SGIP – IMC 61850 SubGroup Call
January 21, 2013

Attendance:
Paul Myrda
Don Von Dollen
Thomas Hurley
Jacek Szamrej
Sam Sciacca
Tim Croushore
Jeremy Laundergan
Ron Farquharson

Meeting Notes:
1. Current status:
   • Paul is hoping that moving the meeting to Mondays will result in increased participation
2. SGIMC website:
   • Paul has added white papers from EPRI and the SGAC
   • The current TWiki page will be transitioned to the SGIP 2.0 website
   • Jeremy – asked for input on how to best accomplish this transition
   • Jeremy estimated that we would start archiving the old pages around the end of March 2013 with pointers to the new site
3. Action: Paul to review last week’s PSRC meeting notes to identify other content that might be good to add to this site
4. Discussion on other relevant industry work. Paul mentioned the ENTSO-E report and asked about other work.
5. Ron mentioned:
   • New IEEE Subs WG C15 – Draft P2030.100 – “Recommended Practice for Recommended Practice for Implementing an IEC 61850 Based Substation Communications, Protection, Monitoring and Control System”
   • New work by CIGRE to address the ENTSO-E report
   • New task force within IEC WG-10 address the ENTSO-E report
   • Sam mentioned a stand-alone standards development underway to define performance requirements for stand-alone merging units. Scheduled to complete this work by 2014.
     New standards work is: IEC TC38  WG 83 IEC 61869-6 Chair: Veselin S. (SEL)
6. IEC 61850 Part 6 – SCL Data Exchange – Paul created a Linked-In Group survey. Major items of focus were “technology not Mature” and “Business Process Change Difficult”. Each of these items scored about 40% each.
7. Looking at slide 2 – the Engineering Workplace. The part that is a problem is that the Engineering Workplace is a vendor specific application. The typical design process could easily start 4-5 years before a vendor is selected so we need to have this piece developed as two parts with a generic part to create templates and design drawings ahead of vendor selection. What has been people’s experience in this area? Sam offers that there are vendors that offer IED configurator tools as two separate products (1. set the protection parameters 2. For the 61850 configuration). It would be useful to point this out to people.
8. It would be good to look at the Part 6 terminology for the components on this diagram to be sure we have a complete view and all the words we should have.
9. Jacek agrees that this is the right approach but they don’t have experience with 61850 at this time.

10. Paul asked Jacek if he would be willing to share their design approach as this would be helpful for the group. The processes should be put into a timeline with a list of steps.
   - Jacek – normally we have a resource development plan but in this SCADA case we followed a different approach.
   - We did not have our own SCADA until two years ago as we are a small Co-Op and depended on the SCADA system operated by the transmission company.
   - We don’t have resources to do more investigation.
   - CERN (NRECA) as a research organization for Co-Ops and Munis might be able to help.

11. The two parts of the Engineering Workplace function (generic and vendor specific) will likely be separate. The output of the generic function would flow into the vendor specific.

12. Paul showed typical DC elementary diagrams. Utilities will normally use standard design approaches that are then tailored to location specific designs.

13. Using 61850 we would have a block diagram of building blocks of specific functions such as “Latch”

14. Utilities don’t have the tools that they need (software applications) that they need. We are missing the transition piece.

15. Sam, we are still going to be challenged to bridge between these generic design standards and vendor specific designs.

16. Paul, it helps to go back and think about the true nature of inter-operability (or interchangeability).

17. Sam, the switch-over may have to be every 3-4 years to manage the effort required

18. Paul, by and large most companies have migrated to a standards approach. So we need tools however I don’t see these tools addressing the business process side.

19. Sam, the DC elementary normally used the C37.2 terminology. Do they continue with this terminology or switch over to the 61850 terminology? We may need a Rosetta Stone for this translation. We may want to add this to our action list.

20. Ron – raised topic of the work of H5 - a report to the PSRC: “Common Format for IED Configuration Data”

21. Paul would like to have Juergen Holback (Chair of H5) do a presentation to this report.

22. Future topics:
   - Utility presentations
   - Comparison of the major differences between Edition 1 and 2
   - Juergen Holback (Chair of H5) do a presentation
   - Rick Liposchak, (Power Engineers) has joined the CIGRE WG and he might be able to do a presentation on what other activities are relevant (e.g. CIGRE)