



**Southwest Power Pool  
TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**May 17, 2017**

**Hilton at the Ballpark – St. Louis, MO**

**• Summary of Action Items •**

There were no action items.



**Southwest Power Pool**

**TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP AND MODEL DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**May 17, 2017**

**Hilton at the Ballpark – St. Louis, MO**

**• M I N U T E S •**

**Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items**

Call to Order

TWG Chair Travis Hyde called the meeting to order at 8:00 am. The following members were in attendance (Attachment 1a, 1b – In-person Attendance, Webex Attendance) or represented by proxy:

TWG

Travis Hyde (Chair), Oklahoma Gas & Electric  
Daniel Benedict, City of Independence  
Jerry Bradshaw, City Utilities of Springfield  
Richard Dahl, Missouri River Energy Services  
Joe Fultz, Grand River Dam Authority  
John Fulton, Southwestern Public Service Company  
Kalun Kelley, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative  
John Knofczynski, East River Electric Power Cooperative  
Randy Lindstrom, Nebraska Public Power District  
Jim McAvoy, Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority  
Matt McGee, American Electric Power  
Nate Morris, Empire District Electric  
Michael Mueller, Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation  
Alan Myers, ITC Great Plains  
Gayle Nansel, Western Area Power Administration  
Chris Pink, Tri-State G&T  
Jason Shook, GDS Associates representing ETEC  
Dave Spargo, Omaha Public Power District  
Matthew Stoltz, Basin Electric Power Cooperative  
Kurt Stradley, Lincoln Electric System  
Noman Williams, South Central MCN  
Harold Wyble, Kansas City Power & Light

MDWG

Nate Morris (Chair), Empire District Electric  
Jason Bentz, American Electric Power  
Dustin Betz, Nebraska Public Power District  
Jerry Bradshaw, City Utilities of Springfield  
Derek Brown, Westar Energy  
Jerad Ethridge, Oklahoma Gas & Electric  
Joe Fultz, Grand River Dam Authority  
Holli Krizek, Western Area Power Administration  
Jason Shook, GDS Associates representing ETEC  
Liam Stringham, Sunflower Electric Power Corporation  
Scott Schichtl, Arkansas Electric Cooperative Company  
Brian Wilson, Kansas City Power & Light

### Proxies

Four TWG proxies were submitted for the meeting.

- Dave Spargo (OPPD) proxy for Dan Lenihan (OPPD)
- Kurt Stradley (LES) proxy for Scott Benson (LES)
- Jerry Bradshaw (CUS) proxy for John Boshears (CUS)
- Michael Wegner, ITC Great Plains, proxy for Alan Myers, ITC Great Plains

Kirk Hall and Anthony Cook informed their respective chairs both groups had achieved a quorum.

## **Agenda Item 2 – TPI Model Building**

### Model Selection

Anthony Cook, SPP staff, presented the latest draft model set including year and seasons (Attachment 2a – 2018 Series ITP Model Selection) for the 2018 Series ITP Model Build. Anthony discussed the next steps for the staff to take to continue the audit of the models to determine the models that will need to be built after the transition year.

### Tentative Powerflow Model Schedule

Anthony proposed the tentative schedule for the model build (Attachment 2b - Powerflow, Short Circuit, and Dynamics Model Build). Anthony discussed how the models could be built in five passes, when usually there have been eight. It was discussed that members may have different internal schedules for developing their data. There was further discussion regarding each pass of the model build as well as the member's role in submissions.

### Working Group Approvals

Anthony posed a question for the group to decide who should approve what models. The group mostly decided that the MDWG, while keeping TWG and ESWG as ITP process experts, should approve all of the models. There was discussion on the companies that review the models may not be the ones involved with the ITP.

### ECDI vs. Block Dispatch

Zach Bearden, SPP staff, presented and discussed the current dispatch method for the upcoming ITP Assessment (Attachment 2c – ITP Dispatch). Zach also discussed the differences between the methods of PROMOD, TARA, and ECDI. Zack recommended switching to an economic dispatch using PSS@E activity ECDI for the 2019 ITP Assessment and onward. Members asked for more information including dispatch and ACCC results differences prior to making a decision.

**Action Item: Staff to provide generation dispatch and ACCC result comparisons for the previous block dispatch method and the ECDI function for members to review prior to making a decision.**

### Data Submission

This item was skipped.

## **Agenda Item 3 – TPL-001-5 Informal Comment Period**

Jonathan Hayes, SPP staff, hosted concerns regarding outages and the analysis potentially required (Attachments 3a, 3b, and 3c – Unofficial Comment form, Draft for Informal Comment, Implementation Plan). Jonathan requested MDWG comments for the drafting team, including solutions as well as language.

Seeing there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am.



Respectfully Submitted,

Kirk Hall  
Secretary

Anthony Cook  
Secretary



**Southwest Power Pool, Inc.**  
**TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP**  
**MODEL DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP**  
**JOINT MEETING**  
**May 17, 2017**

Hilton at the Ballpark  
 1 South Broadway  
 St Louis, Missouri 63102

**• A G E N D A •**

8:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

- 1. Administrative Items ..... Travis Hyde
  - a. Call to Order
  - b. Introductions
  - c. Proxies
  - d. Agenda Review (**Action Item**)
    - i. Meeting Materials
  
- 2. TPI Model Building
  - a. Model Selection (Action Item) ..... Anthony Cook
  - b. Tentative Powerflow Model Schedule ..... Anthony Cook
  - c. Working Group Approvals ..... Anthony Cook
  - d. ECDI vs. Block ..... Zack Bearden
  - e. Data Submission ..... SPP Staff
  
- 3. TPL-001-5 Informal Comment Period..... Jonathan Hayes
  
- 4. Administrative Items ..... Travis Hyde
  - a. Summary of Action Items
  - b. Adjourn

2018 MDWG				
Year	Season	Power Flow Model	Dynamic Model	Short Circuit Model
2018	Spring	X		
2018	Summer	X		X
2018	Summer Shoulder	X		
2018	Fall	X		
2018	Winter	X		
2019	Light Load	X	X	
2019	Spring	X	X	
2019	Summer	X	X	X
2019	Fall	X		
2019	Winter	X	X	
2020	Light Load	X		
2020	Spring	X		
2020	Summer	X	X	
2020	Fall			
2020	Winter	X		
2021	Annual for Future 1			
2021	Spring			
2021	Light Load			
2021	Summer			
2021	Winter			
2022	Summer (Topology Only)			
2023	Light Load	X	X	
2023	Summer	X	X	X
2023	Summer Shoulder	X		
2023	Winter	X	X	
2024	Annual for Future 1			
2024	Annual for Future 2			
2024	Summer			
2024	Winter			
2024	Light Load			
2028	Light Load			
2028	Summer	X	X	
2028	Winter	X	X	
2029	Annual for Future 1			
2029	Annual for Future 2			
2029	Summer			
2029	Winter			
2029	Light Load			

MDWG: Model Development Working Group  
ERAG MMWG: Eastern Interconnection Reliability Assessment Group  
Multiregional Modeling Working Group

X = MMWG

\*MMWG 2017 Series is based off of 2016 Series rolled up by 1 year

PSS/E Version 33.7  
MOD Version 8.1.0.1

2018 SERIES MDWG						
Year	Season	Power Flow Model	Power Flow Sensitivity	Dynamic Model	Dynamic Sensitivity	Short Circuit Model
2018	Spring	X				
2018	Summer	X				X
2018	Summer Shoulder	X				
2018	Fall	X				
2018	Winter	X				
2019	Light Load	X	X	X	X	
2019	Spring	X		X		
2019	Summer	X	X	X	X	X
2019	Fall	X				
2019	Winter	X		X		
2020	Light Load	X				
2020	Spring	X				
2020	Summer	X		X		X
2020	Fall	X				
2020	Winter	X		X		
2021	Light Load	X		X	X	
2021	Summer	X		X	X	X
2021	Winter	X		X		
2023	Light Load	X		X		
2023	Summer	X	X	X		X
2023	Summer Shoulder	X				
2023	Winter	X		X		
2024	Summer	X		X		X
2024	Winter	X		X		
2024	Light Load					
2028	Summer	X		X		
2028	Winter	X		X		
2029	Summer	X		X		X
2029	Winter	X		X		
2029	Light Load					

28

3

18

4

7

X = MMWG

 No Request

<b>2019 ITP</b>	
<b>Base Reliability</b>	<b>SPP BA</b>
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>

19 12



ID	Task Mode	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Predecessors	Resource Names
1		<b>2019 ITP Powerflow &amp; 2018 MDWG Model Series (Powerflow, Short Circuit, Dynamics) - PSS/E 33.7 - MOD 8.1.0.1</b>	<b>313 days</b>	<b>Mon 6/26/17</b>	<b>Wed 9/5/18</b>		
2		June - Staff/Member Conference Call	1 day	Mon 6/26/17	Mon 6/26/17		
3		July (Pass 0)	19 days	Wed 7/5/17	Mon 7/31/17		
4		Pass 0 - Member and SPP Staff reconciliation/collaboration of Area Summary workbook	14 days	Wed 7/5/17	Mon 7/24/17		
5		Pass 0 - Member Area Summary Workbooks due	0 days	Mon 7/24/17	Mon 7/24/17	4	
6		Pass 0 - Staff/Member Conference Call	1 day	Fri 7/14/17	Fri 7/14/17		
7		Pass 0 - SPP Staff compile Area Summary workbooks	5 days	Tue 7/25/17	Mon 7/31/17	4	
8		Pass 0 - Topology Model (unsolved) & Member Area Summary workbook posted	0 days	Mon 7/31/17	Mon 7/31/17	7	
9		<b>2019 ITP &amp; 2018 MDWG Powerflow/Short Circuit Models</b>	<b>148 days</b>	<b>Tue 8/1/17</b>	<b>Thu 2/22/18</b>		
10		Pass 1	25 days	Tue 8/1/17	Mon 9/4/17		
11		Pass 1 - Member Review Pass 0 Powerflow Model/Powerflow & Short Circuit Data submission	10 days	Tue 8/1/17	Mon 8/14/17	8	
12		Pass 1 - Member Area Summary Workbooks due	0 days	Mon 8/14/17	Mon 8/14/17	11	
13		Pass 1 - SPP Staff/Member Conference Call	1 day	Fri 8/4/17	Fri 8/4/17		
14		Pass 1 - Lock Down MOD	15 days	Tue 8/15/17	Mon 9/4/17	11	
15		Pass 1 - SPP Staff Review of Member Data Submissions	10 days	Tue 8/15/17	Mon 8/28/17	11	
16		Pass 1 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 1 Powerflow Models (Merge with MMWG Current or Prior year)	5 days	Tue 8/29/17	Mon 9/4/17	15	
17		Pass 1 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 1 Powerflow Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Mon 9/4/17	Mon 9/4/17	16	
18		Pass 2	22 days	Tue 9/5/17	Wed 10/4/17		
19		Pass 2 - Member Review Pass 1 Powerflow Models/Powerflow & Short Circuit Data submission	12 days	Tue 9/5/17	Wed 9/20/17	17	
20		Pass 2 - Member Area Summary Workbooks due	0 days	Wed 9/20/17	Wed 9/20/17	19	
21		Pass 2 - Model Update Meeting	3 days	Tue 9/12/17	Thu 9/14/17		
22		Pass 2 - Lock Down MOD	10 days	Thu 9/21/17	Wed 10/4/17	19	
23		Pass 2 - SPP Staff Review of Member Data Submissions	5 days	Thu 9/21/17	Wed 9/27/17	19	
24		Pass 2 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 2 Powerflow Models	5 days	Thu 9/28/17	Wed 10/4/17	23	
25		Pass 2 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 2 Powerflow Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Wed 10/4/17	Wed 10/4/17	24	
26		Pass 3 (Loads & Interchange Locked Down)	30 days	Thu 10/5/17	Wed 11/15/17		
27		Pass 3 - Member Review Pass 2 Powerflow Models/Powerflow & Short Circuit Data submission	10 days	Thu 10/5/17	Wed 10/18/17	25	
28		Pass 3 - Member Area Summary Workbooks due	0 days	Wed 10/18/17	Wed 10/18/17	27	
29		Pass 3 - SPP Staff/Member Conference Call	1 day	Fri 10/13/17	Fri 10/13/17		
30		Pass 3 - Lock Down MOD	20 days	Thu 10/19/17	Wed 11/15/17	27	
31		Pass 3 - SPP Staff Review of Member Data Submissions	10 days	Thu 10/19/17	Wed 11/1/17	27	
32		Pass 3 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 3 Powerflow Models	10 days	Thu 11/2/17	Wed 11/15/17	31	
33		Pass 3 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 3 Powerflow Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Wed 11/15/17	Wed 11/15/17	32	
34		Pass 4	41 days	Thu 11/16/17	Thu 1/11/18		
35		Pass 4 - Member Review Pass 3 Powerflow Models/Powerflow & Short Circuit Data submission	16 days	Thu 11/16/17	Thu 12/7/17	33	
36		Pass 4 - SPP Staff/Member Conference Call	1 day	Fri 12/1/17	Fri 12/1/17		
37		Pass 4 - Lock Down MOD	25 days	Fri 12/8/17	Thu 1/11/18	35	
38		Pass 4 - SPP Staff Review of Member Data Submissions	15 days	Fri 12/8/17	Thu 12/28/17	35	
39		Pass 4 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 4 Powerflow Models	10 days	Fri 12/29/17	Thu 1/11/18	38	
40		Pass 4 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 4 Powerflow Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Thu 1/11/18	Thu 1/11/18	39	
41		Pass 5	30 days	Fri 1/12/18	Thu 2/22/18		
42		Pass 5 - Member Review Pass 4 Powerflow Models/Powerflow & Short Circuit Data submission	10 days	Fri 1/12/18	Thu 1/25/18	40	
43		Pass 5 - SPP Staff/Member Conference Call	1 day	Fri 1/19/18	Fri 1/19/18		
44		Pass 5 - Lock Down MOD	10 days	Fri 1/26/18	Thu 2/8/18	42	
45		Pass 5 - SPP Staff Review of Member Data Submissions	10 days	Fri 1/26/18	Thu 2/8/18	42	
46		Pass 5 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 5 Powerflow Models	10 days	Fri 2/9/18	Thu 2/22/18	45	
47		Pass 5 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 5 (Final) Powerflow Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Thu 2/22/18	Thu 2/22/18	46	
48		<b>2018 MDWG Short Circuit Models</b>	<b>129 days</b>	<b>Tue 9/5/17</b>	<b>Fri 3/2/18</b>		
49		Pass 1	27 days	Tue 9/5/17	Wed 10/11/17		
50		Pass 1 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 1 Short Circuit Models	27 days	Tue 9/5/17	Wed 10/11/17	17	
51		Pass 1 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 1 Short Circuit Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Wed 10/11/17	Wed 10/11/17	50	
52		Pass 2	27 days	Thu 10/12/17	Fri 11/17/17		
53		Pass 2 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 2 Short Circuit Models	27 days	Thu 10/12/17	Fri 11/17/17	51	
54		Pass 2 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 2 Short Circuit Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Fri 11/17/17	Fri 11/17/17	53	
55		Pass 3	45 days	Mon 11/20/17	Fri 1/19/18		
56		Pass 3 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 3 Short Circuit Models	45 days	Mon 11/20/17	Fri 1/19/18	54	
57		Pass 3 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 3 Short Circuit Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Fri 1/19/18	Fri 1/19/18	56	
58		Pass 4 - Final	30 days	Mon 1/22/18	Fri 3/2/18		
59		Pass 4 - SPP Staff Builds Pass 4 Short Circuit Models	30 days	Mon 1/22/18	Fri 3/2/18	57	
60		Pass 4 - SPP Staff Posts Pass 4 (Final) Short Circuit Models/Docucheck Corrections Needs Workbook	0 days	Fri 3/2/18	Fri 3/2/18	59	
61		<b>2019 ITP &amp; 2018 MDWG Powerflow Finalization</b>	<b>5 days</b>	<b>Fri 2/23/18</b>	<b>Thu 3/1/18</b>		
62		Final	5 days	Fri 2/23/18	Thu 3/1/18		
63		Members Review for Finalization of 2019 ITP & 2018 Series MDWG Powerflow Models	5 days	Fri 2/23/18	Thu 3/1/18	47	
64		Finalization - Conference Call Vote	0 days	Thu 3/1/18	Thu 3/1/18	63	
65		<b>2018 MDWG Short Circuit Finalization</b>	<b>5 days</b>	<b>Mon 3/5/18</b>	<b>Fri 3/9/18</b>		

ID	Task Mode	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Predecessors	Resource Names
66		<b>Final</b>	<b>5 days</b>	<b>Mon 3/5/18</b>	<b>Fri 3/9/18</b>		
67		<b>Members Review for Finalization of 2018 Series MDWG Short Circuit Models</b>	5 days	Mon 3/5/18	Fri 3/9/18	60	
68		<b>Finalization - Conference Call Vote</b>	0 days	Fri 3/9/18	Fri 3/9/18	67	
69		<b>2018 MDWG DYNAMICS MODELS</b>	<b>169 days</b>	<b>Fri 1/12/18</b>	<b>Wed 9/5/18</b>		
70		<b>MMWG 2017 Series Dynamic Models</b>	<b>1 day</b>	<b>Fri 1/12/18</b>	<b>Fri 1/12/18</b>		
71		Receive ERAG MMWG SDDB (Dynamics Database)	1 day	Fri 1/12/18	Fri 1/12/18		
72		<b>Initial Data Update</b>	<b>40 days</b>	<b>Mon 1/15/18</b>	<b>Fri 3/9/18</b>		
73		<b>Initial Data Update - Build and Post DYRE Files, Wind Farm Data, and Docureport</b>	<b>2 days</b>	<b>Mon 1/15/18</b>	<b>Tue 1/16/18</b>		
74		Initial Data Update - Build and Post DYRE Files, Wind Farm Data, and Docureport	2 days	Mon 1/15/18	Tue 1/16/18		
75		<b>Initial Data Update - Members Submit Data Updates</b>	<b>38 days</b>	<b>Wed 1/17/18</b>	<b>Fri 3/9/18</b>	<b>74</b>	
76		<b>Initial Data Update - Member Data Due</b>	<b>0 days</b>	<b>Fri 3/9/18</b>	<b>Fri 3/9/18</b>	<b>75</b>	
77		<b>Powerflow Adjustments</b>	<b>20 days</b>	<b>Fri 3/2/18</b>	<b>Thu 3/29/18</b>		
78		Powerflow Updates	10 days	Fri 3/2/18	Thu 3/15/18	64	
79		Wind Farm Topology and GI Updates	10 days	Fri 3/16/18	Thu 3/29/18	78	
80		<b>Dynamic Case Adjustments</b>	<b>37 days</b>	<b>Fri 3/16/18</b>	<b>Mon 5/7/18</b>		
81		Update SDDB (ERAG/MMWG Dynamic Database)	4 days	Fri 3/16/18	Wed 3/21/18	78	
82		Duplicate Models	2 days	Thu 3/22/18	Fri 3/23/18	81	
83		Generator Data Checks	2 days	Mon 3/26/18	Tue 3/27/18	82	
84		SDDB Governor Limits and Small Time Constant Reset	2 days	Wed 3/28/18	Thu 3/29/18	83	
85		WMOD/Generic WTG Checks	2 days	Fri 3/30/18	Mon 4/2/18	84	
86		CONL & GNET Files Updates	4 days	Tue 4/3/18	Fri 4/6/18	85	
87		Post Member Feedback for Dynamic Data & Case Issues	1 day	Mon 4/9/18	Mon 4/9/18	86	
88		<b>Members Submit Data Updates</b>	<b>15 days</b>	<b>Tue 4/10/18</b>	<b>Mon 4/30/18</b>	<b>87</b>	
89		<b>Member Data Due</b>	<b>0 days</b>	<b>Mon 4/30/18</b>	<b>Mon 4/30/18</b>	<b>88</b>	
90		Process SPP Member Updates	5 days	Tue 5/1/18	Mon 5/7/18	89	
91		<b>Dynamic Case Initialization</b>	<b>15 days</b>	<b>Tue 5/8/18</b>	<b>Mon 5/28/18</b>		
92		Case & Dyre File Corrections based on Initialization Messages	15 days	Tue 5/8/18	Mon 5/28/18	90	
93		<b>Build Final Models</b>	<b>35 days</b>	<b>Tue 5/29/18</b>	<b>Mon 7/16/18</b>		
94		20 Second No-fault Test & Case Adjustment	10 days	Tue 5/29/18	Mon 6/11/18	92	
95		60 Second Ring-Down Test & Case Adjustment	10 days	Tue 6/12/18	Mon 6/25/18	94	
96		NERC B&C Faults Test & Case Adjustment	5 days	Tue 6/26/18	Mon 7/2/18	95	
97		Dynamic Case Reduction	10 days	Tue 7/3/18	Mon 7/16/18	96	
98		<b>Dynamic Case Review and Finalization</b>	<b>37 days</b>	<b>Tue 7/17/18</b>	<b>Wed 9/5/18</b>		
99		Post Initial Models	5 days	Tue 7/17/18	Mon 7/23/18	97	
100		<b>Member Review of Initial Models</b>	<b>10 days</b>	<b>Tue 7/24/18</b>	<b>Mon 8/6/18</b>	<b>99</b>	
101		<b>Member Data Due</b>	<b>0 days</b>	<b>Mon 8/6/18</b>	<b>Mon 8/6/18</b>	<b>100</b>	
102		Final Data Update - Build Final Models	10 days	Tue 8/7/18	Mon 8/20/18	101	
103		Post Final Models	1 day	Tue 8/21/18	Tue 8/21/18	102	
104		<b>Member Review for Finalization of Dynamic Models</b>	<b>10 days</b>	<b>Wed 8/22/18</b>	<b>Tue 9/4/18</b>	<b>103</b>	
105		<b>Finalization - Conference Call Vote</b>	<b>1 day</b>	<b>Wed 9/5/18</b>	<b>Wed 9/5/18</b>	<b>104</b>	



HELPING OUR MEMBERS WORK TOGETHER  
TO KEEP THE LIGHTS ON... TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE.

# Dispatch Method for ITP Assessment

# Purpose & Rationale

- **Purpose:**

- To propose a more efficient and accurate dispatch method using already available economic marketplace data; this approach would begin with the 2019 ITP Assessment

- **Rationale:**

- Currently SPP uses the block dispatch method; with the implementation of the BOD-approved TPI Task Force improvements, SPP needs a more efficient and accurate method to accommodate the 12-month cycles we are adopting

# Block Dispatch Method

*Incrementally turning on blocks of power one machine at a time using CSV files*

## Pros:

- Allows for member feedback
- Some companies may prefer a block dispatch

## Cons:

- Priority and blocks determined by member feedback, but low response rates risk data quality
  - 2016 ITPNT – 3 companies updated dispatch (2 in SPP)
  - 2017 ITPNT – 1 company updated dispatch
- Requires extra data records that must be maintained by both SPP and members
  - Roughly 1,000 machines, 60 companies, and 80,000 lines of data
- Difficult to implement uniform distribution of plants with similar units or combined-cycle
- Replicating data is difficult

# Economic Dispatch Method

*Utilizing PSS®E's built in ECDI functionality to economically dispatch generation using heat rates, fuel curves, and priorities*

## Pros:

- Based on empirical data
  - Lost data can be retrieved or replicated
  - Increases accuracy of dispatch
  - Ensures data is updated
- Allows for, but does not require, member feedback
  - Companies can still edit priorities and costs (if desired)
  - Saves time requesting data from member companies
- Reduces amount of data required to implement dispatch
  - 99% reduction in data records to represent same amount of data (80,000 → 1,000 records)
  - Smaller records make data easier to review

# Economic Dispatch Method

## Pros (cont.):

- Members can re-create and test dispatch with PSS®E
- Improved features
  - Combined cycle units can be dispatched simultaneously
  - Spinning reserves can be enforced
  - If areas separate or merge, dispatch can easily be separated or combined

## Cons:

- Less control of dispatch by member companies may lead to results that differ slightly from the past



# Key Issues Addressed

- **Low response rate**
  - Data is updated without requiring participation
  - More entities participated in ECDI feedback than block feedback
- **Tedious data**
  - 80,000 rows to 1,000 rows
- **Data inconsistency**
  - New data based on generator specifications
  - Repeatable
- **Uniform dispatch for combined cycle and similar plants**

# Recommendation

- SPP management and staff recommend switching to an economic dispatch using PSS<sup>®</sup>E activity ECDI for the 2019 ITP Assessment and onward

## Unofficial Comment Form

Project 2015-10 Single Points of Failure  
TPL-001-5

**Do not** use this form for submitting comments. Use the [electronic form](#) to submit comments on **TPL-001-5 – Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements**. The electronic form must be submitted by **8 p.m. Eastern, Wednesday, May 24, 2017**.

Additional information is available on the [project page](#). If you have questions, contact Standards Developer, [Latrice Harkness](#) (via email), or at (404) 446-9728.

### Background Information

The SPCS and the SAMS conducted an assessment of protection system single points of failure in response to FERC [Order No. 754](#), including analysis of data from the NERC Section 1600 Request for Data or Information. The assessment confirms the existence of a reliability risk associated with single points of failure in protection systems that warrants further action.

Additionally, the two directives from FERC [Order No. 786](#) (p. 40 and p. 89) and updates to the MOD reference in Requirement R1, Measure M1 and the Violation Severity Levels sections have been added to the scope of the project.

## Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed changes to Requirement 1, Part 1.1.2 that move away from the 6 month duration outage to limited known outages selected by the Planning Coordinator (PC)/Transmission Planner (TP) in consultation with their Reliability Coordinators (RCs) for the time horizon of the operations planning horizon through the near term planning horizon?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

2. Do you agree with the proposed changes to Requirement 2, Part 2.4.5 which addresses the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) order to add the spare equipment with long lead time to the dynamics analysis?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

3. Do you agree with the further clarification of relay to components of a Protection System with the additional footnote to clarify P5 and extreme events?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

4. Do you agree with the proposed Requirement 4, Part 4.6 additions which require a Corrective Action Plan for this subset of Table 1 extreme events (footnote 13, 2e-2h)?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

5. Do you agree with the drafting team's approach which doesn't add additional applicable entities to the applicability of the standard? (e.g. RC, Transmission Operator (TO), Generator Operator (GO), Distribution Provider (DP))

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

6. Do you agree with the 36 month implementation period to address **All Requirements** except for Requirement R4, Part 4.6, and Requirement 2, Part 2.7 associated with P5 due to Footnote 13 bullets 2, 3 and 4, as well as the definitions?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the 60 month implementation plan for Requirement 4, Part 4.6 and Requirement 2, Part 2.7 associated with P5 due to Footnote 13 bullets 2, 3 and 4?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

8. Are you aware of any other governing documents that could be in conflict with the current proposal for this draft of the standard?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

9. Do you agree with the teams proposed changes to align the VRF/VSLs for Requirement 4, Part 4.6 with the VRF/VSLs for Requirement 2, Part 2.7?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

10. Do you have any other general recommendations/considerations for the drafting team?

- Yes  
 No

Comments:

## Standard Development Timeline

This section is maintained by the drafting team during the development of the standard and will be removed when the standard is adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees (Board).

### Description of Current Draft

**This is the first draft of the proposed standard.**

Completed Actions	Date
Standards Committee approved Standard Authorization Request (SAR) for posting	October 29, 2015
SAR posted for comment	May 26 – June 24, 2016

Anticipated Actions	Date
30-day informal comment period with ballot	April 2017
45-day formal comment period with additional ballot	July 2017
45-day formal comment period with additional ballot	October 2017
10-day final ballot	December 2017
Board adoption	February 2018

## New or Modified Term(s) Used in NERC Reliability Standards

This section includes all new or modified terms used in the proposed standard that will be included in the *Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards* upon applicable regulatory approval. Terms used in the proposed standard that are already defined and are not being modified can be found in the *Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards*. The new or revised terms listed below will be presented for approval with the proposed standard. Upon Board adoption, this section will be removed.

**Term(s):**

~~Text~~ None.

Upon Board adoption, the rationale boxes will be moved to the Supplemental Material Section.

## A. Introduction

1. **Title:** Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements
2. **Number:** TPL-001-45
3. **Purpose:** Establish Transmission system planning performance requirements within the planning horizon to develop a Bulk Electric System (BES) that will operate reliably over a broad spectrum of System conditions and following a wide range of probable Contingencies.
4. **Applicability:**
  - 4.1. **Functional Entity**
    - 4.1.1. Planning Coordinator.
    - 4.1.2. Transmission Planner.
- ~~5. **Effective Date:** See Implementation Plan. Requirements R1 and R7 as well as the definitions shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter, 12 months after applicable regulatory approval. In those jurisdictions where regulatory approval is not required, Requirements R1 and R7 become effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter, 12 months after Board of Trustees adoption or as otherwise made effective pursuant to the laws applicable to such ERO governmental authorities.~~
- ~~6. Except as indicated below, Requirements R2 through R6 and Requirement R8 shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter, 24 months after applicable regulatory approval. In those jurisdictions where regulatory approval is not required, all requirements, except as noted below, go into effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter, 24 months after Board of Trustees adoption or as otherwise made effective pursuant to the laws applicable to such ERO governmental authorities.~~
- ~~7. For 84 calendar months beginning the first day of the first calendar quarter following applicable regulatory approval, or in those jurisdictions where regulatory approval is not required on the first day of the first calendar quarter 84 months after Board of Trustees adoption or as otherwise made effective pursuant to the laws applicable to such ERO governmental authorities, Corrective Action Plans applying to the following categories of Contingencies and events identified in TPL-001-4, Table 1 are allowed to include Non-Consequential Load Loss and curtailment of Firm Transmission Service (in accordance with Requirement R2, Part 2.7.3.) that would not otherwise be permitted by the requirements of TPL-001-4:~~
- ~~8. P1-2 (for controlled interruption of electric supply to local network customers connected to or supplied by the Faulted element)~~



- ~~9. P1-3 (for controlled interruption of electric supply to local network customers connected to or supplied by the Faulted element)~~
- ~~10. P2-1~~
- ~~11. P2-2 (above 300 kV)~~
- ~~12. P2-3 (above 300 kV)~~
- ~~13. P3-1 through P3-5~~
- ~~14. P4-1 through P4-5 (above 300 kV)~~
- ~~15.5. P5 (above 300 kV)~~
- ~~16. Background: Text (DELETE GREEN TEXT PRIOR TO PUBLISHING) This section is to only be used for standards that currently have a background section. Going forward standard drafting teams should avoid using this section.~~
- ~~17. Standard-Only Definition: Text (DELETE GREEN TEXT PRIOR TO PUBLISHING) This section is to only be used for standards that currently have standard only definitions. Going forward a standard must provide a justification as to why the standard needs a standard-only definition and cannot be moved to the NERC Glossary of Terms.~~

## B. Requirements and Measures

### Rationale for Requirement R1:

References to MOD-010 and MOD-012 in Requirement R1 have been replaced with MOD-032, which is now the applicable standard to assemble the network modeling data necessary to meet the TPL-001 requirements. MOD-032-1 superseded MOD-010 and MOD-012, which were retired on 6/30/2016 in the United States.

### Rationale for Requirement R1 Part 1.1.2:

In Order 786, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) directed NERC to “modify Reliability Standard TPL-001-4 to address the concern that the six month threshold could exclude planned maintenance outages of significant facilities from future planning assessments” (P 40). The Commission clarified that its directive is to “include known generator and transmission planned maintenance outages in planning assessments, not hypothetical planned outages” (P 42). FERC stated that NERC had flexibility in addressing the identified concerns and outlined three acceptable approaches, that include:

1. “eliminating the six-month threshold altogether”;
2. “decreasing the threshold to fewer months to include additional significant planned outages”; or
3. “including parameters on what constitutes a significant planned outage based for example on MW or facility ratings.”

See Order No. 786 at P 43.

Order 786 includes the following additional concerns:

- Planned maintenance outages less than six months may result in impacts during peak and off-peak periods (see P 41);
- Planned outages during those times should be considered to allow for a single element to be taken out of service without compromising the ability to meet demand (see P 41);
- Criticality of elements taken out for maintenance could result in N-1 outage and loss of non-consequential load or impact to reliability (see P 41);
- Planned outages are not “hypothetical outages” and should not be treated as multiple contingencies in the planning standard (should be addressed in N-0 base case) (see P 42);
- Relying on Category P3 and P6 is not sufficient and does not cover maintenance outages ( see P 44);
- The Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon requires annual assessments using Year One or year two, and year five, and known planned facility outages of less than six months should be addressed so long as their planned start times and durations may be anticipated as occurring for some period of time during the planning time horizon (see P 45).

The change to Requirement 1 Part 1.1.2 eliminates the specified 6 month outage duration and provides the opportunity for the Reliability Coordinator to assist the Planning Coordinator and/or Transmission Planner to determine which known outages, if any, need to be considered in the Planning Assessment for the Near-Term.

Note: The drafting team points out that this is coordination of known outages beyond the Operations Planning.

**R1.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall maintain System models within its respective area for performing the studies needed to complete its Planning Assessment. The models shall use data consistent with that provided in accordance with the ~~MOD-010 and MOD-012~~MOD-032 -standards, supplemented by other sources as needed, including items represented in the Corrective Action Plan, and shall represent projected System conditions. This establishes Category P0 as the normal System condition in Table 1. *[Violation Risk Factor: High] [Time Horizon: Long-term Planning]*

**1.1.** System models shall represent:

**1.1.1.** Existing Facilities

**1.1.2.** Known outage(s) of generation or Transmission Facility(ies) ~~with a duration of at least six months~~ as selected in consultation with the

Reliability Coordinator for the Near-Term Planning Horizon for analyses pursuant to Requirement R2, parts 2.1.3 and ~~R~~. 2.4.3.

- 1.1.3. New planned Facilities and changes to existing Facilities
- 1.1.4. Real and reactive Load forecasts
- 1.1.5. Known commitments for Firm Transmission Service and Interchange
- 1.1.6. Resources (supply or demand side) required for Load

**M1.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall provide evidence, in electronic or hard copy format, that it is maintaining System models within their respective area, using data consistent with ~~MOD-010 and MOD-012~~, MOD-032 including items represented in the Corrective Action Plan, representing projected System conditions, and that the models represent the required information in accordance with Requirement R1.

**Rationale for Requirement R2 Part 2.4.5:**

In Order No. 786, FERC stated that it believed a stability analysis for spare equipment strategy should exist, similar to the steady state analysis under TPL-001-4 Requirement 2 Part 2.1.5 (see P 89). The SDT modified the standard to add R2.4.5, which includes similar language to that used for the steady-state analysis under R2.1.5.

**R2.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall prepare an annual Planning Assessment of its portion of the BES. This Planning Assessment shall use current or qualified past studies (as indicated in Requirement R2, Part 2.6), document assumptions, and document summarized results of the steady state analyses, short circuit analyses, and Stability analyses. [*Violation Risk Factor: High*] [*Time Horizon: Long-term Planning*]

- 2.1. For the Planning Assessment, the Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon portion of the steady state analysis shall be assessed annually and be supported by current annual studies or qualified past studies as indicated in Requirement R2, Part 2.6. Qualifying studies need to include the following conditions:
  - 2.1.1. System peak Load for either Year One or year two, and for year five.
  - 2.1.2. System Off-Peak Load for one of the five years.
  - 2.1.3. P1 events in Table 1, as selected in consultation with the as directed Reliability Coordinator, with ~~the~~ known outages modeled as specified in Requirement R1, Part 1.1.2, under those System peak or Off-Peak conditions when known outages are scheduled.
  - 2.1.4. For each of the studies described in Requirement R2, Parts 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, sensitivity case(s) shall be utilized to demonstrate the impact of changes to the basic assumptions used in the model. To accomplish

this, the sensitivity analysis in the Planning Assessment must vary one or more of the following conditions by a sufficient amount to stress the System within a range of credible conditions that demonstrate a measurable change in System response :

- Real and reactive forecasted Load.
- Expected transfers.
- Expected in service dates of new or modified Transmission Facilities.
- Reactive resource capability.
- Generation additions, retirements, or other dispatch scenarios.
- Controllable Loads and Demand Side Management.
- Duration or timing of known Transmission outages.

**2.1.5.** When an entity's spare equipment strategy could result in the unavailability of major Transmission equipment that has a lead time of one year or more (such as a transformer), the impact of this possible unavailability on System performance shall be studied. The studies shall be performed for the P0, P1, and P2 categories identified in Table 1 with the conditions that the System is expected to experience during the possible unavailability of the long lead time equipment.

**2.2.** For the Planning Assessment, the Long-Term Transmission Planning Horizon portion of the steady state analysis shall be assessed annually and be supported by the following annual current study, supplemented with qualified past studies as indicated in Requirement R2, Part 2.6:

**2.2.1.** A current study assessing expected System peak Load conditions for one of the years in the Long-Term Transmission Planning Horizon and the rationale for why that year was selected.

**2.3.** The short circuit analysis portion of the Planning Assessment shall be conducted annually addressing the Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon and can be supported by current or past studies as qualified in Requirement R2, Part 2.6. The analysis shall be used to determine whether circuit breakers have interrupting capability for Faults that they will be expected to interrupt using the System short circuit model with any planned generation and Transmission Facilities in service which could impact the study area.

**2.4.** For the Planning Assessment, the Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon portion of the Stability analysis shall be assessed annually and be supported by current or past studies as qualified in Requirement R2, Part 2.6. The following studies are required:

**2.4.1.** System peak Load for one of the five years. System peak Load levels shall include a Load model which represents the expected dynamic behavior of Loads that could impact the study area, considering the behavior of induction motor Loads. An aggregate System Load model which represents the overall dynamic behavior of the Load is acceptable.

**2.4.2.** System Off-Peak Load for one of the five years.

**2.4.3.** P1 events in Table 1, with known outages modeled as in Requirement R1, Part 1.1.2, under those System peak or Off-Peak conditions when known outages are scheduled.

**2.4.3.2.4.4.** For each of the studies described in Requirement R2, Parts 2.4.1 and 2.4.2, sensitivity case(s) shall be utilized to demonstrate the impact of changes to the basic assumptions used in the model. To accomplish this, the sensitivity analysis in the Planning Assessment must vary one or more of the following conditions by a sufficient amount to stress the System within a range of credible conditions that demonstrate a measurable change in performance:

- Load level, Load forecast, or dynamic Load model assumptions.
- Expected transfers.
- Expected in service dates of new or modified Transmission Facilities.
- Reactive resource capability.
- Generation additions.

**2.4.5.** When an entity's spare equipment strategy could result in the unavailability of major Transmission equipment that has a lead time of one year or more (such as a transformer), the impact of this possible unavailability on System performance shall be studied. The studies shall be performed for the P1 and P2 categories identified in Table 1 with the conditions that the System is expected to experience during the possible unavailability of the long lead time equipment.

**2.5.** For the Planning Assessment, the Long-Term Transmission Planning Horizon portion of the Stability analysis shall be assessed to address the impact of proposed material generation additions or changes in that timeframe and be supported by current or past studies as qualified in Requirement R2, Part 2.6 and shall include documentation to support the technical rationale for determining material changes.

**2.6.** Past studies may be used to support the Planning Assessment if they meet the following requirements:

- 2.6.1.** For steady state, short circuit, or Stability analysis: the study shall be five calendar years old or less, unless a technical rationale can be provided to demonstrate that the results of an older study are still valid.
- 2.6.2.** For steady state, short circuit, or Stability analysis: no material changes have occurred to the System represented in the study. Documentation to support the technical rationale for determining material changes shall be included.
- 2.7.** For planning events shown in Table 1, when the analysis indicates an inability of the System to meet the performance requirements in Table 1, the Planning Assessment shall include Corrective Action Plan(s) addressing how the performance requirements will be met. Revisions to the Corrective Action Plan(s) are allowed in subsequent Planning Assessments but the planned System shall continue to meet the performance requirements in Table 1. Corrective Action Plan(s) do not need to be developed solely to meet the performance requirements for a single sensitivity case analyzed in accordance with Requirements R2, Parts 2.1.4 and 2.4.3. The Corrective Action Plan(s) shall:
- 2.7.1.** List System deficiencies and the associated actions needed to achieve required System performance. Examples of such actions include:
- Installation, modification, retirement, or removal of Transmission and generation Facilities and any associated equipment.
  - Installation, modification, or removal of Protection Systems or Special Protection Systems
  - Installation or modification of automatic generation tripping as a response to a single or multiple Contingency to mitigate Stability performance violations.
  - Installation or modification of manual and automatic generation runback/tripping as a response to a single or multiple Contingency to mitigate steady state performance violations.
  - Use of Operating Procedures specifying how long they will be needed as part of the Corrective Action Plan.
  - Use of rate applications, DSM, new technologies, or other initiatives.
- 2.7.2.** Include actions to resolve performance deficiencies identified in multiple sensitivity studies or provide a rationale for why actions were not necessary.
- 2.7.3.** If situations arise that are beyond the control of the Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator that prevent the implementation of a Corrective Action Plan in the required timeframe, then the

Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator is permitted to utilize Non-Consequential Load Loss and curtailment of Firm Transmission Service to correct the situation that would normally not be permitted in Table 1, provided that the Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator documents that they are taking actions to resolve the situation. The Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator shall document the situation causing the problem, alternatives evaluated, and the use of Non-Consequential Load Loss or curtailment of Firm Transmission Service.

- 2.7.4.** Be reviewed in subsequent annual Planning Assessments for continued validity and implementation status of identified System Facilities and Operating Procedures.
- 2.8.** For short circuit analysis, if the short circuit current interrupting duty on circuit breakers determined in Requirement R2, Part 2.3 exceeds their Equipment Rating, the Planning Assessment shall include a Corrective Action Plan to address the Equipment Rating violations. The Corrective Action Plan shall:
  - 2.8.1.** List System deficiencies and the associated actions needed to achieve required System performance.
  - 2.8.2.** Be reviewed in subsequent annual Planning Assessments for continued validity and implementation status of identified System Facilities and Operating Procedures.
- M2.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall provide dated evidence, such as electronic or hard copies of its annual Planning Assessment, that it has prepared an annual Planning Assessment of its portion of the BES in accordance with Requirement R2.
- R3.** For the steady state portion of the Planning Assessment, each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall perform studies for the Near-Term and Long-Term Transmission Planning Horizons in Requirement R2, Parts 2.1, and 2.2. The studies shall be based on computer simulation models using data provided in Requirement R1. *[Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Long-term Planning]*
  - 3.1.** Studies shall be performed for planning events to determine whether the BES meets the performance requirements in Table 1 based on the Contingency list created in Requirement R3, Part 3.4.
  - 3.2.** Studies shall be performed to assess the impact of the extreme events which are identified by the list created in Requirement R3, Part 3.5.
  - 3.3.** Contingency analyses for Requirement R3, Parts 3.1 & 3.2 shall:

- 3.3.1.** Simulate the removal of all elements that the Protection System and other automatic controls are expected to disconnect for each Contingency without operator intervention. The analyses shall include the impact of subsequent:

    - 3.3.1.1.** Tripping of generators where simulations show generator bus voltages or high side of the generation step up (GSU) voltages are less than known or assumed minimum generator steady state or ride through voltage limitations. Include in the assessment any assumptions made.
    - 3.3.1.2.** Tripping of Transmission elements where relay loadability limits are exceeded.
  - 3.3.2.** Simulate the expected automatic operation of existing and planned devices designed to provide steady state control of electrical system quantities when such devices impact the study area. These devices may include equipment such as phase-shifting transformers, load tap changing transformers, and switched capacitors and inductors.
  - 3.4.** Those planning events in Table 1, that are expected to produce more severe System impacts on its portion of the BES, shall be identified and a list of those Contingencies to be evaluated for System performance in Requirement R3, Part 3.1 created. The rationale for those Contingencies selected for evaluation shall be available as supporting information.

    - 3.4.1.** The Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner shall coordinate with adjacent Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners to ensure that Contingencies on adjacent Systems which may impact their Systems are included in the Contingency list.
  - 3.5.** Those extreme events in Table 1 that are expected to produce more severe System impacts shall be identified and a list created of those events to be evaluated in Requirement R3, Part 3.2. The rationale for those Contingencies selected for evaluation shall be available as supporting information. If the analysis concludes there is Cascading caused by the occurrence of extreme events, an evaluation of possible actions designed to reduce the likelihood or mitigate the consequences and adverse impacts of the event(s) shall be conducted.
- M3.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall provide dated evidence, such as electronic or hard copies of the studies utilized in preparing the Planning Assessment, in accordance with Requirement R3.

**Rationale for Requirement R4 Part 4.6:**

The SPF of a non-redundant Protection System component is a relevant reliability concern for the electrical utility industry and have been identified as the cause of significant system disturbances in past years. (*See Industry Advisory-Protection System Single Point*



*of Failure, Informational Filing of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation in Response to Order No. 754, Assessment of Protection System Single Points of Failure Based on the Section 1600 Data Request*). The changes herein clearly establish the TPL-001 standard as requiring corrective actions for Planning Events for which a single point of failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System, as described by footnote 13. The drafting team took into consideration the recent history of attention given to single point of failure and the tradeoffs with incorporating the 3 $\emptyset$  fault with failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing into the existing P5 or similar, Table 1 event. Consistent with the concerns expressed in FERC Order No. 754, the drafting team decided to maintain the 3 $\emptyset$  fault event in the extreme event section of Table 1, while incorporating a specific Requirement R4 Part 4.6 to develop Corrective Action Plan when analysis concludes that Cascading is caused. By featuring the extreme events 2e-2h listed from the stability column of Table 1 in Requirement 4 Part 4.6, this highlights the single point of failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing as having higher risk than other extreme events, but only demanding corrective action if observed to cause Cascading. This is a reasonable balance of likelihood of the event and its consequences. In this way, the drafting team intends for the extreme events 2e-2h listed from the stability column of Table 1 that cause Cascading to require correction, most likely through Protection System modifications, not simply be evaluated for possible actions designed to reduce the likelihood or mitigate the consequences of the extreme event, in accordance with Requirement R4 Part 4.5.

A planner is permitted to use engineering judgment to select the Protection System component failures for evaluation that would produce the more severe system results or impact, and the evaluation would address all Protection Systems affected by the selected component. A Protection System component failure that impacts one or more Protection Systems and increases the total fault clearing time requires a planner to simulate the full impact (clearing time and facilities removed) on Bulk Electric System performance.

- R4.** For the Stability portion of the Planning Assessment, as described in Requirement R2, Parts 2.4 and 2.5, each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall perform the Contingency analyses listed in Table 1. The studies shall be based on computer simulation models using data provided in Requirement R1. *[Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Long-term Planning]*
- 4.1.** Studies shall be performed for planning events to determine whether the BES meets the performance requirements in Table 1 based on the Contingency list created in Requirement R4, Part 4.4.
- 4.1.1.** For planning event P1: No generating unit shall pull out of synchronism. A generator being disconnected from the System by fault clearing action or by a Special Protection System is not considered pulling out of synchronism.



ensure that Contingencies on adjacent Systems which may impact their Systems are included in the Contingency list.

- 4.5.** Those extreme events in Table 1 that are expected to produce more severe System impacts shall be identified and a list created of those events to be evaluated in Requirement R4, Part 4.2. The rationale for those Contingencies selected for evaluation shall be available as supporting information. If the analysis concludes there is Cascading caused by the occurrence of extreme events, an evaluation of possible actions designed to reduce the likelihood or mitigate the consequences of the event(s) shall be conducted.
- 4.6.** If the analysis concludes there is Cascading caused by the occurrence of Table 1 extreme events listed in the stability column for events 2e-2h, a Corrective Action Plan shall be developed. The Corrective Action Plan shall:
- 4.6.1.** List System deficiencies and the associated actions needed to prevent the System from Cascading.
- 4.6.2.** Be reviewed in subsequent annual Planning Assessments for continued validity and implementation status of identified System Facilities and Operating Procedures.
- M4.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall provide dated evidence, such as electronic or hard copies of the studies utilized in preparing the Planning Assessment in accordance with Requirement R4.
- R5.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall have criteria for acceptable System steady state voltage limits, post-Contingency voltage deviations, and the transient voltage response for its System. For transient voltage response, the criteria shall at a minimum, specify a low voltage level and a maximum length of time that transient voltages may remain below that level. *[Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Long-term Planning]*
- M5.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall provide dated evidence such as electronic or hard copies of the documentation specifying the criteria for acceptable System steady state voltage limits, post-Contingency voltage deviations, and the transient voltage response for its System in accordance with Requirement R5.
- R6.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall define and document, within their Planning Assessment, the criteria or methodology used in the analysis to identify System instability for conditions such as Cascading, voltage instability, or uncontrolled islanding. *[Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Long-term Planning]*
- M6.** Each Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall provide dated evidence, such as electronic or hard copies of documentation specifying the criteria or methodology used in the analysis to identify System instability for conditions such as

Cascading, voltage instability, or uncontrolled islanding that was utilized in preparing the Planning Assessment in accordance with Requirement R6.

- R7.** Each Planning Coordinator, in conjunction with each of its Transmission Planners, shall determine and identify each entity's individual and joint responsibilities for performing the required studies for the Planning Assessment. [*Violation Risk Factor: Low*] [*Time Horizon: Long-term Planning*]
- M7.** Each Planning Coordinator, in conjunction with each of its Transmission Planners, shall provide dated documentation on roles and responsibilities, such as meeting minutes, agreements, and e-mail correspondence that identifies that agreement has been reached on individual and joint responsibilities for performing the required studies and Assessments in accordance with Requirement R7.
- R8.** Each Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner shall distribute its Planning Assessment results to adjacent Planning Coordinators and adjacent Transmission Planners within 90 calendar days of completing its Planning Assessment, and to any functional entity that has a reliability related need and submits a written request for the information within 30 days of such a request. [*Violation Risk Factor: Medium*] [*Time Horizon: Long-term Planning*]
  - 8.1.** If a recipient of the Planning Assessment results provides documented comments on the results, the respective Planning Coordinator or Transmission Planner shall provide a documented response to that recipient within 90 calendar days of receipt of those comments.
- M8.** Each Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner shall provide evidence, such as email notices, documentation of updated web pages, postal receipts showing recipient and date; or a demonstration of a public posting, that it has distributed its Planning Assessment results to adjacent Planning Coordinators and adjacent Transmission Planners within 90 days of having completed its Planning Assessment, and to any functional entity who has indicated a reliability need within 30 days of a written request and that the Planning Coordinator or Transmission Planner has provided a documented response to comments received on Planning Assessment results within 90 calendar days of receipt of those comments in accordance with Requirement R8.

## C. Compliance

### 1. Compliance Monitoring Process

#### ~~17.1.1.1.~~ **Compliance Enforcement Authority:**

##### ~~Compliance Enforcement Authority:~~

“Compliance Enforcement Authority” means NERC or the Regional Entity, or any entity as otherwise designated by an Applicable Governmental Authority, in their respective roles of monitoring and/or enforcing compliance with mandatory and enforceable Reliability Standards in their respective jurisdictions.

#### ~~17.2.1.2.~~ **Evidence Retention:**

The following evidence retention period(s) identify the period of time an entity is required to retain specific evidence to demonstrate compliance. For instances where the evidence retention period specified below is shorter than the time since the last audit, the Compliance Enforcement Authority may ask an entity to provide other evidence to show that it was compliant for the full-time period since the last audit.

The applicable entity shall keep data identified in Measures M1 through M7 or evidence to show compliance as identified below unless directed by its Compliance Enforcement Authority to retain specific evidence for a longer period of time as part of an investigation.

- Each Responsible Entity shall retain evidence of each requirement in this standard for three calendar years.

#### ~~17.3.1.3.~~ **Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program**

As defined in the NERC Rules of Procedure, “Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program” refers to the identification of the processes that will be used to evaluate data or information for the purpose of assessing performance or outcomes with the associated Reliability Standard.

~~17.4.~~

~~17.5.~~

#### ~~17.6.1.4.~~ ~~1.2~~ **Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Timeframe:**

Not applicable.

~~17.7.~~

#### ~~17.8.1.5.~~ **Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Processes:**

Compliance Audits

Self-Certifications

Spot Checking

Compliance Violation Investigations

Self-Reporting

Complaints

**17.9. Data Retention:**

~~The Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator shall each retain data or evidence to show compliance as identified unless directed by its Compliance Enforcement Authority to retain specific evidence for a longer period of time as part of an investigation:~~

- ~~• The models utilized in the current in force Planning Assessment and one previous Planning Assessment in accordance with Requirement R1 and Measure M1.~~
- ~~• The Planning Assessments performed since the last compliance audit in accordance with Requirement R2 and Measure M2.~~
- ~~• The studies performed in support of its Planning Assessments since the last compliance audit in accordance with Requirement R3 and Measure M3.~~
- ~~• The studies performed in support of its Planning Assessments since the last compliance audit in accordance with Requirement R4 and Measure M4.~~
- ~~• The documentation specifying the criteria for acceptable System steady state voltage limits, post-Contingency voltage deviations, and transient voltage response since the last compliance audit in accordance with Requirement R5 and Measure M5.~~
- ~~• The documentation specifying the criteria or methodology utilized in the analysis to identify System instability for conditions such as Cascading, voltage instability, or uncontrolled islanding in support of its Planning Assessments since the last compliance audit in accordance with Requirement R6 and Measure M6.~~
- ~~• The current, in force documentation for the agreement(s) on roles and responsibilities, as well as documentation for the agreements in force since the last compliance audit, in accordance with Requirement R7 and Measure M7.~~

~~— The Planning Coordinator shall retain data or evidence to show compliance as identified unless directed by its Compliance Enforcement Authority to retain specific evidence for a longer period of time as part of an investigation:~~

- ~~• Three calendar years of the notifications employed in accordance with Requirement R8 and Measure M8.~~
- ~~• If a Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator is found non-compliant, it shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant or the time periods specified above, whichever is longer.~~

**17.10.1.6. Additional Compliance Information:**

None

## Violation Severity Levels

R #	Violation Severity Levels			
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
<b>R1.</b>	The responsible entity's System model failed to represent one of the Requirement R1, Parts 1.1.1 through 1.1.6.	The responsible entity's System model failed to represent two of the Requirement R1, Parts 1.1.1 through 1.1.6.	The responsible entity's System model failed to represent three of the Requirement R1, Parts 1.1.1 through 1.1.6.	<p>The responsible entity's System model failed to represent four or more of the Requirement R1, Parts 1.1.1 through 1.1.6.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity's System model did not represent projected System conditions as described in Requirement R1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity's System model did not use data consistent with that provided in accordance with the <del>MOD-010 and MOD-012</del> <u>MOD-032</u> standards and other sources, including items represented in the Corrective Action Plan.</p>



<p><b>R2.</b></p>	<p>The responsible entity failed to comply with Requirement R2, Part 2.6.</p>	<p>The responsible entity failed to comply with Requirement R2, Part 2.3 or Part 2.8.</p>	<p>The responsible entity failed to comply with one of the following Parts of Requirement R2: Part 2.1, Part 2.2, Part 2.4, Part 2.5, or Part 2.7.</p>	<p>The responsible entity failed to comply with two or more of the following Parts of Requirement R2: Part 2.1, Part 2.2, Part 2.4, or Part 2.7.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity does not have a completed annual Planning Assessment.</p>
<p><b>R3.</b></p>	<p>The responsible entity did not identify planning events as described in Requirement R3, Part 3.4 or extreme events as described in Requirement R3, Part 3.5.</p>	<p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R3, Part 3.1 to determine that the BES meets the performance requirements for one of the categories (P2 through P7) in Table 1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R3, Part 3.2 to assess the impact of extreme events.</p>	<p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R3, Part 3.1 to determine that the BES meets the performance requirements for two of the categories (P2 through P7) in Table 1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity did not perform Contingency analysis as described in Requirement R3, Part 3.3.</p>	<p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R3, Part 3.1 to determine that the BES meets the performance requirements for three or more of the categories (P2 through P7) in Table 1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity did not perform studies to determine that the BES meets the performance requirements for the P0 or P1 categories in Table 1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity did not base its studies on</p>

				computer simulation models using data provided in Requirement R1.
<b>R4.</b>	The responsible entity did not identify planning events as described in Requirement R4, Part 4.4 or extreme events as described in Requirement R4, Part 4.5.	<p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R4, Part 4.1 to determine that the BES meets the performance requirements for one of the categories (P1 through P7) in Table 1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R4, Part 4.2 to assess the impact of extreme events.</p>	<p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R4, Part 4.1 to determine that the BES meets the performance requirements for two of the categories (P1 through P7) in Table 1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity did not perform Contingency analysis as described in Requirement R4, Part 4.3.</p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>The responsible entity did not develop a Corrective Action Plan as described in Requirement R4, Part 4.6.</u></p>	<p>The responsible entity did not perform studies as specified in Requirement R4, Part 4.1 to determine that the BES meets the performance requirements for three or more of the categories (P1 through P7) in Table 1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity did not base its studies on computer simulation models using data provided in Requirement R1.</p>
<b>R5.</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	The responsible entity does not have criteria for acceptable System steady state voltage limits, post-Contingency voltage deviations, or the transient

				voltage response for its System.
<b>R6.</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	The responsible entity failed to define and document the criteria or methodology for System instability used within its analysis as described in Requirement R6.
<b>R7.</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Planning Coordinator, in conjunction with each of its Transmission Planners, failed to determine and identify individual or joint responsibilities for performing required studies.

## D. Regional Variances

None.

## E. Associated Documents

Link to the Implementation Plan and other important associated documents. **(DELETE GREEN TEXT PRIOR TO PUBLISHING) A link should be added to the implementation plan and other important documents associated with the standard once finalized.**

**Rationale for Table 1 P5 Event and Footnote 13:**

The revisions to Table 1 Category P5 event require an entity to model a single point of failure of a non-redundant Protection System component that may prevent correct operation of a Protection System, including other Protection Systems impacted by that failed component based on the as-built design of that Protection System. The evaluation shall address all Protection Systems affected by the failed component and the increases (if any) of the total fault clearing time. Footnote 13 provides the attributes of the specific system component failure that the entity shall consider for evaluation.

Changes to the Table 1 P5 event and related footnote 13 are driven by subsequent results of an assessment of Protection System single points of failure in response to FERC Order No. 754. In paragraph 19 of Order No. 754, FERC stated that there is “an issue concerning the study of the non-operation of non-redundant primary Protection Systems; e.g., the study of a single point of failure on Protection Systems.” NERC subsequently issued a NERC Section 1600 Request for Data or Information, the results of which were analyzed by the System Protection and Control Subcommittee (SPCS) and the System Modeling and Analysis Subcommittee (SAMS). In their 2015 report “*Assessment of Protection System Single Points of Failure Based on the Section 1600 Data Request*,” the SPCS and SAMS considered a variety of alternatives to address the reliability risk posed by single points of failure. SPCS and SAMS concluded that the most appropriate recommendation aligning with Order No. 754 directives and maximizing reliability of Protection System performance included modifying NERC Reliability Standard TPL-001-4 (Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements) through the NERC standards development process.

The SPCS/SAMS report made the recommendations to replace “relay” with “component of a Protection System” in the Table 1 P5 event and replace footnote 13 in TPL-001-4 with alternate wording: “The components from the definition of Protection System for the purposes of this standard include (1) protective relays that respond to electrical quantities, (2) single station DC supply that is not monitored for both low voltage and open circuit, with alarms centrally monitored (i.e., reported within 24 hours of detecting an abnormal condition to a location where corrective action can be initiated), and (3) DC control circuitry associated with protective functions through the trip coil(s) of the circuit breakers or other interrupting devices.”

This revision to footnote 13 clarifies the components of the Protection System that must be considered when simulating delayed fault clearing due to the failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System. The SPCS/SAMS report described voltage or current sensing devices as having a lower level of risk of failure to trip due to robustness and likelihood to actually cause tripping upon failure. Therefore, these components of a Protection System are omitted from footnote 13.

The drafting team sought to limit the scope of protective relays which respond to electrical quantities that may be considered non-redundant components of a Protection System that may experience a single point of failure to those relays that are used for primary protection at the local terminal and applied over the element in question. As typical Protection System designs implement backup protective relaying locally and remotely, the drafting team did not include backup protective relays or overlapping zonal protection as components of a Protection System specified in footnote 13.

Given the increasing importance of communication-aided Protection Systems (e.g., pilot protection schemes, direct transfer tripping schemes, permissive transfer tripping schemes, etc.), the proper operation of the communication system must be considered when considering potential SPF components of Protection Systems. The drafting team augmented the SAMS/SPCS recommendations to include reference to the subset of communication systems that are part of a communication-aided Protection System, necessary where the performance of that Protection System is required to achieve Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements, enumerated in Table 1 of TPL-

001-5. In other words, a communication-aided Protection System that may experience a SPF, causing it to operate improperly or not at all, must be considered as part of non-redundancy. The drafting team concluded that the failure of communication-aided Protection Systems may take many forms; however, by alarming and monitoring these systems, the overall risk of impact to the Bulk Electric System is reduced to an acceptable level. Most new Protection Systems deployed in the industry include communication-aided protection with component and communication failure alarms monitored at centralized Control Centers. This alarm monitoring is similar to the requirement associated with station DC supplies. Therefore, this requirement is more applicable to legacy systems that need communication-aided Protection Systems to meet performance requirements of the TPL-001-5 standard.

**Table 1 – Steady State & Stability Performance Planning Events**

**Steady State & Stability:**

- a. The System shall remain stable. Cascading and uncontrolled islanding shall not occur.
- b. Consequential Load Loss as well as generation loss is acceptable as a consequence of any event excluding P0.
- c. Simulate the removal of all elements that Protection Systems and other controls are expected to automatically disconnect for each event.
- d. Simulate Normal Clearing unless otherwise specified.
- e. Planned System adjustments such as Transmission configuration changes and re-dispatch of generation are allowed if such adjustments are executable within the time duration applicable to the Facility Ratings.

**Steady State Only:**

- f. Applicable Facility Ratings shall not be exceeded.
- g. System steady state voltages and post-Contingency voltage deviations shall be within acceptable limits as established by the Planning Coordinator and the Transmission Planner.
- h. Planning event P0 is applicable to steady state only.

- i. The response of voltage sensitive Load that is disconnected from the System by end-user equipment associated with an event shall not be used to meet steady state performance requirements.

**Stability Only:**

- j. Transient voltage response shall be within acceptable limits established by the Planning Coordinator and the Transmission Planner.

Category	Initial Condition	Event <sup>1</sup>	Fault Type <sup>2</sup>	BES Level <sup>3</sup>	Interruption of Firm Transmission Service Allowed <sup>4</sup>	Non-Consequential Load Loss Allowed
<b>P0</b> No Contingency	Normal System	None	N/A	EHV, HV	No	No
<b>P1</b> Single Contingency	Normal System	Loss of one of the following: 1. Generator 2. Transmission Circuit 3. Transformer <sup>5</sup> 4. Shunt Device <sup>6</sup>	3∅	EHV, HV	No <sup>9</sup>	No <sup>12</sup>
		5. Single Pole of a DC line	SLG			
<b>P2</b> Single Contingency	Normal System	1. Opening of a line section w/o a fault <sup>7</sup>	N/A	EHV, HV	No <sup>9</sup>	No <sup>12</sup>
		2. Bus Section Fault	SLG	EHV	No <sup>9</sup>	No
				HV	Yes	Yes
		3. Internal Breaker Fault <sup>8</sup> (non-Bus-tie Breaker)	SLG	EHV	No <sup>9</sup>	No
				HV	Yes	Yes
4. Internal Breaker Fault (Bus-tie Breaker) <sup>8</sup>	SLG	EHV, HV	Yes	Yes		



Category	Initial Condition	Event <sup>1</sup>	Fault Type <sup>2</sup>	BES Level <sup>3</sup>	Interruption of Firm Transmission Service Allowed <sup>4</sup>	Non-Consequential Load Loss Allowed
P3 Multiple Contingency	Loss of generator unit followed by System adjustments <sup>9</sup>	Loss of one of the following: 1. Generator 2. Transmission Circuit 3. Transformer <sup>5</sup> 4. Shunt Device <sup>6</sup>	3Ø	EHV, HV	No <sup>9</sup>	No <sup>12</sup>
		5. Single pole of a DC line	SLG			
P4 Multiple Contingency (Fault plus stuck breaker <sup>10</sup> )	Normal System	Loss of multiple elements caused by a stuck breaker <sup>10</sup> (non-Bus-tie Breaker) attempting to clear a Fault on one of the following: 1. Generator 2. Transmission Circuit 3. Transformer <sup>5</sup> 4. Shunt Device <sup>6</sup> 5. Bus Section	SLG	EHV	No <sup>9</sup>	No
				HV	Yes	Yes
		6. Loss of multiple elements caused by a stuck breaker <sup>10</sup> (Bus-tie Breaker) attempting to clear a Fault on the associated bus	SLG	EHV, HV	Yes	Yes

<u>Category</u>	<u>Initial Condition</u>	<u>Event</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Fault Type</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>BES Level</u> <sup>3</sup>	<u>Interruption of Firm Transmission Service Allowed</u> <sup>4</sup>	<u>Non-Consequential Load Loss Allowed</u>
<b>P5</b> Multiple Contingency (Fault plus <del>relay non-redundant component</del> of a Protection System failure to operate)	Normal System	Delayed Fault Clearing due to the failure of a non-redundant <del>relay component of a Protection System</del> <sup>13</sup> protecting the Faulted element to operate as designed, for one of the following: 1. Generator 2. Transmission Circuit 3. Transformer <sup>5</sup> 4. Shunt Device <sup>6</sup> 5. Bus Section	SLG	EHV	No <sup>9</sup>	No
				HV	Yes	Yes
<b>P6</b> Multiple Contingency (Two overlapping singles)	Loss of one of the following followed by System adjustments. <sup>9</sup> 1. Transmission Circuit 2. Transformer <sup>5</sup> 3. Shunt Device <sup>6</sup> 4. Single pole of a DC line	Loss of one of the following: 1. Transmission Circuit 2. Transformer <sup>5</sup> 3. Shunt Device <sup>6</sup> 4. Single pole of a DC line	3Ø	EHV, HV	Yes	Yes
			SLG	EHV, HV	Yes	Yes

Category	Initial Condition	Event <sup>1</sup>	Fault Type <sup>2</sup>	BES Level <sup>3</sup>	Interruption of Firm Transmission Service Allowed <sup>4</sup>	Non-Consequential Load Loss Allowed
<b>P7</b> Multiple Contingency <i>(Common Structure)</i>	Normal System	The loss of: 1. Any two adjacent (vertically or horizontally) circuits on common structure <sup>11</sup> 2. Loss of a bipolar DC line	SLG	EHV, HV	Yes	Yes

**Table 1 – Steady State & Stability Performance Extreme Events**

**Steady State & Stability**

For all extreme events evaluated:

- a. Simulate the removal of all elements that Protection Systems and automatic controls are expected to disconnect for each Contingency.
- b. Simulate Normal Clearing unless otherwise specified.

**Steady State**

1. Loss of a single generator, Transmission Circuit, single pole of a DC Line, shunt device, or transformer forced out of service followed by another single generator, Transmission Circuit, single pole of a different DC Line, shunt device, or transformer forced out of service prior to System adjustments.
2. Local area events affecting the Transmission System such as:
  - a. Loss of a tower line with three or more circuits.<sup>11</sup>
  - b. Loss of all Transmission lines on a common Right-of-Way<sup>11</sup>.
  - c. Loss of a switching station or substation (loss of one voltage level plus transformers).
  - d. Loss of all generating units at a generating station.
  - e. Loss of a large Load or major Load center.
3. Wide area events affecting the Transmission System based on System topology such as:
  - a. Loss of two generating stations resulting from conditions such as:
    - i. Loss of a large gas pipeline into a region or multiple regions that have significant gas-fired generation.

**Stability**

1. With an initial condition of a single generator, Transmission circuit, single pole of a DC line, shunt device, or transformer forced out of service, apply a 3Ø fault on another single generator, Transmission circuit, single pole of a different DC line, shunt device, or transformer prior to System adjustments.
2. Local or wide area events affecting the Transmission System such as:
  - a. 3Ø fault on generator with stuck breaker<sup>10</sup> ~~or a relay failure<sup>13</sup>~~-resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.
  - b. 3Ø fault on Transmission circuit with stuck breaker<sup>10</sup> ~~or a relay failure<sup>13</sup>~~-resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.
  - c. 3Ø fault on transformer with stuck breaker<sup>10</sup> ~~or a relay failure<sup>13</sup>~~-resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.
  - d. 3Ø fault on bus section with stuck breaker<sup>10</sup> ~~or a relay failure<sup>13</sup>~~-resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.
  - e. 3Ø fault on generator with failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System<sup>13</sup> resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.
  - f. 3Ø fault on Transmission circuit with failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System<sup>13</sup> resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ii. Loss of the use of a large body of water as the cooling source for generation.</li><li>iii. Wildfires.</li><li>iv. Severe weather, e.g., hurricanes, tornadoes, etc.</li><li>v. A successful cyber attack.</li><li>vi. Shutdown of a nuclear power plant(s) and related facilities for a day or more for common causes such as problems with similarly designed plants.</li></ul> <p>b. Other events based upon operating experience that may result in wide area disturbances.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><u>g. 3Ø fault on transformer with failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System<sup>13</sup> resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.</u></li><li><u>h. 3Ø fault on bus section with failure of a non-redundant component of a Protection System<sup>13</sup> resulting in Delayed Fault Clearing.</u></li><li><del>d.i.</del> 3Ø internal breaker fault.</li><li><del>e.i.</del> Other events based upon operating experience, such as consideration of initiating events that experience suggests may result in wide area disturbances</li></ul>
---	---

**Table 1 – Steady State & Stability Performance Footnotes  
(Planning Events and Extreme Events)**

1. If the event analyzed involves BES elements at multiple System voltage levels, the lowest System voltage level of the element(s) removed for the analyzed event determines the stated performance criteria regarding allowances for interruptions of Firm Transmission Service and Non-Consequential Load Loss.
2. Unless specified otherwise, simulate Normal Clearing of faults. Single line to ground (SLG) or three-phase (3 $\emptyset$ ) are the fault types that must be evaluated in Stability simulations for the event described. A 3 $\emptyset$  or a double line to ground fault study indicating the criteria are being met is sufficient evidence that a SLG condition would also meet the criteria.
3. Bulk Electric System (BES) level references include extra-high voltage (EHV) Facilities defined as greater than 300kV and high voltage (HV) Facilities defined as the 300kV and lower voltage Systems. The designation of EHV and HV is used to distinguish between stated performance criteria allowances for interruption of Firm Transmission Service and Non-Consequential Load Loss.
4. Curtailment of Conditional Firm Transmission Service is allowed when the conditions and/or events being studied formed the basis for the Conditional Firm Transmission Service.
5. For non-generator step up transformer outage events, the reference voltage, as used in footnote 1, applies to the low-side winding (excluding tertiary windings). For generator and Generator Step Up transformer outage events, the reference voltage applies to the BES connected voltage (high-side of the Generator Step Up transformer). Requirements which are applicable to transformers also apply to variable frequency transformers and phase shifting transformers.
6. Requirements which are applicable to shunt devices also apply to FACTS devices that are connected to ground.
7. Opening one end of a line section without a fault on a normally networked Transmission circuit such that the line is possibly serving Load radial from a single source point.
8. An internal breaker fault means a breaker failing internally, thus creating a System fault which must be cleared by protection on both sides of the breaker.
9. An objective of the planning process should be to minimize the likelihood and magnitude of interruption of Firm Transmission Service following Contingency events. Curtailment of Firm Transmission Service is allowed both as a System adjustment (as identified in the column entitled 'Initial Condition') and a corrective action when achieved through the appropriate re-dispatch of resources obligated to re-dispatch, where it can be demonstrated that Facilities, internal and external to the Transmission Planner's planning region, remain within applicable Facility Ratings and the re-dispatch does not result in any Non-Consequential Load Loss. Where limited options for re-dispatch exist, sensitivities associated with the availability of those resources should be considered.

**Table 1 – Steady State & Stability Performance Footnotes  
(Planning Events and Extreme Events)**

10. A stuck breaker means that for a gang-operated breaker, all three phases of the breaker have remained closed. For an independent pole operated (IPO) or an independent pole tripping (IPT) breaker, only one pole is assumed to remain closed. A stuck breaker results in Delayed Fault Clearing.
11. Excludes circuits that share a common structure (Planning event P7, Extreme event steady state 2a) or common Right-of-Way (Extreme event, steady state 2b) for 1 mile or less.
12. An objective of the planning process is to minimize the likelihood and magnitude of Non-Consequential Load Loss following planning events. In limited circumstances, Non-Consequential Load Loss may be needed throughout the planning horizon to ensure that BES performance requirements are met. However, when Non-Consequential Load Loss is utilized under footnote 12 within the Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon to address BES performance requirements, such interruption is limited to circumstances where the Non-Consequential Load Loss meets the conditions shown in Attachment 1. In no case can the planned Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 exceed 75 MW for US registered entities. The amount of planned Non-Consequential Load Loss for a non-US Registered Entity should be implemented in a manner that is consistent with, or under the direction of, the applicable governmental authority or its agency in the non-US jurisdiction.
13. For purposes of this standard, non-redundant components of a Protection System to consider are as follows:
  1. A single protective relay
  2. A single communications system, necessary for correct operation of protective functions, which is not monitored or not reported
  3. A single dc supply associated with protective functions, and that single station dc supply is not monitored or not reported for both low voltage and open circuit
  4. A single control circuitry associated with protective functions through the trip coil(s) of the circuit breakers or other interrupting devices  
Applies to the following relay functions or types: pilot (#85), distance (#21), differential (#87), current (#50, 51, and 67), voltage (#27 & 59), directional (#32, & 67), and tripping (#86, & 94).

Attachment 1

I. Stakeholder Process

During each Planning Assessment before the use of Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 is allowed as an element of a Corrective Action Plan in the Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon of the Planning Assessment, the Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator shall ensure that the utilization of footnote 12 is reviewed through an open and transparent stakeholder process. The responsible entity can utilize an existing process or develop a new process. The process must include the following:

1. Meetings must be open to affected stakeholders including applicable regulatory authorities or governing bodies responsible for retail electric service issues
2. Notice must be provided in advance of meetings to affected stakeholders including applicable regulatory authorities or governing bodies responsible for retail electric service issues and include an agenda with:
  - a. Date, time, and location for the meeting
  - b. Specific location(s) of the planned Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12
  - c. Provisions for a stakeholder comment period
3. Information regarding the intended purpose and scope of the proposed Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 (as shown in Section II below) must be made available to meeting participants
4. A procedure for stakeholders to submit written questions or concerns and to receive written responses to the submitted questions and concerns
5. A dispute resolution process for any question or concern raised in #4 above that is not resolved to the stakeholder's satisfaction

An entity does not have to repeat the stakeholder process for a specific application of footnote 12 utilization with respect to subsequent Planning Assessments unless conditions spelled out in Section II below have materially changed for that specific application.

II. Information for Inclusion in Item #3 of the Stakeholder Process

The responsible entity shall document the planned use of Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 which must include the following:

1. Conditions under which Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 would be necessary:
  - a. System Load level and estimated annual hours of exposure at or above that Load level
  - b. Applicable Contingencies and the Facilities outside their applicable rating due to that Contingency
2. Amount of Non-Consequential Load Loss with:



- a. The estimated number and type of customers affected
- b. An explanation of the effect of the use of Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 on the health, safety, and welfare of the community
3. Estimated frequency of Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 based on historical performance
4. Expected duration of Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 based on historical performance
5. Future plans to alleviate the need for Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12
6. Verification that TPL Reliability Standards performance requirements will be met following the application of footnote 12
7. Alternatives to Non-Consequential Load Loss considered and the rationale for not selecting those alternatives under footnote 12
8. Assessment of potential overlapping uses of footnote 12 including overlaps with adjacent Transmission Planners and Planning Coordinators

### III. Instances for which Regulatory Review of Non-Consequential Load Loss under Footnote 12 is Required

Before a Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 is allowed as an element of a Corrective Action Plan in Year One of the Planning Assessment, the Transmission Planner or Planning Coordinator must ensure that the applicable regulatory authorities or governing bodies responsible for retail electric service issues do not object to the use of Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 if either:

1. The voltage level of the Contingency is greater than 300 kV
  - a. If the Contingency analyzed involves BES Elements at multiple System voltage levels, the lowest System voltage level of the element(s) removed for the analyzed Contingency determines the stated performance criteria regarding allowances for Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12, or
  - b. For a non-generator step up transformer outage Contingency, the 300 kV limit applies to the low-side winding (excluding tertiary windings). For a generator or generator step up transformer outage Contingency, the 300 kV limit applies to the BES connected voltage (high-side of the Generator Step Up transformer)
2. The planned Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12 is greater than or equal to 25 MW

Once assurance has been received that the applicable regulatory authorities or governing bodies responsible for retail electric service issues do not object to the use of Non-Consequential Load Loss under footnote 12, the Planning Coordinator or Transmission Planner must submit the information outlined in items II.1 through II.8 above to the ERO for a determination of whether there are any Adverse Reliability Impacts caused by the request to utilize footnote 12 for Non-Consequential Load Loss.

## Version History

Version	Date	Action	Change Tracking
0	April 1, 2005	Effective Date	New
0	February 8, 2005	BOT Approval	Revised
0	June 3, 2005	Fixed reference in M1 to read TPL-001-0 R2.1 and TPL-001-0 R2.2	Errata
0	July 24, 2007	Corrected reference in M1. to read TPL-001-0 R1 and TPL-001-0 R2.	Errata
0.1	October 29, 2008	BOT adopted errata changes; updated version number to "0.1"	Errata
0.1	May 13, 2009	FERC Approved – Updated Effective Date and Footer	Revised
1	Approved by Board of Trustees February 17, 2011	Revised footnote 'b' pursuant to FERC Order RM06-16-009	Revised (Project 2010-11)
2	August 4, 2011	Revision of TPL-001-1; includes merging and upgrading requirements of TPL-001-0, TPL-002-0, TPL-003-0, and TPL-004-0 into one, single, comprehensive, coordinated standard: TPL-001-2; and retirement of TPL-005-0 and TPL-006-0.	Project 2006-02 – complete revision
2	August 4, 2011	Adopted by Board of Trustees	
1	April 19, 2012	FERC issued Order 762 remanding TPL-001-1, TPL-002-1b, TPL-003-1a, and TPL-004-1. FERC also issued a NOPR proposing to remand TPL-001-2. NERC has been directed to revise footnote 'b' in accordance with the directives of Order Nos. 762 and 693.	
3	February 7, 2013	Adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees.	

Version	Date	Action	Change Tracking
		TPL-001-3 was created after the Board of Trustees approved the revised footnote 'b' in TPL-002-2b, which was balloted and appended to: TPL-001-0.1, TPL-002-0b, TPL-003-0a, and TPL-004-0.	
4	February 7, 2013	Adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees. TPL-001-4 was adopted by the Board of Trustees as TPL-001-3, but a discrepancy in numbering was identified and corrected prior to filing with the regulatory agencies.	
4	October 17, 2013	FERC Order issued approving TPL-001-4 (Order effective December 23, 2013).	
4	May 7, 2014	NERC Board of Trustees adopted change to VRF in Requirement 1 from Medium to High.	Revision
4	November 26, 2014	FERC issued a letter order approving change to VRF in Requirement 1 from Medium to High.	
<u>5</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>Adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees.</u>	<u>Revised To address reliability issues as identified in FERC Order No. 754 and Order No. 786 directives and update the references to the MOD Reliability Standards in TPL-001.</u>

# Implementation Plan

## Project 2015-10 Single Points of Failure Reliability Standard TPL-001-5

### Applicable Standard(s)

- TPL-001-5 – Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements

### Requested Retirement(s)

- TPL-001-4 – Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements

### Prerequisite Standard(s)

- None

### Applicable Entities

- Planning Coordinator
- Transmission Planner

### Background

Reliability Standard TPL-001-5 revises the prior version of the TPL-001 standard in three key respects:

- To address reliability issues concerning the study of single points of failure on Protection Systems, as identified in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Order No. 754 issued September 15, 2011 and the NERC Planning Committee System Protection and Control Subcommittee and System Analysis and Modeling Subcommittee September 2015 report titled *Assessment of Protection System Single Points of Failure Based on the Section 1600 Data Request*;
- To address directives from FERC Order No. 786 issued October 17, 2013, in which FERC approved Reliability Standard TPL-001-4; and
- To replace references to the MOD-010 and MOD-012 standards, which have been superseded by the MOD-032 Reliability Standard.

### General Considerations

The 36-month implementation period for TPL-001-5 provides Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners with time to update their annual Planning Assessments to include the new System models and studies required by the standard. This implementation period reflects consideration that Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners will need time to develop, among other things:

- A process for coordinating with the Reliability Coordinator which known outages of generation of Transmission Facilities of less than six months shall be represented in planning studies;
- A process for establishing coordination with protection engineers to obtain the necessary data to perform the single points of failure analysis required by the standard; and
- Additional base case models and analysis.

In addition, the implementation plan includes an additional 24 month period for the development of Corrective Action Plans under TPL-001-5 to address newly-added studies involving single points of failure on Protection Systems. This implementation period reflects consideration that Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners will need time beyond that provided to conduct the new studies and analysis to develop processes for coordination with asset owners and protection engineers to identify appropriate Corrective Action Plan actions and establish the associated timetables for completion. This includes:

- Any necessary Corrective Action Plans to address Cascading caused by the occurrence of Table 1 extreme events listed in the stability column for events 2e-2h required by TPL-001-5 Requirement R4 Part 4.6; and
- Any necessary Corrective Action Plans to address System performance issues for studies involving Table 1 Category P5 Multiple Contingency (Fault plus non-redundant component of a Protection System failure to operate) required by TPL-001-5 Requirement R2 Part 2.7 for the following non-redundant components of a Protection System identified in TPL-001-5 Table 1 Footnote 13, items 2-4:
  - A single communications system, necessary for correct operation of protective functions, which is not monitored or not reported
  - A single dc supply associated with protective functions, and that single station dc supply is not monitored or not reported for both low voltage and open circuit
  - A single control circuitry associated with protective functions through the trip coil(s) of the circuit breakers or other interrupting devices.

Lastly, the provisions related to Corrective Action Plans including Non-Consequential Load Loss and curtailment of Firm Transmission Service (in accordance with Requirement R2, Part 2.7.3) are carried forward from the TPL-001-4 implementation plan.

## **Effective Date**

### **TPL-001-5 – Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements**

Where approval by an applicable governmental authority is required, the standard shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 36 months after the effective date of the applicable governmental authority's order approving the standard, or as otherwise provided by the applicable governmental authority.

Where approval by an applicable governmental authority is not required, the standard shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 36 months after the date the standard is adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees, or as otherwise provided for in that jurisdiction.

**Compliance Date for TPL-001-5 Requirement R4, Part 4.6 and Requirement 2, Part 2.7 associated with Table 1 Category P5 Footnote 13 items 2, 3, and 4**

Entities shall not be required to comply with Requirement R4, Part 4.6 until 24 months after the effective date of Reliability Standard TPL-001-5.

Entities shall not be required to comply with Requirement R2, Part 2.7 for the Table 1 Category P5 planning event for the non-redundant components of a Protection System identified in footnote 13 items 2, 3, and 4 until 24 months after the effective date of Reliability Standard TPL-001-5.

**Note Regarding Corrective Action Plans**

For 84 calendar months beginning the first day of the first calendar quarter following applicable regulatory approval of TPL-001-4, or in those jurisdictions where regulatory approval is not required on the first day of the first calendar quarter 84 months after Board of Trustees adoption or as otherwise made effective pursuant to the laws applicable to such ERO governmental authorities, Corrective Action Plans applying to the following categories of Contingencies and events identified in TPL-001-5, Table 1 are allowed to include Non-Consequential Load Loss and curtailment of Firm Transmission Service (in accordance with Requirement R2, Part 2.7.3.) that would not otherwise be permitted by the requirements of TPL-001-5:

- P1-2 (for controlled interruption of electric supply to local network customers connected to or supplied by the Faulted element)
- P1-3 (for controlled interruption of electric supply to local network customers connected to or supplied by the Faulted element)
- P2-1
- P2-2 (above 300 kV)
- P2-3 (above 300 kV)
- P3-1 through P3-5
- P4-1 through P4-5 (above 300 kV)
- P5 (above 300 kV)

**Initial Performance of Periodic Requirements**

Each responsible entity shall complete the first annual Planning Assessment in accordance with TPL-001-5 by the effective date of the standard.

Each responsible entity shall complete any required Corrective Action Plans under Requirement R4, Part 4.6 and Requirement R2, Part 2.7 associated with the non-redundant components of a

Protection System identified in Table 1 Category P5 Footnote 13 items 2, 3, and 4 by 24 months after the effective date of Reliability Standard TPL-001-5.

### **Retirement Date**

#### **TPL-001-4 – Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements**

Reliability Standard TPL-001-4 shall be retired immediately prior to the effective date of TPL-001-5 in the particular jurisdiction in which the revised standard is becoming effective.