Question text	Response	Follow-up 1	Follow-up 2
Regarding PRC-029 R4 documentation, can the drafting team provide examples of what engineering analysis and test results may look like in the absence of vendor documentation?	We will see if the information can be provided in the Technical Rationale of the standard. But due to the tight time schedule we might not be able to implement it anymore.	Appreciate the consideration. Including examples in the Technical Rationale will greatly assist industry. Perhaps the drafting team can consider drafting an implementation guidance for R4.	
Is there a distinction between hardware and firmware	Unfortunately the FERC allowed only exemptions for "hardware" limitations. The exemptions due to any software is not allowed! DT agrees that the software/firmware limitations are also very critical and can not be easily mitigated. To adress that point new SAR is required.		
Is it expected that PRC-029-2 is approved before PRC-029-1 compliance needs to be proven or exemptions sought? Or how these two versions expected to align?	The target of the DT is that PRC-029-2 will be effective at the same date as PRC-029-1, so that PRC.029-2 will be valid providing the excemptions		
Regarding example #2, wouldn't it possibly impact FAC-002 qualified change criteria that could require informing the PC/TP and needing re-study to be done?	Yes, it is expected that a re-study might be required, but at the end the exemption can be applied if the study shown that the requirement can not be fulfilled		
Eugen, what was the reason for not just using "by the effective date of PRC-029-1" for both the executed interconnection agreement AND the executed procurement contract? Why add the first day of the first month language to the latter? Is there a reason for this?	NERC compliance team was not happy with the date "August 28th", and wanted to have a beginning of a month as a refence date. Therefore the selected wording		
How do we handle the compliance of the IBRs with legacy inverters/WTGs (not in business anymore) with PRC-029-2?	For that IBRs the exemption can be used showing that due to the hardware limitation the requirements can not be met. For such IBRs vendor documents might not be available, so that an engineering analysis can be used.		
A central database would be great. Especially related to each OEM's equipment capability and limitations. Will help with PRC-029 R4 documentation/evidence.	Thank you for that thought. Are you already using databases like https://www.zerez.net/ as "proxies" in absence of a comparable database in North America?		
\Can German equipment certification data base used for the same equipment in the US to assess PRC-029 compliance?	Based on our EPRI analysis, the technical requirements are "close enough" to effectively use German equipment certifications to manage a large part of the risk related to conformity with IEEE 2800, and thus NERC PRC-029.	However, whether German certificates can legally be used is a question for lawyers.	Have you requested access to the German database at https://www.zerez.net/ yet? Please share any observations or concerns with us by e-mail.
For IBRs connecting to 525 kV systems, there's some concern about meeting the upper voltage thresholds. These levels exceed the 550 kV equipment rating. Is there any guidance on this, and how should it be handled? Especially important since future projects likely won't be able to rely on exceptions.	This question got answered during Q&A. In summary it's important to understand which specific equipment is experiencing these limitations and why, if this is a widespread technology limitation, potentially a new SAR can be submitted to NERC to updat PRC-029 accordingly. Anyone can submit a SAR.		
OEM engagement is the most critical piece in IBR Ride through design evaluation approach or model quality testing. Any suggestions on how this step can be made smoother for the entire industry?	If all stakeholders, including OEMs, follow the recommended practices from IEEE 2800.2-2026, conversations and coordination may become smoother. If you find errors or areas for improvement, please engage at https://site.ieee.org/pes-edpgcom-wsppidsc/working-groups-and-task-forces/		
What issues are you seeing in PPCs in regards to PRC-029?	This question got answered during Q&A. In summary, PPCs do play a meaningful role in compliance assessments with PRC-029, however often times any potential issues are annoticed during the assessment as PPCs are not accurately represented in the models. More rigor is needed to true up models and settings at commissioning. NERC Reliability Guideline daft focusing on commissioning (NERC IRPS work item #24) is currently in works and will provide good detailed guidance on that.		
Is having this Implementation Guidance endorsed by NERC likely to encourage OEMs to provide standardized information packages for each inverter make & model?	This question got answered during Q&A. In summary, it would be highly desirable. There's no reason for each GO / developer having to go to OEM for each project to get seme information abtou same make and model of the equipment there should be a way to put out a data based of equipment capabilities that GOs/developers using this equipment can access. This will reduce buden on everyone and increase consistency of informaiton		
If the model rides through as per PRC-29 how do you know that what model is showing is correct? What would make you dig deeper and ask OEMs for additional details, eg RoCOF or phase jump relay settings?	IEEE 2800.2-2026 requires thorough validation and verification of the models.	The standard library model is not able to reflect ROCOF / phase angle so that is why you would ask these questions	
We've actually already ran into that same issue where the model does not show that we recover within 1 second of a LVRT event. Is anyone else seeing this issue yet? Does anyone have any potential fixes for this?	In EMT or PDT domain? In the PDT domain I've seen it happen when the either the PPC "freeze" settings were not modeled correctly or when the REEC Vdip parameters were not setup correctly. Feel free to reach out to us (jboemer@epri.com) and we can help review your specific case. Does the post-disturbance voltage recover into the "continuous operation region" or does it get stuck and keeps the IBR in ride-through mode?	It's the PDT domain. It looks like they get stuck in their power freeze time or perhaps something with their active power ramp rate?	Ramp rate could be one possibility but I've rarely seen it be set less than 100%/s. I'd double check the Vup/Vdip, dbd1/2, Vref, and the Thld settings of the REEC model. If its ramp rate limitation, then you can play around with the dpmax/dpmin. This is usually configurable in the OEM software. Common one to check is if you have an OLTC is it modeled properly. You can also check that your OLTC is enabled if you have one, some trips are seen if OLTCs are fixed when they shouldn't be. Seems most likely to be your reec model