

## Ed Skiba

---

**From:** jdrjcassociates@cs.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 27, 2011 3:37 PM  
**To:** Ed Skiba; nsaini@entergy.com  
**Subject:** NERC Standards

Ed and Narindar,

Happy Holiday season.

At the December 9 SRS call I volunteered to look at the impact of Project 2007-12 Frequency Response on NAESB standards. This was in anticipation if Standard BAL-003-1 passed. As it turns out the standard failed, only achieving an approval vote of 30.82%. I think we should note the vote failure and that SRS will continue to monitor SDT efforts.

I have done the review anyway. I found the following:

- **Definitional Change:** The proposed definition differs from the one in the NAESB Glossary. There is more detail in the NERC definition but I don't believe there is any NAESB impact. I quickly reviewed the comments of voters who voted NO and did not see any objections to the proposed NERC revised definition. I would expect the NERC SDT to leave the definition as proposed in the next version of the standard that goes for ballot. When passed, the only reason for NAESB to change is for consistency with NERC.
- **Requirements:** I don't believe the proposed changes to the requirements have any impact on NAESB standards WEQ-005, 006 and 007. Changes to Requirements 1-4 seem to me to be clarifications on existing language. New Requirement 5 set minimum frequency bias settings for traditional and generation only BAs.
- **Measures** were added that did not exist in BAL-003-0.

*Jim*

Jim Cyrulewski  
JDRJC Associates, LLC  
1120 East Long Lake Road Suite 205  
Troy, Mi. 48085  
248-515-1109 (cell)  
248-743-0711 (fax)