



## **RELIABILITY FIRST**

**Planning Resource Adequacy Analysis, Assessment and Documentation (PRAA)  
SDT Conference Call/WebEx Agenda  
Thursday October 20, 2016 11:00 – 12:00 ET (10:00-11:00 CT)**

[Join WebEx meeting](#)

Meeting number (access code): 738 850 387

Meeting password: 102016

Join by phone

**1-855-244-8681** Call-in toll-free number (US/Canada)

**1-650-479-3207** Call-in toll number (US/Canada)

- 1. Welcome and Attendance**
- 2. Review Anti-Trust statement**
  - RF Antitrust Statement.pdf
- 3. Approve August 17, 2016 Draft Notes**
  - PRAA\_SDT\_081716\_Notes.doc
- 4. Review and Respond to BAL-502-RF-03 1<sup>st</sup> Comment Posting Period Comments**
  - BAL-502-RF-03\_First\_Comment\_and\_Responses\_102016.doc
- 5. Determine if BAL-502-RF-03 is Ready For Category Ballot**
- 6. Action Items**
- 7. Schedule Upcoming Conference Call**

## **ANTITRUST STATEMENT**

IT IS THE POLICY OF RELIABILITYFIRST TO OBEY THE ANTITRUST LAWS AND TO AVOID ALL CONDUCT THAT UNREASONABLY RESTRAINS COMPETITION. IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH DIRECTOR, MEMBER AND EMPLOYEE OF RELIABILITYFIRST TO ADHERE TO RELIABILITYFIRST'S "ANTITRUST COMPLIANCE GUIDELINES," A COPY OF WHICH IS AVAILABLE ON RELIABILITYFIRST'S WEBSITE.



## RELIABILITY FIRST

**Planning Resource Adequacy Analysis, Assessment and Documentation (PRAA)  
SDT Conference Call/WebEx Notes  
Wednesday August 17, 2016 2:00 – 3:00 ET (1:00-2:00 CT)**

[Join WebEx meeting](#)

Meeting number (access code): 732 703 127

Meeting password: 081716

Join by phone

1-855-244-8681 Call-in toll-free number (US/Canada)

1-650-479-3207 Call-in toll number (US/Canada)

Member	Company
Joe O'Brien	NIPSCO
Jeffery W. Beattie	Consumers Energy
Tom Falin (Chair)	PJM
Jordan Cole (Vice Chair)	MISO
Anthony Jablonski	ReliabilityFirst Staff
Tim Fryfogle	ReliabilityFirst Staff
Paul Kure*	ReliabilityFirst Staff
Susan Morris*	FERC

\* Denotes not in attendance

**1. Welcome and Attendance**

Tony welcomed the SDT and attendance was taken. SDT members introduced themselves.

**2. Review Anti-Trust statement**

➤ RF Antitrust Statement.pdf

Tony reviewed the Anti-Trust statement.

**3. Approve July 29, 2016 Draft Notes**

**Action:** Approve July 29, 2016 Draft Notes

**Motion:** Joe O'Brien

**Second:** Tom Falin

**Outcome:** The SDT unanimously approved July 29, 2016 draft notes.

#### **4. Review Draft Assessment of the Impact Neighboring Regions**

- Draft\_BAL-502-RF-03\_Impact\_on\_Neighboring\_Regions\_080816.doc

The SDT reviewed the draft assessment of the impact neighboring regions document and agreed with the content. Minor editorial changes were made.

#### **5. Review Draft Perceived Reliability Impact**

- Draft\_BAL-502-RF-03\_Perceived\_Reliability\_Impact\_080816.doc

The SDT reviewed draft perceived reliability impact document and agreed with the content.

#### **6. Review Draft Implementation Plan**

- Draft\_BAL-502-RF-03\_Implementation\_Plan\_080816.doc

The SDT reviewed the Implementation Plan and agreed with the content.

#### **7. Review Draft Posting Questions**

- Questions\_for\_1st\_Posting\_BAL-502-RF-03.doc

The SDT reviewed the draft first set of posting questions and agreed to go with the second option Tony had presented.

#### **8. Determine if Draft Standards is Ready for First Comment Posting Period**

- Draft\_BAL-502-RF-03\_Redline\_072916.docx

The SDT performed a final review of the draft BAL-502-RF-03 standard and Tony explained the next steps in the standards drafting process. a question was asked related to capitalized terms within the draft and Tony noted they are FERC approved definitions included in the NERC Glossary of Terms.

**Action:** Approve draft BAL-502-RF-03 standard to move into the first comment posting period

**Motion:** Tom Falin

**Second:** Jeffery W. Beattie

**Outcome:** The SDT unanimously approved the draft BAL-502-RF-03 standard to move into the first comment posting period.

#### **9. Action Items**

- Prepare package for RF Standards Committee (SC) approval - Tony
- Request RF SC approval to move into 1<sup>st</sup> 30-Day comment posting period – Tony
- Following RF SC approval, prepare draft standard for 1<sup>st</sup> 30-Day comment posting period – Tony

#### **10. Schedule Upcoming Conference Call**

TBD

**ReliabilityFirst Planning Resource Adequacy Analysis, Assessment and Documentation (BAL-502-RF-03) 30-Day Comment Period - 09/12/2016 - 10/11/2016**

<b>Question 1</b>	Do you agree with the newly added Time Horizons for each Requirement? If not, please provide specific comments on why you do not agree with the newly designated Time Horizons.
-------------------	---

<b>Consideration of Comments</b>	
----------------------------------	--

<b>Answers</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Yes	1
No	1
Abstain	0

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Scott Cunningham (OVEC)	No	The standard should be retired as it does not address a reliability need. There are adequate market incentives to fill the planning reserve requirement.	<p>It is outside of the Standards Authorization Request (SAR) to determine whether the standards should be retired. During the SAR comment period (conducted 04/01/16 – 05/10/16), all individuals whom provided comments agreed with the scope of the SAR. Furthermore during the “five year review” comment period (conducted 02/29/16 – 03/09/16), all individuals whom provided comments indicated the Standard should be re-affirmed.</p> <p>Also, the BAL-502-RF-03 standards does not require the Planning Coordinator to “fill the planning reserve requirement”, rather it establishes common criteria, based on “one day in ten year” loss of Load expectation principles, for the analysis, assessment and documentation of Resource</p>

			Adequacy for Load in the ReliabilityFirst Corporation region.
Sean Bodkin (Dominion)	Yes		Thank you.

**Question 2** Do you agree with the non-substantive changes made throughout the Standard? If not, please provide specific comments on why you do not agree with the non-substantive changes made throughout the Standard.

**Consideration of Comments**

Answers	Frequency
Yes	2
No	0
Abstain	0

Commenter	Answer	Comment	Response
Scott Cunningham (OVEC)	Yes		Thank you.
Sean Bodkin (Dominion)	Yes		Thank you.

**Question 3** Do you agree that the newly added Requirement R3 is responsive to the Directive noted in FERC Order No 747, to include a requirement requiring the Planning Coordinator to identify any gap between the needed amount of planning reserves defined in Requirement R1.1 and the planning reserves determined from the resource adequacy analysis? If not, please provide specific comments on why you do not agree that the newly added Requirement R3 is responsive to the FERC Directive.

**Consideration of Comments**

Answers	Frequency
Yes	1
No	1
Abstain	0

Commenter	Answer	Comment	Response
Scott Cunningham (OVEC)	No	Even if the PC identifies a gap, there is no requirement in any standard to address the gap. There are market incentives for resource owners to address the planning reserve requirement.	You are correct, if the PC identifies a gap, there is no requirement in any standard to address the gap. NERC's ability to require the building or acquisition of new generating capacity, is prohibited by section 215(a)(3) of the FPA and thus no corresponding requirement is proposed.  Furthermore, the addition of the new requirement R3 was a result of a Directed noted in FERC Order No 747.
Sean Bodkin (Dominion)	Yes		Thank you.

<b>Question 4</b>	Do you agree with the newly included Measure M3? If not, please provide specific comments on why you do not agree with the newly included Measure M3.
-------------------	---

<b>Consideration of Comments</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Answers	Frequency
Yes	1
No	1
Abstain	0

Commenter	Answer	Comment	Response
Scott Cunningham (OVEC)	No	Similar to the above question, the PC may document load and resources, but there is no requirement in the standards to address any gaps.	You are correct, if the PC identifies a gap, there is no requirement in any standard to address the gap. NERC's ability to require the building or acquisition of new generating capacity, is prohibited by section 215(a)(3) of the FPA and thus no corresponding requirement is proposed.

			Furthermore, the addition of the new requirement R3 was a result of a Directed noted in FERC Order No 747.
Sean Bodkin (Dominion)	Yes		Thank you.

<b>Question 5</b>	Do you agree with the newly included Violation Severity Levels (VSLs) for Requirement R3? If not, please provide specific comments on why you do not agree with the newly included VSLs for Requirement R3.
-------------------	---

<b>Consideration of Comments</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Answers	Frequency
Yes	1
No	1
Abstain	0

Commenter	Answer	Comment	Response
Scott Cunningham (OVEC)	No	Given that these standards must function in a market environment, market incentives should address the requirements. If they do not, we should not be fostering a market-driven system.	Thank you for your comment. ???
Sean Bodkin (Dominion)	Yes		Thank you.

<b>Question 6</b>	Do you agree with the BAL-502-RF-03 Implementation Plan? If not, please provide specific comments on why you do not agree with the BAL-502-RF-03 Implementation Plan.
-------------------	---

<b>Consideration of Comments</b>	
----------------------------------	--

Answers	Frequency
---------	-----------



Yes	1
No	1
Abstain	0

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Scott Cunningham (OVEC)	No	See responses to questions 1 and 5.	See responses to questions 1 and 5.
Sean Bodkin (Dominion)	Yes		