

Reliability Standards Standing Committee (RSSC)

Minutes of Meeting #41

July 11th, 2018 | 9:30 AM – 3:00 PM | IESO's 16th Floor Boardroom, 120 Adelaide St W, Toronto

Attendance

Participant Name	Company Name	Attendance Status
Dave Dunn	IESO	A
Ben Li	Representing IESO	A
David Kiguel	Observer	A
Soon Chua	Portlands Energy Centre	A
Payam Farahbakhsh	Hydro One	A
David Kwan	OPG	A
Haider Naveed	Hydro One	A
Paul Malozewski	Hydro One	A
Laurie Reid	OEB	A
Owaid Ahmed	IESO	A
Angie Turek	IESO	A
Norn Dang	IESO	A
Helen Laines	IESO	A
Scott Berry	IESO	A
Sean Lagan	IESO	A
Mary Polk	FLP	A (Phone)
Luis Zaragoza	Pattern Energy	A (Phone)
Hajar Kacem	Transalta	A (Phone)
Cristian Dragnea	IESO	A (Phone)
Monica Adam	IESO	A (Phone)
Juri Baroskov	Goreway	A (Phone)
Mike Beuthing	Hydro One	A (Phone)
Kevin Wozniak	Hydro One	A (Phone)
Shadid Khan	Northlands	A (Phone)
Joel Charlebois	AESI	A (Phone)
Paul Whitehead	Bruce Power	A (Phone)
Jim Cook	GLP	A (Phone)

Scribe: Sean Lagan

orcp@ieso.ca: Please report any corrections, additions or deletions to scribe.

All meeting materials are available on the IESO's RSSC webpage at:

<http://www.ieso.ca/en/sector-participants/engagement-initiatives/standing-committees/reliability-standards-standing-committee>

References:

IESO MACD page: <http://www.ieso.ca/en/sector-participants/market-oversight/rule-compliance/compliance-overview>

IESO Reliability Standards Compliance page: <http://www.ieso.ca/en/sector-participants/system-reliability/ontario-reliability-compliance-program>

NERC Standards page: <http://www.nerc.com/page.php?cid=2>

NPCC Regional Standards/Criteria page: <https://www.npcc.org/Standards/default.aspx>

FERC Electric page: <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/electric.asp>

SER Project page available at <http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Pages/Standards-Efficiency-Review.aspx>

Action Item Summary as of the 39 th Meeting			
#	Date	Action	Status
1	April 25, 2018	<i>The IESO will strike a working group with the purpose of identifying the level of detail required in data reporting for market participants to meet their reporting obligations. Any interested party should reach out to Scott Berry or Helen Lainis to join</i>	Open

1. Welcome and Introductions

The forty first RSSC meeting commenced at 9:30 am with brief introductions by each participant.

2. Administrative Issues

a) The agenda for the meeting was reviewed; no additional items were added to the agenda. Motion to adopt the meeting agenda as final was made and agenda was adopted.

b) The minutes of the last (forty) RSSC meeting were reviewed page by page.

Minor spelling corrections were made to the minutes.

Dates were added to the TSC Update provided in Meeting Forty.

The minutes were not distributed with enough time to review prior to the meeting. They will be posted online as a draft with a deadline for comment.

c) Action items were reviewed and updated.

Item #1

The IESO will strike a working group with the purpose of identifying the level of detail required in data reporting for market participants to meet their reporting obligations. Any interested party should reach out to Scott Berry or Helen Lainis to join

Payam Farahbakhsh (H1): The need for working group is between transmitters and IESO. It is probably better for H1 to work individually with the IESO to resolve (unless anyone else wants to join).

Dave Kwan (OPG): OPG does require some minor clarification and would like to be involved in the discussions.

Joel Chalrebois (AESI): Likewise, AESI would like to be involved in the discussions.

Scott Berry (IESO): Proposes we close item. The interested parties will work with CA directly (no working group will be assembled) .

This is agreed to. Item is now closed.

d) RSSC Roster Updates were reviewed: changes to the members of the RSSC Distribution list can be emailed to Sean Lagan and orcp@ieso.ca

3. Standard Efficiency Review (SER)

S. Berry provided update on status of SER and expectations moving forward.

The recap touched on the scope of project and highlighted the requirements that have been targeted for retirement.

The purpose of Phase 1 is to retire the recommended requirements.

The SAR draft was issued for review from industry for comment.

NERC and SER teams will now assemble comments from industry and then issue formal SAR request to standards committee before the beginning of August.

The Standards Committee will consider what was included in SAR and recommend a standard drafting team to review the recommendations and draft.

What industry received in what we will call the “Pre-SAR” was a listing of what there was overwhelming support for the retirement of. Little pushback was expected.

Q (Dave Kiguel) – it is not a question about “feeling” if something should be retired. Requirements should be weighed against a criteria list to determine if it qualifies for retirement (similar to paragraph 81). Scott indicating that his wording was incorrect, and that criteria was established and used to ensure a consistent method in reviewing the requirements. He did note that a formal investigation of each requirement wasn’t completed, but that once the standard drafting team has an opportunity to take a deeper look at the recommended requirements, the list of what is formally proposed will be smaller.

SER Alternatives to retirement

Categories:

Certification program

- Requirements can be moved into a certification program instead of keeping them in NERC standards.

Scott emphasized while some of these requirements do not necessarily directly impact reliability, we still need standards that enforce and manage behaviour across ERO. Part of the certification program would include the Appendix A items that are applicable to RC, BA, TOP.

Control Review:

- Does the standard act as a control rather than a requirement?

Consolidation and simplification:

- Rules of procedure – section 1600: use this for data requests.
- NAESB- moving requirements here - note naesb is not enforceable in Canada

Phase 2 of the project will be looking at available efficiencies beyond retirement. This includes modifications, moving items out of standards, and the consolidation of any requirement redundancies.

Dave Kiguel Question: will there be one drafting team taking charge of overall or individual?

Scott: They are considering one drafting team right now, but standards committee will decide how they want to approach to ensure they have the appropriate SMEs in place to evaluate.

4. TPL-007-2 GMD Update

Laurie Reid provided the following update on TPL-007-2.

Since the last meeting a notice has went out from board to all licensed transmitters and generators asking who wants to participate. No additional participants came forward. Therefore, it is only H1 and IESO who are involved. NERC indicated they may want to make a submission but the capacity of their participation is to be determined.

This content would not be an issue for a delegated authority, so it has been bumped up to a standard panel.

Version two has went to FERC, and has been discussed. They are going to put a NOPR out on the Supplemental Cap as they want a corrective action plan in place for the supplemental benchmark.

If version two is approved, we will need to put stay into effect.

P. Farahbakhsh asked If NERC is going to make revisions to the standard and version three becomes in effect, we will need to issue another review?

Ben- Since the NOPR is out on TPL-007-2. It is likely FERC will approve standard.

However there is a caveat that corrective action is put in place to put into supplementary results.

Our SAR for Canadian variance and SAR for cap would come into effect at the same time. There is some debate around if they should be consolidate or maintained separately.

Regarding effective date- it is unlikely version two will come into effect in Ontario.

Laurie indicated that the stay has been requested but not yet approved

5. MOD-032- Data Reporting Update

S Lagan indicated the notices for Mod-032 R2 reporting fulfillment have been issued to BES impacted participants. Some clarification around what is needed to be compliant with the standard is provided. Sean indicated that the purpose of this exercise is to confirm you haven't had any changes that have not been reported to the IESO that need to be in our model. The level of detail required is a confirmation that you have done a review, and that no changes beyond that which have been submitted for SIA purposes have been made.

J Charlebois: "Would you not want MPs to validate that the data they have on file is correct and has not changed, to say that they have submitted data, and perhaps what they have submitted maybe is not entirely accurate. If nothing has changed outside of a connection assessment in the past?"

S. Berry: would I want them to be aware and feel obligated to provide that info "yes"

Does this standard require that "no".

S Khan: “the entities that have performed the testing for 2017 mod 25, 26, 27”,

The wording says to specify facility and confirm if data has changed,

S. Berry: MOD 25, 26, 27 validates that your existing model. If you need to make tweaks, or changes are required than you need to go through connection assessment. If you have submitted information that would require a change to the model, you can state what needed changing. Beyond that “no other modifications were required to the model”. We can take this offline to have a further discussion relevant to northland- their mod,25,26,27 submissions and their impact on mod 32.

S Khan: agree.

S. Berry reiterates that MP’s continue to use SIA for changes, and that compliance with this requirement is the responsibility of the MP’, and that this process is established to help them meet requirement.

6. CIP Standards Development Update

Dave Dunn provided a CIP Standards development Update.

CIP-012

The non-binding pole has been approved and will be going to final ballot soon.

The current version is dealing with the definition of control center (protected communications between control centers). There are cases where the requirements for these protected communications would be “overkill” for the type of facility.

The team is looking at dealing with exceptions for cases where these requirements will not make sense for a particular group.

CIP 003

The SAR is out now to address malicious code from Transient Devices

The language in Appendix A does not contain strong wording around the mitigation of issues when these cases are reviewed.

CIP-002-6

SAR deals with modifications to the IROL issues presently contained within FAC standards. The impact will be the proposed retirement of FAC-010-3, and addressing IROL language in CIP-002-5.1a resulting in CIP-002-6.

Enforcement dates- to be discussed later

N. Dang stated that there was an industry webinar around virtualization, technology innovation, and the NERC CIP Standards. A drafting team has put a proposal forward that instead of making specific changes, CIP 5,7,10 should be written to be more generally and take the prescriptive requirements out. NERC is meeting with auditors to ensure these changes would still be auditable and prove compliance. The idea is that once they make this change, they will have more flexibility going forward as a more “program” type standard, without having to go edit every prescriptive requirement the way it is today.

It is expected that this will encounter some pushback, but the issue is that the way the standards are written today, we are unable to work with new technologies.

P. Farahbakhsh - stated the concern that if we move to a less prescriptive requirement that will be technology neutral, This will be hard for auditors to audit. This could result in problems for Market Participants as it opens up for interpretation, which could lead to an inconsistent approach to implementation and audits going forward.

D. Dunn replied that this would be more of a controls based approach rather than a prescriptive approach. We would define our control objectives, and entity can determine how they satisfy objective, by designing their controls to mitigate the risk.

J. Charlebois- Nuclear groups have been moving towards control approach with some success. The key is establishing clear control objectives and documentation to support compliance. In the long run this is a better approach.

P. Malozewski asked if this is the first attempt to move towards this approach. Has any thought been given to what the equivalent of an RSAW will look like?

D. Dunn responded “Yes. Older standards are prescriptive. This is first move toward control objectives. The use of ICE program methodology is used to match controls against requirements in standards and can help find gaps. This evaluation can help assess how control program is meeting obligations.”

When Standard Drafting Team starts to get into this, they will look to entities with these programs in place. This will help ensure when drafting the standards they are more control based in nature and not prescriptive.

Auditors will first assess the design of controls and ask for entities to “Show me how these controls work”.

The RSAWs will still exist, but will be “control based”

H. Naveed “has there been a control based audit done before?”

Scott B: no- but it is used to help reduce the scope of prescriptive based audit (sean get details from Scott and Dave Dunn)

P. Farahbakhsh asked if there is a FERC rep on the drafting team, and have they indicated if they support this approach? (Historically they seem to have been opposed to this approach).

N. Dang: Yes there is, but they have not expressed their opinion.

S. Berry: will depend on their appetite for risk.

P. Malozewski: As an observation. If you transition to a controls approach and end up at a place when you demonstrate your controls and the adequacy of the controls, when an auditor asks for proof controls work, is that not the same as where we are now? “Show me evidence...”

D. Dunn: “In terms of showing evidence, you are correct. They would pick a sample for a specified period, and if you cannot show satisfactory compliance they would expand the scope.

Phone Comment: “This seems to expand the compliance burden.”

S. Berry: Upfront is would seem that way. There is work upfront to validate controls. Once that is done, if these controls stay in place, it becomes easier in an ongoing basis.

D. Dunn: “once you get to the point of defining controls. We track controls that have changed so that the next time you are audited they know what to spend time evaluating. The team can collect evidence in an ongoing basis”

S. Berry added while still on CIP items.

Helen has provided a spreadsheet highlighting the implementation timeline for requirements of the CIP-003-7. This is going to be posted on IESO website.

Note, Market Participants will not be required to implement CIP-003-6, Requirement R2, Attachment 1, Sections 2 and 3. Instead, Market Participants will implement CIP-003-7, Requirement R2, Attachment 1, Sections 2 and 3 on January 1, 2020.

7. MACD Activities and CMP Status Update

Monica Adam provided an update on CMP.

In terms of CMP –there are no changes.

Q3 self-certifications were issued last week. Some participants will have received requests. They have deadline of Aug 20th to submit information about protection program.

H. Naveed wants to confirm if all self-certifications for Q3 have gone out, and that any further requests would come in Q4.

M. Adam confirms that as far as she knows, all Q3 went out last week.

S. Berry added that a reminder that PRC-005 excel spreadsheet is issued in RCT, but participant must submit their results through MACD compliance portal as RCT is unable to receive excel files. MP’s can submit RSAW and any other evidence through the RCT.

D. Kwan stated that “my understanding of the request of PRC 5 was that we submit PSMP but do not submit maintenance records.”

M. Adam indicated that this was correct, and that MACD will review PSMP and then issue specific request for maintenance records.

8. Standards Enforcement Dates Update/Roadmap

A Turek provided update by quarter.

Since last meeting 5 standards have become enforceable (on July 1).

- CIP-009-6 R2.3
- CIP-010-2 R3.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2
- MOD-026-1 R2, R2.1-2.1.6
- MOD-027-1 R2, 2.1-2.1.5

- TPL-007-1 R2

No other standards will become enforceable this quarter.

Looking forward, the following standards will come into place during the listed periods;

Q4 2018

- TOP- (Oct 1)
- CIP-003-6R2 will not be enforceable – instead V7 comes into effect in Jan 2019.
- PRC-025- Oct 1.

Q1 2019

- TPL-007-1 R5
- FAC-001-3
- BAL-005-1

Q2 2019

- EOP-004-4
- EOP-005-3
- EOP-006-3
- EOP-008-2

Future

- PRC-002-2 R2-4, 6-11
- PRC-012-2
- PRC-026-1 R2-4
- TPL-007-1 R3, 4, 7
- TPL-007-1 R6,6.1-6.4

9. NERC 2017 Lessons Learned

Since the last RSSC meeting three lessons learned have been posted on the NERC website.

1. Back Office EMS Support Tools Impact Real-Time Situational Awareness

Applicable to: TOPs/RCs/TOs

Event: Upon receiving a call from its RC about a particular contingency, a registered entity identified that half of the contingency lists in the energy management system (EMS) list were disabled. This was due to a back-office study where the contingency list control display was opened and modified, inadvertently impacting the contingencies being displayed in the real-time environment.

Corrective Action: Because the lack of application separation for study case vs real-time made the need to maintain the real-time case locked absolute, and this condition was not well understood, the registered entity trained its operations support staff regarding this issue

2. External Model Data Causing State Estimator to Not Converge

Applicable to: TOPs/RCs/TOs who operate an EMS with study/simulation capabilities

Event: Several entities in the ReliabilityFirst (RF) Region have experienced state estimator (SE) outages due to Inter-Control Center Communications Protocol (ICCP) data received from neighboring entities. Upon investigation, the topology of the neighboring system had changed but the receiving entities had not updated their representation so the ICCP data no longer matched with the older model. The SE was unable to converge (or solve).

Corrective Action: Three Corrective Actions were identified

- Removing the data points from the model to allow the SE to converge around the area, hopefully producing a quality solution.
- Phone calls were made to the RC or neighboring entities to assess the situation.
 - It is possible that RTU maintenance may be the reason for the external data point to be invalid even though its quality shows as good; however, reason is often due to some type of external topology change outside of the entity's footprint. Discuss topology with neighbors so the model can be adjusted as necessary.
- Some entities have the ability to freeze external data (either globally or for a specific area) and revert to the last known good solution. This allows the SE to converge while personnel troubleshoot the external model and incoming data.

3. Loss of Communication to Multiple SCADA RTUs at a Switching Center

Applicable to: TOPs/RCs

Event: Grid operations lost communication with multiple substation remote terminal units (RTUs) when conditions allowed a pre-existing configuration error to express itself. The event that transpired had wide reaching impacts to both control center operations and field personnel

Corrective Action: Four Corrective Actions were identified.

- The UPS system auto/manual restart switch at this facility was placed in the auto position.
- Future installations of similar UPS systems have been flagged to ensure correct auto/manual restart switch position selection prior to releasing equipment for regular service.
- Operating personnel have been counselled regarding deficiencies in the response to the UPS general alarm received on the day of the event.
- Mandatory operator response to alarms of this nature have been reinforced, including communication requirements.

NERC lessons learned are posted on NERC website under compliance.

No questions were asked.

10. NERC Compliance Guideline

S. Berry directs us to the NERC Webpage>compliance> Compliance Guidance

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide examples for the implementation of standards. These provide a method for how to implement/be compliant with the standard. Participants do not need to need to do exactly as posted.

The list of guidelines and the types of standards included is growing.

The page also provides an “under consideration” section that shows what standards are currently collecting information on.

This page can be used as an aid for driving best practice.

11. Update on NERC Standards Committee Activities

Dave Kiguel is giving a report on the standards committee activities.

Dave is focusing on activities that have to do with the management of standards development rather than details specific to each standard.

The committees has monthly meeting scheduled throughout the year, four of which are in person, and 8 teleconferences.

Recent activities include;

Canadian specific revisions for TPL-007-2

- Accepted SAR for final posting
- Appointed SAR team as Standard Drafting Team
 - Team is comprised all of Canadian representatives (no American)
 - The group had limited experience in being on a drafting team

Project 2017-07 Standard’s Alignment with Registration (See Dave’s Slides)

- March 19 2015 FERC approved NERC’s risk based registration initiative.
- Removed two functional categories, PSE and IA from the Compliance Registry.
- Created a new registration category - UFLS-only Distribution Provider (DP), for PRC-005 and its progeny standards.
- Subsequently approved the removal of Load-Serving Entity (LSE) from the NERC registry.
- Clean-up effort required.
- Appointed Drafting team

Review of Appendix 3A in the NERC Rules of Procedure (standard process manual SPM)

- The manual addresses
 - Processes for conducting field test and collecting and analyzing data
 - Process for developing (SEE SLIDE)

New SCPS Members:

- Paul Malozewski

FMAG 2018 Scope of Work

- Changes to functional entity definition
- Obtain industry input on the scope of any further changes to the functional model

Standard Drafting Team Nomination Selection Criteria

- Concerns around consultants being in SDT's and the potential influence they may have. (Are they there to advance reliability or their own interests?)
- There is differing opinion on their suitability for inclusion.
 - Ultimately this has resulted in a new paragraph being added "Revised Participant Conduct Policy;

"Participants shall not use the standards development process for commercial purposes or for their own private purposes, including, but not limited to, advertising or promoting a specific product or service, announcements of a personal nature, sharing of files or attachments not directly relevant to the purpose of the standards development process, and communication of personal views or opinions, unless those views are directly related to the purpose of the standards development process."

P. Malozewski asked "Did the group look at something simpler around if they looked at a policy where consultants are permitted if they are acting on behalf of a functional entity?"

B. Li added the following concerns

- voluntary language is problematic "personal views or opinions"
- why would vendors be labelled? They need to act on a level field. Does not make sense to isolate them as a group.

12. A. NERC Standards Development

Ben Li provided an update on the following standards developments

Revisions to TPL-001 Standard Addressing FERC Directives

TPL-001 standard impacts H1 and IESO.

The issue is that they created “planning event 8” instead of considering an extreme event.

S. Berry commented what happened to the cost effective analysis approach in ERO in development of standards? We have opportunity to show this is not cost effective, but we are still making people participate in the process which is timely and costly?

Bal-002-3

This only impacts IESO.

The Project is initiated to address FERC’s concerns over the lack of specificity for the 15-minute ACE recovery period (in Requirement R1).

FERC wants the standard to require responsible entities (Balancing Authorities or Reserve Sharing Groups):

- To notify the reliability coordinator of the conditions set forth in Requirement R1, Part 1.3.1 which prevents the BA from complying with the 15-minute ACE recovery period;
- To provide the reliability coordinator with its ACE recovery plan, including a target recovery time.

FERC feels language needs to be tightened so that RC is aware of BA inability to recover ace.

Ben added that when you declare emergency you need to notify RC- so they would already know. It seems redundant to then have them need to notify that they cannot recover ACE).

The proposed changes seem unnecessary; nevertheless, they have no material impact on the IESO since it is both the BA and the RC;

It was balloted in May and received 69.46% support

It is expected to go to final ballot with little change

CIP-012-1 Standard on Communication Between Control Centers

Draft standard was balloted in April and received 83.33% support.

Companion definition of a Control Centre failed ballot at 46.7%. As a result CIP-012-1 was revised to insert exception language instead of revising the definition of Control Centre, which received 68.45% support. At this passage, there is a result of going to a final ballot.

If the final ballot reaches 66.7% it will be approved.

If below that level, the project is dropped and all the work leading up to this point would be lost.

As such, it may be better to revise standard one more time to get more support for the standard so that when it goes to final ballot, we can increase the confidence on vote.

Changes to CIP-02 Standard

The CIP-02 standard will need to be revised to be consistent with the retirement of the FAC-001-3.

This should be a minor change.

It must also be revised to address the directive in Order 843.

- NERC to develop modifications to the CIP Reliability Standards to mitigate the risk of malicious code that could result from third-party transient electronic devices.
- In the SAR, NERC indicates that it will ensure that responsible entities implement controls to mitigate the risk of malicious code that could result from third-party transient electronic devices.
- For example, by modifying Section 5 of Attachment 1 to CIP-003-7 to clarify that responsible entities must implement controls to mitigate the risk of malicious code that could result from the use of third-party transient electronic devices

Standard Process Manual

There are the revisions proposed to three (3) main Sections – Section 6, 7 and 11

- Section 6 – Field Test:
 - Improved clarity on responsibility for starting, stopping, collecting data and analysing field tests
- Section 7 – Developing an Interpretation:
 - Improved clarity on the submission, accepting and processing requests for interpretation
- Section 11 – Posting Reference Documents:
 - Removal of posting of compliance guideline documents

The first draft was posted in April 2017 and received 64% support. Now the 3 Sections are slightly revised to address industry concerns (mainly to provide clearer language and specificity) and will be balloted by August 9. The IESO plans to support this version.

13. B. NPCC Standards Development

Directory 8- system restoration

Directory 8 has been revised to better align the maintenance requirement for battery and battery charger with the requirements stipulated in the recently approved NERC PRC-005 Standard. Specific revisions were made to Section 1.7 of Directory 8. The IESO supports the proposed revisions.

PRC-006-NPCC-02- Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding

PRC-006-NPCC-02 - Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding has been revised to achieve:

- Modifications to Figures #1 and #2
- Addition of a Guidelines and Technical Basis section
- Incorporation of certain Criteria attributes from Directory #12 Automatic UFLS Program Requirements which will facilitate the retirement of Directory #12
- Additional clarification of requirement language
- Removal of redundancy with the PRC-006-2 Continent-wide NERC standard

- Revisions to the applicability of Requirements R4 and R5 to consider that Hydro Quebec is not part of the Eastern Interconnection

The IESO generally supports the proposed revisions, but commented on:

- The need to fully align the frequency restoration criteria with the NERC Standard;
- Inappropriate responsibility for Requirement 5.4.1 (a TO/DP may not have the capability to provide technical justification for deviating from assigned settings)
- Lack of rationale for revising certain VRFs

P. Farahbakhsh: Quick discussion on PRC-006. NY, OPG, H1 have some issues with these revisions, is the IESO supporting it?

Ben Li- Not on behalf of IESO, but from my own perspective the rational was that when we created directory 12 it was a stopgap measure. The decision was to develop a regional standard. With that in-place the taskforce with the coordination of planning view that directory 12 could be retired in due course, but not the regional standard because there were items specific to NPCC.

Ben added that at this time it makes sense to go along with these revisions knowing NPCC will issue task to compare commonality between NPCC and NERC standard.

P. Farahbakhsh added that based on some of the discussions that was provided by OPG it sounds like we have some tactical visibility issues implementing this standard in Ontario. As such the IESO should look at this.

S. Berry responded that given this was brought up at RSC meeting, the IESO will be enquiring about the possibility of attaining an exemption to standard based on the physical limitations within the region.

13. Other Items

D. Kiguel wanted to talk about a potential A-10 proposal
3 methodologies were proposed and considered
Submitted to task force by the end of june for review.

D. Kiguel recalled one methodology was purely accounting, the second was a mix of performance and accounting, and the third was purely performance. Dave had remembered that the pure accounting methodology had been dropped and they are testing the final two. They will not define selection criteria until they see the results of testing. First iteration of test results would be presented at end of July.

P. Farahbakhsh asked at RSC if cost considerations are being considered prior to evaluating options. The answer was none.

P. Farahbakhsh believes that any outcome that is going to add to the facilitates that are considered BPS will likely be heavily be opposed.

14. Next Meeting

Next meeting: Tentative booking Sept 27-aiming to be held at Adelaide.
Note: (this has since been changed to Clarkson)

15. Motion to Adjourn

There being no other business items to be addressed,
Motion to adjourn from P. Malozewski
Second from D. Kwan

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m