the NERC Board of Trustees on November 7, 2012. Upon FERC approval of the interpretation, the standard will be referred to as BAL-002-1a.
5.20	Compliance Filing	RM08-13-000, RM08-13-001	Compliance Filing Of The North American Electric Reliability Corporation In Response To Order Nos. 733 And 759 – Transmission Relay Loadability Reliability Standard	2/19/13
	<u>Summary, Instructions, Dates =></u>			NERC hereby submits this filing in compliance with FERC's Order Nos. 733 and 759 directing NERC to file with FERC a test for Planning Coordinators to identify sub-200kV critical facilities, and the results of that test on a representative sample of utilities in three Interconnections (<i>i.e.</i> , Eastern, Western, and the Electric Reliability Council of Texas "ERCOT").

Item 5 Table 5.1 thru 5 Table 5.20--Guy Zito discussed Items 5 Table 5.1 thru 5.4, 5.6, 5.8 thru 5.16, 5.18 thru 5.20. Regarding Item 5 Table 5.5, 3/15/13 is the date the Order will be effective, 7/1/13 is the date the BES definition will be effective, and 7/1/15 is the enforcement date. Regarding Item 5.7, David Kiguel said that the Oversight Committee

was formed under the Standards Committee to help ensure the quality of the product. How will the P81 Project fit in? NERC now has multiple directions for its projects. Regarding Item 5.17, the Petition is to skip the implementation of Version 4 and go to Version 5. President Obama issued an Executive Order for Cybersecurity. TFIST is investigating what it means to the electric power industry. Trying to get FERC to speedily approve Version 5.

6. Posted NERC Projects (in Meeting Materials Package)

- a. A table of past ballot recommendations (in the Supplement) is periodically being posted on the [NPCC Website](#).
- b. [Project 2010-11– TPL Table 1 Order TPL-002-2b, footnote ‘b’ and TPL-001-3, footnote 12 recirculation ballot results.](#)
- c. NERC seeking a NPCC member for the [Project 2008-02 - Undervoltage Load Shedding](#) Drafting Team.

Item 6a--Guy Zito discussed.

Item 6b--Guy Zito reported that there were two appeals filed with NERC about how the Drafting Team addressed comments. It was felt that the Drafting Team provided incorrect responses. Language was initially not substantive. Addressed Canadian concerns. For information, the Ontario Energy Board has the authority to not do anything with a standard which is a default acceptance, or remand back to NERC. David Kiguel described the Ontario regulatory process. If remanded to NERC, the MOU dictates a NERC review. If NERC does nothing, will not be enforceable in Ontario. The OEB has never initiated a remand. Each Province is different. It is important to take the Canadian perspective into consideration.

Item 6c--This is an opportunity to get a NPCC representative on the Drafting Team. Si-Truc reported that HQ has some undervoltage load shedding. This project will be monitored.

<u>Project and Supporting Materials</u>	<u>Current and Pending Ballots</u>	<u>Join Ballot Pools</u>	<u>Posted for Comment</u>
---	------------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------

1.	Project and Supporting Materials Project 2010-05.1 – Protection Systems: Phase 1(Misoperations) PRC-004-3 Related Files Paul DiFilippo to call in 10:30 a.m. 2/20/13 to discuss.	Current and Pending Ballots		Join Ballot Pools		Posted for Comment	
		Successive Ballot Start	Non-Binding Poll End			1/22/13	2/20/13
		2/11/13	2/20/13				
2.	Project 2007-09 - Generator Verification - PRC-024-1 Related Files	Successive Ballot Start	Non-Binding Poll End			1/25/13	2/25/13
		2/15/13	2/25/13				
3.	Project 2010-13.2 Phase 2 of Relay Loadability: Generation (Also Cost Effectiveness, Supplemental SAR, RSAW Comment Forms) NOTE: First CEAP Posting Related Files	Initial Ballot		1/25/13	2/25/13	1/25/13	3/11/13
		3/1/13	3/11/13				
4.	Rapid Revision Procedure					2/5/13	3/6/13
5.	Project 2012-INT-06 - Interpretation of CIP-003-3 for Consumers Energy	Initial Ballot		2/6/13	3/7/13	2/6/13	3/22/13
		3/13/13	3/22/13				
6.	Project 2012-INT-04 - Interpretation of CIP-007-3 for ITC	Initial Ballot		2/6/13	3/7/13	2/6/13	3/22/13
		3/13/13	3/22/13				

Items 6 Table 5, 6--TFIST meeting Feb. 19-20, 2013. Preparing ballot recommendation. Guy Zito reported that he received information from TFIST regarding these items. TFIST recommended a “Yes” vote with no comments for either of them. For Item 6 Table 5--Guy Zito read the Request for Clarification and the Drafting Team’s response. David Kiguel commented that he had a concern with where the interpretation says the entity is not precluded (last paragraph in the response). An entity may have multiple

functions, but if one NERC ID can only have one senior manager. If an entity has multiple IDs, can have multiple senior managers, or one senior manager. Guy Zito will be sending out a recommendation to approve. David Ramkalawan asked how this applies in Ontario? David Kiguel replied that it depends on the license with the OEB. David Ramkalawan then asked what if you had multiple plants under one license, need one senior manager for each plant? Ron Falsetti thinks you can only have one senior manager. David Ramkalawan said that each business unit has its own procedures, and manager. He doesn't think the senior vice president should be responsible for all the business entities. The responsible manager should be closer administratively to the unit. David Kiguel commented that it should have one senior manager. For Item 6 Table 6 Guy Zito discussed the Drafting Team response to the Request for Interpretation. David Kiguel remarked that it was submitted to NERC June, 2011, and is just being dealt with now. Mike Jones said that CAN 17 is contrary to this. CAN 17 was issued November, 2011. CAN 17 is being audited to. Guy Zito commented that a CAN isn't an effective way to process an interpretation. He doesn't think CANs are being generated anymore. David Ramkalawan said that CANs generated the need for TFEs. Guy Zito will send out his recommendation to vote "Yes".

Item 6 Table 1--Paul DiFilippo, the vice-Chair of TFSP and a member of the Project 2010-05.1 Drafting Team called in. Guy Zito had asked TFSP for a ballot recommendation. Concerns had been raised about the Standard. There was concern over Requirement R1. Paul DiFilippo said that the point of R1 was to have someone start the investigation. The time period was of concern. Discussed George Wegh's timeframe concerns. Paul DiFilippo explained how Requirement R3 affected it. Guy Zito suggested changing the wording to reflect immediacy. Paul DiFilippo commented that the Drafting Team tried not to use excess words, ambiguous words. David Kiguel asked about how a situation when there were multiple BES operations involving multiple BES equipment owned by multiple parties would be handled? Guy Zito replied that each device was covered by the Standard. Paul DiFilippo agreed with Guy Zito. Lee Pedowicz asked why 120 days? Paul DiFilippo said that 120 days was needed because of misoperations that might not be so obvious. 120 days was selected because of concerns about misoperations that were not so obvious. The 120 day period was also selected recognizing that there are periods when there can be numerous operations. Lee Pedowicz expressed his concern about the 120 day period. Paul DiFilippo again reiterated the 120 days was needed for periods of heavy activity. Every operation has to be looked at. The Drafting Team wanted to encourage accurate reporting of operations, and misoperations. Guy Zito asked the assembled if there were any issues. Brian Robinson was concerned that the Standard makes one entity reliant on the actions of another. Brian Murpy was concerned about timeframes. Guy Zito mentioned that changing timeframes would not be a substantive change. Juan Villar asked about interconnection issues. Mike Jones asked why TFSP did not give a recommendation? It was mentioned that George Wegh's E-mail came out over the preceding weekend. TFSP did not reach a consensus. After further discussion Guy Zito suggested that Requirements R1, R1.1, and the sub-bullets could be reworded to clarify what is meant by the 120 day period. Carmen Agavrioloai

said that the IESO did not support. The IESO had a problem with Requirements R2, and R3. Wanted more clarity for who is responsible for the CAP. Guy Zito liked the Standard, but could see that revisions are needed. David Kiguel thought that both parties would investigate why a piece of equipment operated. Guy Zito and David Kiguel both said that Operating Agreements might come into play. Mike Jones was concerned about collaboration. Guy Zito said that he could not make a recommendation, that there are just issues. The Comment Form was discussed. David Kiguel asked whether or not the Protection System owner should be responsible for the requirements of the Standard. The question was raised about RAPA being a request for reports on all operations, how is the request initiated? (See Minutes p.23).

Item 6 Table 2--There were no issues raised that had to be discussed. The comments submitted to Lee Pedowicz as of the date of the Meeting would be submitted.

Item 6 Table 3--Guy Zito participated in a Webinar last week. Waiting for a TFSP recommendation. Cost Effectiveness has been presented to the industry. Guy Zito is leading the Cost Effectiveness team. Juan Villar asked about the timeline for Cost Effectiveness. Guy Zito responded that it depends on the responses received from the Comment Form posting. The intent is to have a report posted for the next Successive Ballot. Cost Effectiveness provides cost and implementation information. It is not a data request. David Kiguel remarked that it is meant to provide other ways to implement a standard from a cost basis. Meant to be informational and help the decision making process. Si-Truc Phan said he has comments, but that instead of discussing now he will wait for the TFSP response. Raised the possibility of combining transmission and generation (PRC-023, PRC-025), and putting everything into one document. Ron Falsetti said that the intent was to delineate between transmission and generation protection. Ron Falsetti said that most of the time a Generator Owner owns the relays in the plant. For Hydro-Quebec the Transmission Owner owns the relays at the generator. Si-Truc said that this issue applies to PRC-004-3. Mike Garton said that PRC-025 changed to look at the output line from the GSU. There is an overlap between Standards. Guy Zito said that clarification is needed as to the Standard's applicability. Si-Truc Phan commented that PRC-025 is in conflict with PRC-023. Comments are to be sent to Lee Pedowicz. Peter Yost said that this Project is a pilot for the CEAP. Guy Zito said that a Comment Form is available.

Item 6 Table 4--Guy Zito said that this is intended to address something small that needs to get done quickly and has compliance implications, but is broader in scope than an interpretation. From page 1 of the Rapid Revision Procedure, Guy Zito feels that the statement "... then this Rapid Revision Procedure may be used in lieu of including the issue within the scope of a Standard Authorization Request (SAR) governing a normal standards project." seems to skip a SAR step. The phrase indicates you don't need a SAR, which is a deviation from the Standards Process Manual. The Standards Process Manual will have to be revised. Mike Garton reported that Mallory Huggins (NERC) said at yesterday's Webinar that there are no changes to the Standards Process Manual. Guy Zito doesn't understand the aforementioned paragraph, and it needs clarification.

Except for that one paragraph the Rapid Revision Procedure agrees with the Standards Process Manual. A suggestion is to add the word “existing” before SAR.

7. Current NERC Drafting Team Nominations

a.				
----	--	--	--	--

8. NERC Meetings (in Meeting Materials Package)

- a. NERC Definition of BES Standard Drafting Team.
 1. Conference call Dec. 4, 2012.
 2. Pete Heidrich (FRCC) discussion.
- b. Standards Committee Special Election--closes Feb. 25, 2013.
- c. Standards Committee Meeting.
 1. Jan. 16-17, 2013 Meeting. David Kiguel’s Meeting notes.
 2. SCPS update.
- d. NERC 2013 Reliability Standards and Compliance Spring Workshop-- March 19-21, 2013, St. Louis, Mo.
- e. Member Representatives Committee.
 1. [Jan. 16, 2013](#).
 2. [Jan. 30, 2013 Conference Call](#).
 3. [Feb. 6, 2013](#).
 - a. [Presentations](#).
- f. [Standards Oversight and Technology Committee Meeting--Feb. 6, 2013](#).
 1. [Presentations](#).
- g. [Corporate Governance and Human Resources Committee Meeting--Feb. 6, 2013](#).
 1. [Presentations](#).
- h. NERC Board of Trustees Conference Call--Dec. 19, 2012.
 1. [Dec. 19, 2012 Conference Call](#).
 2. [Feb. 7, 2013 Meeting--Standards approved by the Board](#).
- i. [Lessons Learned--Feb. 18, 2013](#)--discuss ways to improve standards.
- j. System Protection and Control Subcommittee--Feb. 5-7, 2013 Meeting notes (Quoc Le).

Item 8a1--Generation thresholds have been given to the Planning Committee. There appears to be no reason to change them. There is disappointment with not changing the 20MW and 75MW generation numbers. Disappointed with the analysis. The BES numbers came from the Compliance Registry. The technical analysis was not satisfactory.

Item 8b--Bruce Metruck nominated Randy Crissman for Segment 5. The nomination deadline is Feb. 25, 2013.

Item 8c1--David Kiguel reported that at the meeting the election for Chair and Vice-Chair was held. Brian Murphy was the newly elected Chair. With the new members on the Standards Committee, time has to be given to them to settle in. The Standards Committee seems to be rushing things. The Executive Committee was elected. There is

no Canadian representation in the Standards Committee leadership. Brian Murphy will represent the Standards Committee on the RISC. Guy Zito said that the new Standards Committee Charter gives them more power to act on their own. Kathleen Goodman commented that only three affirmative votes are needed to pass a motion on the Executive Committee. It is longer necessary for the full Standards Committee to ratify Executive Committee decisions.

There was a COM-003 Workshop Feb. 14-15, 2013. Lee Pedowicz was in the audience, and Kathleen Goodman called in. Lee Pedowicz gave a recap of the proceedings. It was emphasized at the Workshop that COM-003 deals with protocols. Howard Gugel lead the Workshop, and opened the floor to options that would make the Standard acceptable to industry. Suggestions were made to combine COM-002-3 with COM-003, eliminate COM-003 entirely, and make changes to the requirements. The Standard will not be eliminated, and combining COM-002-3 with COM-003 was ruled out. A suggestion by Lee Pedowicz to revise PER training Standards to reflect appropriate training was not entertained. Brian Shanahan commented that the NRC doesn't require three part communication, and it seems overly prescriptive. Brian Shanahan did not see the last posted version of COM-003 as burdensome, and was in favor of it. Kathleen Goodman said that she hasn't heard that the Board has a consensus position. There was a discussion of the possible application of Section 321 of the Rules of Procedure to COM-003's development.

Item 8c2--David Kiguel lead the discussion. Guy Zito is going to lead looking at the Standard Drafting Team Guidelines. Guy Zito needs to know how VSLs will be handled. Discussed the single portal concept. Reported that the concept is being solidified. Guy Zito is taking over the single portal project. There will be a single form accessible on the NERC Website for all issues. The intent is not to change, but to use the resources that are available. Consensus building during the SAR stage was discussed. A SAR should be assessed on a technical basis before posting. There was no discussion on the CEAP pilot. There was a discussion on quality review. More work is need on Drafting Team guidelines. The standards development process needs to be shortened. The Strategic Workplan for 2013 was worked on. The size of the Standards Committee might change. By June of this year, organizational changes will be implemented. Guy Zito brought up for consideration a possible regrouping of standards. Are the standards families correct?

Item 8d--Guy Zito will be making a presentation on the CEAP at the Workshop.

Items 8e thru 8h--in the Meeting Materials package.

Item 8i--Guy Zito mentioned for the group's information.

Item 8j--Guy Zito postulates that Phase 3 of Relay Loadability for power swings will be developed. Ron Falsetti commented that sudden pressure relays can't be tested--one test and they have to be replaced.

9. NERC Compliance Activity (in Meeting Materials Package)

a.

	<u>Draft CANs--Table</u>	<u>Posted</u>	<u>Comments Due</u>

10. NERC Items of Interest

- a. Winter Preparation for Severe Weather Event.
 - 1. Project 2013-01 - Cold Weather Preparedness Webinar--March 20, 2013.
- b. Reliability Assurance Initiative--Concept White Paper posted.
- c. Proposal for NERC CEAP pilot project--Project 2010-13.2 Generator Relay Loadability, GMD standard.
- d. NERC 2013 Reliability Standards and Compliance Workshops--March 19-21, 2013; September 24-26, 2013.
- e. Brian Murphy (NextEra Energy, Inc.) Chairman of NERC's Standards Committee--discuss NERC's Standard Processes Manual, NERC's Standard's Committee (1:00 p.m. Feb. 20, 2013).
- f. NERC 2014 Business Plan and Budget Schedule.
- g. NERC Single Portal Project.

Item 10a--Guy Zito reported that there is a Webinar scheduled for March 20, 2013. The topic was given to the RISC. The RISC gave it to the Operating Committee. There may be a standard started, but the responses to the SAR will affect what is done with a standard. It is already on record that the RISC does not think that a standard is the solution. David Ramkalawan said that he reviewed the guideline, but did not realize that a standard would also be developed. Juan Villar asked how the recent bad weather in the Northeast affected winter readiness? Guy Zito said that he was not aware of an impact on generation. He believed any problems affected the distribution systems, and it is under investigation. Juan Villar commented that the recent bad weather would be a good test. Both Ron Falsetti and David Ramkalawan both said that the recent snow wasn't that unusual. Guy Zito said that this item would not benefit the Northeast, but other Regions have demonstrated that their responses to cold weather preparedness were not good. The Webinar is March 20, 2013 from 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

Item 10b--Peter Yost said that the original thought of the RAI was that it would be filed in March. Per NERC, would just be filing routine reports. Guy Zito asked what would this mean for members? Peter Yost commented that more risk based compliance is going to be followed at NERC. He doesn't know how it will be implemented. Ron Falsetti said that there are no filings to be had on the RAI. Guy Zito will follow up for the next RSC Meeting. Mike Jones heard that June will be the publishing date.

Item 10c--Discussed previously under Item 6 Table 3.

Item 10d--Guy Zito discussed.

Item 10e--Guy Zito gave the floor to Brian Murphy. There is a lot of confusion regarding the P81 Project. Brian Murphy wants to go over the changes with the Standards Committee. He said there is a Webinar on Feb. 27, 2013 to cover the items that Brian Murphy discussed. A new Reliability Standards Development Plan was issued at the end of 2012. Thinking of grouping Standards into families. Hopes to move standards through in one year. One idea to make the standards process more efficient is to build consensus beforehand. Will see informal consensus building. NERC is looking, and will continue to look for SME's. Hope to have a pool of SME's to nominate themselves to be on call as a resource for the smaller Drafting Teams. The standards development process will be better served with smaller Drafting Teams, with a lawyer and technical writer included on each of the teams. The teams will also have a Standards Committee liaison to help guide the Drafting Team through impasses. If the Drafting Team is not working, the Standards Committee will step in. The Standards Committee Oversight Committee was formed. Hope to work more closely with the NERC Staff. The Standards Committee is not seeing strong project management. Wants to make it more visible. Brian Murphy is giving his full support to Guy for the cost effectiveness effort. Looking at risk. Diane Barney commented that given that there will be smaller Drafting Teams, will there be guidelines for SMEs to reach out to the regions that are not represented. The guidelines right now are informal. Brian Murphy is agreeable to getting written guidelines developed. David Kiguel said that it is important for Drafting Teams to capture continent-wide views. It is important that the Drafting Teams be given the resources to contact. Brian Murphy will start having the guidelines developed. Gerry Dunbar what the size of the Drafting Teams will be? Brian Murphy said the target is for between eight and ten participants, but there may be instances when larger teams will be needed, the Standards Committee can have it done. Consensus building will be a good aid. How well the consensus building does will have to be evaluated. Brian Murphy said that h thinks the Standards Committee will be flexible on Drafting Team size. Kathleen Goodman asked how the Standards Committee will interact with the Reliability Issue Steering Committee? With regard to the cold weather preparedness SAR, the RISC thinks the guideline is sufficient. The Standards Committee needs the overall picture. The Drafting Team thinks the SAR is too broad and wants to narrow it down, then re-post and bring it to closure. Guy Zito asked about the time schedules for when these things will be implemented. Can use NPCC resources to help build consensus. The solicitation for SMEs to be sent out by the end of February. Looking at regional committees, and the accessibility of documents for consensus building. Gerry Dunbar asked if the Drafting Team reforms need any formal changes? Not worrying about enhancements, but implementation.

Item 10f--Guy Zito mentioned that it was for the group's information.

Item 10g--Guy Zito is leading a small team to move the single portal project forward. Peter Yost asked for a description of what it was all about. Guy Zito said that for NERC processes, etc. stakeholders don't know where to go. Meant to have a single place for an entity to go. It is envisioned that an entity would fill out a form, and it would

automatically be routed to the right place. Right now NERC's handling of entities' inputs is very inefficient. Entities' inputs get routed to multiple parties, etc. Introduces delays. Guy Zito has been marketing it. Make sure that it melds with NERC's Sharepoint. This will be discussed at the NERC Workshop.

11. NPCC Regional Standards, Directories and Related Items (in Meeting Materials Package)

- a. Responses to Request for Criteria Interpretation.
 - 1. Clarification of the criteria surrounding Section 5.6.2 of Directory#3 Maintenance Criteria for Bulk Power System Protection (completed Dec. 20, 2012).
 - 2. Clarification of the criteria surrounding Section 5.7.1 of Directory#3 Maintenance Criteria for Bulk Power System Protection (completed Dec. 20, 2012).
- b. Directories.
 - 1. Directory#12--Automatic UFLS Program Requirements posted for comment in the NPCC Open Process through March 14, 2013.
 - 2. Directory#1--Design and Operation of the BPS. Status of Joint CO-7/CP-11 Review.
 - 3. Directory#7--SPS. Status of TFSP Review.
- c. RCC.
 - 1. Scope.
 - 2. Feb. 27, 2013 Meeting--
- d. Regional Reliability Standards Process Manual.
- e. PRC-002-NPCC-01--Disturbance Monitoring.
 - 1. Utility Services Request for Interpretation.
 - 2. Daren Verner (TFSP) RSAR.
- f. NPCC Board of Directors Jan. 30, 2013 Meeting.
 - 1. RSC Status Report.
 - 2. NPCC 2013 Corporate Goals.

Item 11a1--Gerry Dunbar reported that TFSP rendered its opinion.

Item 11a2--Gerry Dunbar discussed the TFSP response. TFSP reviewed their response and revised.

How high should the level of approval be for interpretations? Moving approvals to the RCC is being considered. Currently just the appropriate Task Force looks at it and renders its opinion, and that is it. Ron Falsetti asked if interpretations are appended to Directories? Guy Zito and Gerry Dunbar both responded that they are not. Interpretations are just posted on the NPCC Website. Gerry Dunbar will look into appending it to the appropriate Directory. Looking at reformatting Directory #3 with regard to Criteria requirements.

- Formatted: Font: Not Bold
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.19", Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Underline
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.69", Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Underline
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", First line: 0", Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Underline
- Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

RSC April 2013 Meeting Item 2.1

Item 11b1--TFSS recommended additional changes to Directory #12. Needed to be reposted until March 14, 2013.

Item 11b2--Directory #1 is being reformatted. TFCO is struggling with what contingencies to cover. The Chairs of TFCP and TFCO elected to send it back to CO-7/CP-11. Gerry Dunbar will be involved. Any input is welcome. There will be a joint CO-7/CP-11 meeting next month.

Item 11b3--The posting concluded. TFSP is looking at the comments received. Looking at Appendix B. It has been given back to TFCP. Will be reposted.

Items 11c1, 11c2--Guy Zito discussed.

Item 11d--Guy Zito said Michael Lombardi will be working on the Regional Standards Process Manual. The Interpretation process needs to be addressed.

Item 11e1--NPCC Board of Directors approved. Will hold to give to the Drafting Team when it looks at the Standard.

Item 11e2--Guy Zito reported that TFSP says the Standard needs to be looked at with regard to the BES definition. There is a Compliance Guidance Statement regarding the use of the word "capability" in PRC-002NPCC-01. Should be posted for comments. Juan Villar asked what will we do after the continent-wide standard is developed? Guy Zito replied that this Regional Standard was moved forward because there was no standard available to industry. If the continent-wide standard covers everything in PRC-002-01, the Regional Standard might be retired. Several iterations of a RSAR have been developed. Guy Zito reported that we've gotten a legal view of the definition of capability. He thinks there are three Compliance Guidance Statements being developed. The Industry Need Section was revised to read:

"In order to support the NERC Event Analysis Program and to facilitate comprehensive review of disturbances on the BES, a robust Disturbance Monitoring standard is necessary. Review of the existing PRC-002-NPCC-01 is necessary to ensure the existing requirements are appropriate in light of the newly FERC approved BES definition."

The Detailed Description Section was revised to read:

"The standard is based on the current BES definition and will be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect the new FERC approved definition."

David Ramkalawan made a motion to approve the RSAR with the minor revisions discussed. Seconded by Brian Shanahan. All in attendance were in favor.

Si-Truc Phan suggested that the continent-wide standard, when developed, combine PRC-002 and PRC-018.

This RSAR will now be given to the Disturbance Monitoring Drafting Team.

Item 11f--Guy Zito discussed. Regarding Item 11f2, provided recommendations for the bullets. Standards goals are to revise the Regional Standards Process Manual, promote the CEAP, and shepherd the single portal process.

12. **Other Items of Interest**

- a. Regional Standards Committee Work Plan for Calendar Years 2013-2014.
- b. Review of [NPCC Triage Process for Standards Related Matters](#).
- c. [Régie de l'énergie](#) approved the reliability standards pre-filing [consultation process](#). Si-Truc Phan to discuss. The following link is for additional supporting materials:

<https://neptune.npcc.org:443/AHT/DownloadLogin.aspx?package=728fSSgzhZqw1EhjZG1aAd7YEYI7jr1M2wEiKha4ztX2LIGDwfmro8rg1tBYOsMIVvtbuUhaq8BwD5lZZd7nUsMFYQRuWcdo2M1ZsjQzbM4%3d>

Item 12a--Guy Zito discussed.

Item 12b--Guy Zito said the Triage Process needs to be looked at. There is a need to make the Task Force reviews more efficient and less burdensome to them. Suggestion was made that the NPCC Staff review first, then give those issues to the Task Forces. David Kiguel commented that they have the same problem at Hydro One. When they seek comments, they give the SMEs a draft of comments along with materials. David Kiguel thinks it is helping a little. Guy Zito said that when the RSC was CP-9, Guy Zito would get SMEs to go over Comment Forms. Constraints now prevent that. Guy Zito said that with the increased NPCC staff, maybe NPCC can start putting together comments. Give smaller packages to the SMEs. Need to get more efficient ways to solicit comments from SMEs. Conducting Webinars for postings is a possibility.

Item 12c--Si-Truc Phan lead the discussion. There are 55 entities in Quebec that work with the Regie. Having information sessions to give information on new standards. Updated standards will be on Hydro-Quebec's Website. VRFs and VSLs--how to tell NERC when they are different from the NERC Standards. David Ramkalawan asked whether when the standards were translated into French were there any differences introduced by the translation? Si-Truc Phan said that they tried to do a faithful interpretation. Appendices were added to identify corrections to mistakes that were found. The standards were submitted to NERC. In the future, after the second draft the RC can translate and send to the entities. David Ramkalawan asked what might cause an entity to intervene? Si-Truc Phan said that they also produce English versions. Have 17 standards that were just translated. David Kiguel asked for verification that entities in Ontario get the information. Si-Truc Phan to send a link to the group. Quebec has the 17 standards posted for comments. Si-Truc Phan will send that link to the RSC. Twelve of the standards have already been adopted. David Ramkalawan asked if Quebec conforms to the NERC Standards? Si-Truc Phan replied yes, but it is voluntary. The BES is called the MTS (Main Transmission System) in Quebec. David Ramkalawan asked why MTS

RSC April 2013 Meeting Item 2.1

and not BES? Si-Truc Phan replied that Quebec has always followed NPCC's A-10 Criteria. With the new BES, don't want to apply protection requirements down to 100kV equipment. Regie to come to a decision. Until then, everything is voluntary.

On Feb. 20 the question regarding RAPA reports was raised (see p. 16 of these Minutes). Mike Jones sent a 2013 Protection System Operations document to Lee Pedowicz. It was made available to the assembled, and discussed. Ben Eng responded via E-mail that it is not compliance related. Ron Falsetti commented that a mixed message is being sent as to what should be reported. David Kiguel said that reports are being done with CDAA. But forms can be used. David Ramkalawan asked if the annual report of misoperations is mandatory, and David Kiguel said yes it is. David Ramkalawan then asked if the quarterly reports are voluntary? David Kiguel said yes, for anything above 100kV. David Ramkalawan said that there is a market rule in Ontario that says data can be requested (mandatory), not voluntary.

13. Future NPCC Meetings

RSC 2013/14 Meeting Dates

April 10-11, 2013 NPCC Offices, New York
June 19- 20, 2013 Saratoga, New York
August 21-22, 2013 Toronto
Oct. 9-10, 2013 Montreal
Dec. 5-6, 2013 (General Meeting Dec. 4, 2013)

RSC April 2013 Meeting Item 2.1

Boston, Mass.
Feb. 19-20, 2014
NextEra Energy Offices
Juno Beach, Florida

Item 13--David Kiguel said that the August Meeting will be in Hydro-One's Offices on Bay Street. David Kiguel is getting a list of hotels, and will send that to Guy Zito and Lee Pedowicz. Wireless access at that location is given on an individual basis. Anyone interested in getting wireless access has to send David Kiguel their names and affiliations. RSC members planning to attend must send Lee Pedowicz this information. Lee Pedowicz needs this information one month prior to the meeting. Si-Truc Phan said that the October Meeting to be held at the SpringHill Suites.

2013 RSC Conference Call Schedule
(call 719-785-1707, Guest Code 8287#)

March 6, 2013	March 22, 2013
April 5, 2013	April 26, 2013
May 10, 2013	May 24, 2013
June 7, 2013	July 5, 2013
July 19, 2013	August 2, 2013
August 16, 2013	September 6, 2013
September 20, 2013	October 4, 2013
October 25, 2013	November 8, 2013
November 22, 2013	December 20, 2013

BOD 2013 Meeting Dates

March 12, 2013 –BES Implementation Teleconference
April 30, 2013 – Teleconference
June 25, 2013
August 6, 2013 – Teleconference
September 10, 2013
October 29, 2013 – Teleconference
December 4, 2013

RCC, CC, and Task Force Meeting Dates--2013

RCC	Feb. 27, <u>June 5, September 11, December 3</u>
CC	
TFSS	<u>March 19-20, May 22-23, July 24-25, September 25-26, November 13-14</u>
TFCP	<u>May 8, August 14, November 6</u>
TFCO	March 20-21, May 15-16, August 28-29, Oct. 17-18, Dec. 5-6
TFIST	<u>May 28-29, September 12-13</u>
TFSP	March 26-28, May 14-16, July 23-25, Sept. 17-19, Nov. 19-21

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, Not Bold

Respectfully Submitted,

Guy V. Zito, Chair RSC
Assistant Vice President-Standards
Northeast Power Coordinating Council Inc.

Meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.
Meeting adjourned at 10:04 a.m.

Northeast Power Coordinating Council, Inc. (NPCC)

Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

It is NPCC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. The antitrust laws make it important that meeting participants avoid discussion of topics that could result in charges of anti-competitive

behavior, including: restraint of trade and conspiracies to monopolize, unfair or deceptive business acts or practices, price discrimination, division of markets, allocation of production, imposition of boycotts, exclusive dealing arrangements, and any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition.

It is the responsibility of every NPCC participant and employee who may in any way affect NPCC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

Participants in NPCC activities (including those participating in its committees, task forces and subgroups) should refrain from discussing the following throughout any meeting or during any breaks (including NPCC meetings, conference calls and informal discussions):

- Industry-related topics considered sensitive or market intelligence in nature that are outside of their committee's scope or assignment, or the published agenda for the meeting;
- Their company's prices for products or services, or prices charged by their competitors;
- Costs, discounts, terms of sale, profit margins or anything else that might affect prices;
- The resale prices their customers should charge for products they sell them;
- Allocating markets, customers, territories or products with their competitors;
- Limiting production;
- Whether or not to deal with any company; and
- Any competitively sensitive information concerning their company or a competitor.

Any decisions or actions by NPCC as a result of such meetings will only be taken in the interest of promoting and maintaining the reliability and adequacy of the bulk power system.

Any NPCC meeting participant or employee who is uncertain about the legal ramifications of a particular course of conduct or who has doubts or concerns about whether NPCC's antitrust compliance policy is implicated in any situation should call NPCC's Secretary, Andrienne S. Payson at 212-335-4765.