

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
E-mail:		
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment	
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)

Group Name: PJM

Lead Contact: Albert DiCaprio

Contact Organization: PJM

Contact Segment: 2

Contact Telephone: 610-666-8854

Contact E-mail: dicapram@pjm.com

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
Bruce Balmat	PJM	RFC	2
Joseph Willson	PJM	RFC	2
Mark Kuras	PJM	RFC	2

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: (items 1 and 4) We support the CESDT approach to ensure that each requirement in a reliability standard has an applicable measure and that if a requirement cannot be effectively measured that a note be inserted into the standard.

(item 5) With regards to duplicate requirements, we believe that the drafting team meant to say "if there is no Measure in the other standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate "requirement and associated standard". In the case where a measure exists already, we would assume that the DT would also add a note that compliance would be evaluated using standard XXX-001.

(item 2) We think the CESDT has provided a valuable service by suggesting 'types of evidence' in each measure where the requirement is silent. However, we are concerned that applying these types of 'evidence' will become de-facto requirements. By not modifying the actual requirement and clearly defining what 'evidence must be produced' in the requirement, we will continue to have inconsistency in compliance monitoring.

We suggest that until the specific requirements are revised to clearly state what is the expected performance, that the term "evidence" be defined elsewhere in the standard and not be included in the specific measures nor in the additional compliance information section.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Isn't there also a possibility that a particular requirement is not appropriate? Under the proposed process, an inappropriate standard would be de facto raised to the level of a Mandatory Reliability Standard. There should be an option in the proposed process to at least highlight the fact that a given standard/requirement may in fact be questionable BEFORE it is given a Measurement et al.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: We agree that each standard should have the same common format and sections. Section D of each standard should have the 1.1 Compliance Monitoring Responsibility; 1.2 Compliance Monitoring (Process) and Reset Time Frams; 1.3 Data retention; and 1.4 Additional Compliance Information. This information is contained in the draft COM-001 standard. However, the information shown in the yellow box above does not match this question.

Those standards which require 48 hour notification of violations are determined annually by NERC staff and the CCMC and not the drafting teams. The inclusion of which standards that need 48 hour reporting standards is a process question and not part of the actual standard. We would not want to have to repost and ballot these standards for this type of change. We suggest not including 48 hour reporting in a standard.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

3. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding the "Data Retention" periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding "Additional Compliance Information" to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the "Additional Compliance Information" each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the "Additional Compliance Information" section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: This information should be included under Section 1.2 Compliance Monitoring (Process) and Reset Time Frame.

The 'Additional Compliance Information' section should be supporting documents such as training manuals, reference documents, etc. which explain how the requirements are calculated. The draft standard COM-001 followed this format, not the one suggested in the yellow box. Another good example is Standard PER-003.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1. Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2. Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1 Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2 Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3. Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4. Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1 Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2 There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the "Levels of Non-Compliance?" If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: We agree in concept with the approach taken by the CESDT but find using this Section very confusing. Perhaps a Table showing Levels of Non-compliance versus Requirements would better show what an entity will be evaluated against. Attached is a sample to consider.

Also the footnote on page 4 states " The requirements referred to in R6 are the same as the responsibilities identified in Attachment 1-Com-001. However, the Attachment itself, lists "Violations" of the NERCnet Security Policy as the three bullets under User Accountability and Compliance and not the items listed under Responsibilities. Consistent terminology must be used. We would suggest that the measures be clear about what needs to be evaluated and not just reference the Attachment. Revise the Attachment to state "Requirements" and to remove "Violations" if that is what will be measured.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: All they state is you need to meet requirement X.

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: No Criteria is defined for a triggered investigation. Investigations are usually reserved for standards that have actions associated it and can only be measured if the event happens. Triggered Investigations need to have specific events that initiate the investigation. This standard does not have any such events and should only be evaluated using other appropriate monitoring methods.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Agree in general with levels for R1 through R5 but not R6. In order to be a user of the NERCnet system the entity must complete and submit a User Application Form to NERC. By so doing it has incorporated the Policy and therefore Level 2 can never be violated. Levels 3 and 4 are not measurable.

There is a question with regards to relative importance.

Requirement 2.2.1 is the requirement to have the physical facilities. According to the Non-Compliance element proposal - not having a facility is deemed a Level 2 non-compliance. Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.2.2 - it punishes a system at a Level 2 for not having a plan to handle the fact that they don't have one of the needed communications facilities. This too should be easy to comply with, but if a system does not comply it would seem that there is a worse risk to reliability then not having some documentation.

Non-Compliance element 2.4.1 requires that the facility be monitored. If a facility is not monitored that is deemed a Level 4 non-compliance. Following this logic, it is better to have no facility at all, then it is to have one and not monitor it.

Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.4.2 which requires "written operating instructions". Not having instructions written down is a Level 4 non-compliance - this seems to ignore a system may be following it rules exactly, but does not have the required documentation available. Which is better/worse, operationally following a set of plans but not having the documentation? or ignoring a set of plans but having the documentation? or is it not having the documentation but doing the right actions?

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

We would suggest that a more appropriate order (based on relative importance) would be as follows:

Violations of R1 = Level 4

Violations of R2 = Level 3

Violations of R3 = Level 2

Violations of R4 = Level 1

Violations of R5 = Level 4

Violations of R6 = Level 1 / Level 2

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:	Jeffrey T. Baker	
Organization:	Cinergy	
Telephone:	513-287-3368	
E-mail:	jeff.baker@cinergy.com	
NERC Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: If an entity is charged with a violation of a Requirement that is deemed to have serious implications to reliability the auditing entity should have the responsibility of informing the RRO of the violation or charge of violation. The entity charged should not be the entity to notify the RRO.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team’s modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The entity charged with a violation should not be the entity to notify the RRO of the violation. The auditing entity should have this responsibility.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:**
- Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 - Do** use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 - Do** use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 - Do** submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:**
- Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 - Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 - Do not** use quotation marks in any data field.
 - Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
E-mail:		
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)			
Group Name:	ISO/RTO Council		
Lead Contact:	Bruce Balmat		
Contact Organization:	PJM		
Contact Segment:	2		
Contact Telephone:	610-666-8860		
Contact E-mail:	balmatbm@pjm.com		
Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
Charles Yeung	SPP	SPP	2
Bill Phillips	MISO	RFC+	2
Don Tench	IESO	NPCC	2
Lisa Szot	CAISO	WECC	2
Sam Jones	ERCOT	ERCOT	2
Anita Lee	AESO	WECC	2
Mike Calimano	NYISO	NPCC	2
Pete Brandien	ISO-NE	NPCC	2
			0
			0
			0

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding "Measures" to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires 'evidence', then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective "Measure" for a requirement, a 'temporary' comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: (items 1 and 4) We support the CESDT approach to ensure that each requirement in a reliability standard has an applicable measure and that if a requirement cannot be effectively measured that a note be inserted into the standard. We fully agree that there needs to be at least one measure for each requirement. Given that to be the case, we suggest that the requirement number to which the measure applies be included.

(item 5) With regards to duplicate requirements, we believe that the drafting team meant to say "if there is no Measure in the other standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate "requirement and associated standard". In the case where a measure exists already, we would assume that the DT would also add a note that compliance would be evaluated using standard XXX-001.

(item 2) We think the CESDT has provided a valuable service by suggesting 'types of evidence' in each measure where the requirement is silent. However, we are concerned that applying these types of 'evidence' will become de-facto requirements. By not modifying the actual requirement and clearly defining what 'evidence must be produced' in the requirement, we will continue to have inconsistency in compliance monitoring.

We suggest that until the specific requirements are revised to clearly state what is the expected performance, that the term "evidence" be defined elsewhere in the standard

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

and not be included in the specific measures nor in the additional compliance information section.

Isn't there also a possibility that a particular requirement is not appropriate? Under the proposed process, an inappropriate standard would be de facto raised to the level of a Mandatory Reliability Standard. There should be an option in the proposed process to at least highlight the fact that a given standard/requirement may in fact be questionable BEFORE it is given a Measurement et al.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: We agree that each standard should have the same common format and sections. Section D of each standard should have the 1.1 Compliance Monitoring Responsibility; 1.2 Compliance Monitoring (Process) and Reset Time Frames; 1.3 Data retention; and 1.4 Additional Compliance Information. This information is contained in the draft COM-001 standard. However, the information shown in the yellow box above does not match this question.

While we agree that reporting of a requirement violation can be useful for need-to-know information, record and follow up action purposes, we do not agree that there is any urgency to report within the prescribed time periods. Note that any corrective actions to remedy the adverse impacts of a violation, if any, would be directed by the concerned reliability functional entities. Under such situation, these entities' priority would be to mitigate, contain and minimize the adverse impacts. Reporting to the RRO and NERC should be placed at a slightly lower priority. Additionally, the term "deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System" needs to be defined and that would require some time for obtaining industry consensus. Providing the missing measures and compliance elements at this time should have higher priority than introducing elements that may not add much value to the standard development process. If such reporting requirements are needed, they are best introduced as requirements in the appropriate standards at their future revisions.

Those standards which require 48 hour notification of violations are determined annually by NERC staff and the CCMC and not the drafting teams. The inclusion of which standards that need 48 hour reporting standards is a process question and not part of the actual standard. We would not want to have to repost and ballot these standards for this type of change. We suggest not including 48 hour reporting in a standard.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: We generally agree with the proposed retention periods but would suggest that an exception also be made for the "one of" audit or certification process, e.g. entity certification which is a one-time, initial process for which the data retention period should be much shorter.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Yes

No

Comments: This information should be included under Section 1.2 Compliance Monitoring (Process) and Reset Time Frame.

The 'Additional Compliance Information' section should be supporting documents such as training manuals, reference documents, etc. which explain how the requirements are calculated. The draft standard COM-001 followed this format, not the one suggested in the yellow box. Another good example is Standard PER-003.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1. Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2. Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1 Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2 Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3. Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4. Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1 Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2 There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the "Levels of Non-Compliance?" If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: The Level 1 non-compliance appears to be applicable for a very small group of entities which may give rise to the perception of discrimination.

We agree in concept with the approach taken by the CESDT but find using this Section very confusing. Perhaps a Table showing Levels of Non-compliance versus Requirements would better show what an entity will be evaluated against.

Also the footnote on page 4 states " The requirements referred to in R6 are the same as the responsibilities identified in Attachment 1-Com-001. However, the Attachment itself, lists "Violations" of the NERCnet Security Policy as the three bullets under User Accountability and Compliance and not the items listed under Responsibilities. Consistent terminology must be used. We would suggest that the measures be clear about what needs to be evaluated and not just reference the Attachment. Revise the Attachment to state "Requirements" and to remove "Violations" if that is what will be measured.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: All they state is you need to meet requirement X.

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: (1) While this may be applicable for US jurisdictional entities, the Compliance monitoring process must also adhere to the Compliance framework(s) that will be established for Canadian Entities. Would suggest inclusion of "... as established by delegation agreements with the ERO or by the MOU with governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico as applicable..."

(2) While we agree with the data retention requirements, we believe a generic retention period be specified for all standards and it be referenced. Only include specific retention periods in individual standard when they need to deviate from the generic retention period.

(3) No Criteria is defined for a triggered investigation. Investigations are usually reserved for standards that have actions associated it and can only be measured if the event happens. Triggered Investigations need to have specific events that initiate the investigation. This standard does not have any such events and should only be evaluated using other appropriate monitoring methods.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Agree in general with levels for R1 through R5 but not R6. In order to be a user of the NERCnet system the entity must complete and submit a User Application Form to NERC. By so doing it has incorporated the Policy and therefore Level 2 can never be violated. Levels 3 and 4 are not measurable.

There is a question with regards to relative importance.

Requirement 2.2.1 is the requirement to have the physical facilities. According to the Non-Compliance element proposal - not having a facility is deemed a Level 2 non-compliance. Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.2.2 - it punishes a system at a Level 2 for not having a plan to handle the fact that they don't have one of the needed communications facilities. This too should be easy to comply with, but if a system does

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

not comply it would seem that there is a worse risk to reliability then not having some documentation.

Non-Compliance element 2.4.1 requires that the facility be monitored. If a facility is not monitored that is deemed a Level 4 non-compliance. Following this logic, it is better to have no facility at all, then it is to have one and not monitor it.

Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.4.2 which requires "written operating instructions". Not having instructions written down is a Level 4 non-compliance - this seems to ignore a system may be following it rules exactly, but does not have the required documentation available. Which is better/worse, operationally following a set of plans but not having the documentation? or ignoring a set of plans but having the documentation? or is it not having the documentation but doing the right actions? We would suggest that a more appropriate order (based on relative importance) would be as follows:

Violations of R1 = Level 4

Violations of R2 = Level 3

Violations of R3 = Level 2

Violations of R4 = Level 1

Violations of R5 = Level 4

Violations of R6 = Level 1 / Level 2

Also See our response to Q5 on Level 1 non-compliance.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: On the standard itself, please note the missing word in "facilities FOR the exchange" in R1 of Section B.

Also, the IRC believes that the drafting team should carefully consider whether it is appropriate to force a multitude of new compliance measures on the industry for review right now, with all the ERO activities consuming peoples attention. The IRC would like to see a measured approach to developing the missing compliance elements rather than a bulk cut-and-paste approach for the remaining 21 standards.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information	
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)	
Name:	Ron Falsetti
Organization:	IESO
Telephone:	905-855-6187
E-mail:	ron.falsetti@ieso.ca
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 — Load-serving Entities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: We generally support the CESDT approach noted and further suggest the requirement number to which the measure applies be included in each measure.

While we believe the CESDT provided a valuable service by suggesting 'types of evidence' in the measures where the requirement is silent, we are concerned that by doing so, these types of 'evidence' become de-facto requirements. By not modifying the actual requirement and clearly defining what 'evidence must be produced' in the requirement, we will continue to have inconsistency in compliance monitoring.

We also share the view the possibility exists where an existing requirement may be inappropriate. There should be an option in the proposed process to highlight this fact that a given standard/ requirement may in fact be questionable BEFORE it is given a Measurement at all.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

We agree that each standard should have the same common format and sections. However, the information shown in the yellow box above does not match this question.

While we agree that reporting of a violation can be useful for event driven, need-to-know information, record and follow up action purposes, we do not agree that there is urgency to report within the prescribed time periods noted in the yellow box.

Requirements which require 48 hour notification of violations should be determined annually as they are now by the CCMC and approved by the BOT, not the drafting teams. The determination of which standards need 48 hour reporting is a process question and should not be part of the actual standard. We would not want to have to repost and ballot these standards for this type of change. We suggest excluding reference to 48 hour reporting in a standard.

Moreover, the term "deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System" needs to be defined and that would require some time for obtaining industry consensus. Providing the missing measures and compliance elements at this time should be priority, rather than introducing elements that may not add much value to the standard development process.

If such reporting requirements are needed, they are best introduced as requirements in the appropriate standards at their future revisions.

Note that any corrective actions to remedy the adverse impacts of a violation, if any, would be directed by the concerned reliability functional entities. Under such situation, these entities' priority would be to mitigate, contain and minimize the adverse impacts.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: While we agree with the data retention requirements, we believe a generic retention period be specified for all standards and it be referenced. Only include retention period exceptions in individual standard when they need to deviate form the generic retention period; such as the "one of" audit or certification process, e.g. entity certification which is a one-time, initial process for which the data retention period should be much shorter.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: This information should be included under Section 1.2 Compliance Monitoring (Process) and Reset Time Frame.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: The Level 1 non-compliance appears to be applicable for a very small group of entities which may give rise to the perception of discrimination.

We agree in concept with the approach taken by the CESDT but find using this Section very confusing. Perhaps a Table showing Levels of Non-compliance versus Requirements would better show what an entity will be evaluated against.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 — Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: (1) While this may be applicable for US jurisdictional entities, the Compliance monitoring process must also adhere to the Compliance framework(s) that will be established for Canadian Entities. Would suggest inclusion of "... as established by delegation agreements with the ERO or by the MOU with governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico as applicable..."

(2) No Criteria is defined for a triggered an investigation. Investigations are usually reserved for standards that have actions associated it and can only be measured if the event happens. Triggered Investigations need to have specific events that initiate the investigation. This standard does not have any such events and should only be evaluated using other appropriate monitoring methods.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Agree in general with levels for R1 through R5 (See response to Q5 on Level 1 non-compliance) but not R6. In order to be a user of the NERCnet system the entity must complete and submit a User Application Form to NERC. By so doing it has incorporated the Policy and therefore Level 2 can never be violated. Levels 3 and 4 are not measurable.

There is also a question with regards to relative importance.

Requirement 2.2.1 is the requirement to have the physical facilities. According to the Non-Compliance element proposal - not having a facility is deemed Level 2 non-compliance. Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.2.2 - it assesses a system at Level 2 for not having a plan to handle the fact that they don't have one of the needed communications facilities. This too should be easy to comply with, but if a system does not comply it would seem that there is a more significant risk to reliability then not having some documentation.

Non-Compliance element 2.4.1 requires that the facility be monitored. If a facility is not monitored that is deemed Level 4 non-compliance. Following this logic, it is better to have no facility at all, which is Level 2, than it is to have one and not monitor it.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.4.2 which requires "written operating instructions". Not having instructions written down is Level 4 non-compliance - this seems to ignore a system may be following it rules exactly, but does not have the required documentation available. Which is better/worse, operationally following a set of plans but not having the documentation? or ignoring a set of plans but having the documentation? or is it not having the documentation but doing the right actions? We would suggest that a more appropriate order (based on relative importance) would be as follows:

Violations of R1 = Level 4

Violations of R2 = Level 3

Violations of R3 = Level 2

Violations of R4 = Level 1

Violations of R5 = Level 4

Violations of R6 = Level 1 / Level 2

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: On the standard itself, please note the missing word "FOR" in R1 of Section B. It should read "facilities FOR the exchange"

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:	Kathleen A. Davis	
Organization:	Tennessee Valley Authority	
Telephone:	423-751-8023	
E-mail:	kadavis@tva.gov	
NERC Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact E-mail:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team’s modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information	
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)	
Name:	John Horakh, 03-10-2006
Organization:	MAAC
Telephone:	609-625-6014
E-mail:	john.horakh@pepcoholdings.com
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact E-mail:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: For point number 5 above, it is not clear how the duplicate Requirement in the other Standard will be eliminated. The footnote alone will not do this.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: "Serious implications" is a judgement call. Will the CESDT make this judgement on their own, or will they seek guidance from the industry?

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The heading "Additional Compliance Information" does not seem to be the correct location for this information, it should be stated earlier. For point 4 above (Triggered Investigations), "up to 30 days notice" does not seem appropriate, since it would allow zero notice.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team’s modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:**
- Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 - Do** use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 - Do** use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 - Do** submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:**
- Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 - Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 - Do not** use quotation marks in any data field.
 - Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
E-mail:		
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)			
Group Name:	Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO)		
Lead Contact:	Alan Boesch		
Contact Organization:	MRO (NPPD)		
Contact Segment:	2		
Contact Telephone:	420-845-5210		
Contact E-mail:	agboesc@nppd.com		
Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
Terry Bilke	MISO	MRO	2
Robert Coish	MHEB	MRO	2
Dennis Florom	LES	MRO	2
Ken Goldsmith	Alliant Energy	MRO	2
Todd Gosnell	OPPD	MRO	2
Wayne Guttormson	SPC	MRO	2
Jim Maenner	WPSC	MRO	2
Darrick Moe, Chair	WAPA	MRO	2
Pam Oreschnick	XEL	MRO	2
Dave Rudolph	BEPC	MRO	2
Tom Mielnik	MEC	MRO	2
Dick Pursley	GRE	MRO	2
Joe Knight, Secretary	MRO	MRO	2
27 Additional MRO Members	Companies not named above	MRO	2

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Many standards including COM-001-1 have vague requirements. Requirements should have explicitly stated technical, performance, or preparedness requirements. Each requirement should identify who is responsible and what action is to be performed or what outcome is to be achieved. Any requirement that falls short of this threshold should be placed in a reference document. If the same or a similar requirement exists in another standard the requirements should be consolidated into one requirement in one standard. Based on the proposed measures for COM-001-1 it appears that the drafting team is attempting to compensate for the lack of clarity in the requirements by adding requirements in the measures. This practice is not consistent with the NERC standards process manual and is not an acceptable practice. NERC has a window of opportunity to clarify requirements in standards. Failure to clarify requirements will leave the requirements subject to interpretation of auditors. With the introduction of penalties, standard requirements need to be clear so the entities that are subject to the audits know what needs to be done to meet the requirements of the standard.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: There is no reset time frame discussed in the approach. EOP-004-0 Disturbance Reporting already addresses reporting disturbances and unusual events within 24 hours regardless of the connection of the event with a violation of a standard requirement. Any other 24 hour or 48 hour reporting would be an administrative burden and would not add any value to the reliable operation of the Bulk Electric System.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Comments: Data retention should be specific to each standard. Some standards such as INT-001-0 require a large volume of operational data. Data retention should be sufficient to measure compliance with the standards. Four years of data is excessive and provides no benefit to reliable operation of the Bulk Electric System.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: In item 4, the potential exists where, depending on the severity of an event, the information and/or data required for an investigation may take more than 30 days to gather. It is recommended to add language where requests can be made for an extension.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: Level 4 non-compliance should not be associated with lack of documentation. Level 4 non-compliance should be restricted to actions or lack of action that lead to serious operational issues of the Bulk Electric System. Administrative issues such as lack of procedures should be limited to level one or two.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team’s modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Measure 1 is just a vague as requirement 1. What is the definition of adequate facilities? Measure/Requirement 2 does not specify a frequency for testing. What is the definition of a vital communication facility? Measurement 3- It is hard to tell if this is a good measure because the intent of the requirement is not known. Measure 4- This requirement should focus on results. We would suggest that this requirement be added to a reference document. Measure 5 is good as it exists. Measure/Requirement 6 should be incorporated into the Cyber Security Standard.

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Four years of evidence is excessive. The amount of data available should be specific to each standard.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Level 4 non-compliance should not be associated with lack of documentation. Level 4 non-compliance should be restricted to actions or lack of action that lead to serious operational issues of the Bulk Electric System. Administrative issues such as lack of procedures should be limited to level one or two.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: We appreciate the effort that the drafting team is putting into the development of measures and compliance elements, however we would recommend that the first step to creating measures and compliance elements would be identification of clear unambiguous requirements. Anything short of that goal will lead to confusion and conflicts. The standard drafting team should identify all of the requirements that lack clarity and other requirements that are not requirements but guidelines or permissive statements. The requirements that lack clarity should be clarified. The requirements that are guidelines or permissive statements should be moved to other documents, such as a reference document.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information	
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)	
Name:	Michael Calimano
Organization:	New York Independent System Operator
Telephone:	518-356-6129
E-mail:	mcalimano@nyiso.com
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 — Load-serving Entities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: (items 1 and 4) The NYISO supports the CESDT approach to ensure that each requirement in a reliability standard has an applicable measure and that if a requirement cannot be effectively measured that a note be inserted into the standard. We fully agree that there needs to be at least one measure for each requirement. Given that to be the case, we suggest that the requirement number to which the measure applies be included.

(item 5) With regards to duplicate requirements, we believe that the drafting team meant to say "if there is no Measure in the other standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate "requirement and associated standard". In the case where a measure exists already, we would assume that the DT would also add a note that compliance would be evaluated using standard XXX-001.

(item 2) We think the CESDT has provided a valuable service by suggesting 'types of evidence' in each measure where the requirement is silent. However, we are concerned that applying these types of 'evidence' will become de-facto requirements. By not modifying the actual requirement and clearly defining what 'evidence must be produced' in the requirement, we will continue to have inconsistency in compliance monitoring.

We suggest that until the specific requirements are revised to clearly state what is the expected performance, that the term "evidence" be defined elsewhere in the standard

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

and not be included in the specific measures nor in the additional compliance information section.

Isn't there also a possibility that a particular requirement is not appropriate? Under the proposed process, an inappropriate standard would be de facto raised to the level of a Mandatory Reliability Standard. There should be an option in the proposed process to at least highlight the fact that a given standard/requirement may in fact be questionable BEFORE it is given a Measurement et al.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The NYISO agrees that each standard should have the same common format and sections. However, the information shown in the yellow box above does not match this question..

While we agree that reporting of a requirement violation can be useful for need-to-know information, record and follow up action purposes, we do not agree that there is any urgency to report within the prescribed time periods. Note that any corrective actions to remedy the adverse impacts of a violation, if any, would be directed by the concerned reliability functional entities. Under such situation, these entities' priority would be to mitigate, contain and minimize the adverse impacts. Reporting to the RRO and NERC should be placed at a slightly lower priority. Additionally, the term "deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System" needs to be defined and that would require some time for obtaining industry consensus. Providing the missing measures and compliance elements at this time should have higher priority than introducing elements that may not add much value to the standard development process. If such reporting requirements are needed, they are best introduced as requirements in the appropriate standards at their future revisions.

Those standards which require 48 hour notification of violations are determined annually by NERC staff and the CCMC and not the drafting teams. The inclusion of which standards that need 48 hour reporting standards is a process question and not part of the actual standard. We would not want to have to repost and ballot these standards for this type of change. We suggest not including 48 hour reporting in a standard.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The NYISO generally agrees with the proposed retention periods but would suggest that an exception also be made for the "one of" audit or certification process, e.g. entity certification which is a one-time, initial process for which the data retention period should be much shorter.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Yes

No

Comments: The NYISO proposes that this information should be included under Section 1.2 Compliance Monitoring (Process) and Reset Time Frame.

The 'Additional Compliance Information' section should be supporting documents such as training manuals, reference documents, etc. which explain how the requirements are calculated. The draft standard COM-001 followed this format, not the one suggested in the yellow box. Another good example is Standard PER-003.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1. Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2. Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1 Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2 Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3. Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4. Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1 Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2 There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the "Levels of Non-Compliance?" If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: The Level 1 non-compliance appears to be applicable for a very small group of entities which may give rise to the perception of discrimination.

The NYISO agrees in concept with the approach taken by the CESDT but find using this Section very confusing. Perhaps a Table showing Levels of Non-compliance versus Requirements would better show what an entity will be evaluated against.

Also the footnote on page 4 states " The requirements referred to in R6 are the same as the responsibilities identified in Attachment 1-Com-001. However, the Attachment itself, lists "Violations" of the NERCnet Security Policy as the three bullets under User Accountability and Compliance and not the items listed under Responsibilities. Consistent terminology must be used. We would suggest that the measures be clear about what needs to be evaluated and not just reference the Attachment. Revise the Attachment to state "Requirements" and to remove "Violations" if that is what will be measured.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: All they state is you need to meet requirement X.

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: (1) While this may be applicable for US jurisdictional entities, the Compliance monitoring process must also adhere to the Compliance framework(s) that will be established for Canadian Entities. Would suggest inclusion of "... as established by delegation agreements with the ERO or by the MOU with governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico as applicable..."

(2) While we agree with the data retention requirements, we believe a generic retention period be specified for all standards and it be referenced. Only include specific retention periods in individual standard when they need to deviate from the generic retention period.

(3) No Criteria is defined for a triggered investigation. Investigations are usually reserved for standards that have actions associated it and can only be measured if the event happens. Triggered Investigations need to have specific events that initiate the investigation. This standard does not have any such events and should only be evaluated using other appropriate monitoring methods.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Agree in general with levels for R1 through R5 but not R6. In order to be a user of the NERCnet system the entity must complete and submit a User Application Form to NERC. By so doing it has incorporated the Policy and therefore Level 2 can never be violated. Levels 3 and 4 are not measurable.

There is a question with regards to relative importance.

Requirement 2.2.1 is the requirement to have the physical facilities. According to the Non-Compliance element proposal - not having a facility is deemed a Level 2 non-compliance. Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.2.2 - it punishes a system at a Level 2 for not having a plan to handle the fact that they don't have one of the needed communications facilities. This too should be easy to comply with, but if a system does

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

not comply it would seem that there is a worse risk to reliability then not having some documentation.

Non-Compliance element 2.4.1 requires that the facility be monitored. If a facility is not monitored that is deemed a Level 4 non-compliance. Following this logic, it is better to have no facility at all, then it is to have one and not monitor it.

Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.4.2 which requires "written operating instructions". Not having instructions written down is a Level 4 non-compliance - this seems to ignore a system may be following it rules exactly, but does not have the required documentation available. Which is better/worse, operationally following a set of plans but not having the documentation? or ignoring a set of plans but having the documentation? or is it not having the documentation but doing the right actions? We would suggest that a more appropriate order (based on relative importance) would be as follows:

Violations of R1 = Level 4

Violations of R2 = Level 3

Violations of R3 = Level 2

Violations of R4 = Level 1

Violations of R5 = Level 4

Violations of R6 = Level 1 / Level 2

Also See our response to Q5 on Level 1 non-compliance.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: On the standard itself, please note the missing word in "facilities FOR the exchange" in R1 of Section B.

Also, the NYISO supports other industry comments that suggests that the drafting team should carefully consider whether it is appropriate to force a multitude of new compliance measures on the industry for review right now, with all the ERO activities consuming peoples attention. The NYISO would like to see a measured approach to developing the missing compliance elements rather than a bulk cut-and-paste approach for the remaining 21 standards.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:**
- Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 - Do** use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 - Do** use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 - Do** submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:**
- Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 - Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 - Do not** use quotation marks in any data field.
 - Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
E-mail:		
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment	
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)

Group Name: NPCC CP9, Reliability Standards Working Group
Lead Contact: Guy V. Zito
Contact Organization: NPCC
Contact Segment: 2
Contact Telephone: 212-840-1070
Contact E-mail: gzito@npcc.org

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
Ralph Rufrano	New York Power Authority	NPCC	1
David Little	Nova Scotia Power	NPCC	1
Alden Briggs	New Brunswick ISO	NPCC	2
Ron Falsetti	IESO	NPCC	2
Peter Lebro	National Grid	NPCC	1
David Kiguel	Hydro One Networks	NPCC	1
Bill Shemley	ISO-New England	NPCC	2
Guy V. Zito	Northeast Power Cor. Council	NPPC	2
Al Adamson	New York State Rel. Council	NPCC	2
Shashi Parekh	Mass. Dept of Tele. and Energy	NPCC	9
Greg Campoli	NYISO	NPCC	2
Kathleen Goodman	ISO-NE	NPCC	2

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: NPCC participating members generally support the CESDT approach noted and further suggest the requirement number to which the measure applies be included in each measure.

While we believe the CESDT provided a valuable service by suggesting 'types of evidence' in the measures where the requirement is silent, we are concerned that by doing so, these types of 'evidence' become de-facto requirements. By not modifying the actual requirement and clearly defining what 'evidence must be produced' in the requirement, we will continue to have inconsistency in compliance monitoring.

We further suggest that until the specific requirements are revised to clearly state what is the expected performance, that the term "evidence" be defined elsewhere in the standard and not be included in the specific measures nor in the additional compliance information section.

We also share the view the possibility exists where an existing requirement may be inappropriate. There should be an option in the proposed process to highlight this fact that a given standard/ requirement may in fact be questionable BEFORE it is given a Measurement at all.

With regards to item 5 - duplicate requirements, we believe that the drafting team meant to say "if there is no Measure in the other standard, the CESDT will develop a

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate "requirement and associated standard".

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: NPCC participating members agree that each standard should have the same common format and sections. However, the information shown in the yellow box above does not match this question.

While we agree that reporting of a violation can be useful for event driven, need-to-know information, record and follow up action purposes, we do not agree that there is urgency to report within the prescribed time periods noted in the yellow box.

Requirements which require 48 hour notification of violations should be determined annually as they are now by the CCMC and approved by the BOT, not the drafting teams. The determination of which standards need 48 hour reporting is a process question and should not be part of the actual standard. We would not want to have to repost and ballot these standards for this type of change. We suggest excluding reference to 48 hour reporting in a standard.

Moreover, the term "deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System" needs to be defined and that would require some time for obtaining industry consensus. Providing the missing measures and compliance elements at this time should be priority, rather than introducing elements that may not add much value to the standard development process.

If such reporting requirements are needed, they are best introduced as requirements in the appropriate standards at their future revisions.

Note that any corrective actions to remedy the adverse impacts of a violation, if any, would be directed by the concerned reliability functional entities. Under such situation, these entities' priority would be to mitigate, contain and minimize the adverse impacts.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: While NPCC participating members agree with the data retention requirements, we believe a generic retention period be specified for all standards and it be referenced. Only include retention period exceptions in individual standard when they need to deviate form the generic retention period; such as the "one of" audit or certification process, e.g. entity certification which is a one-time, initial process for which the data retention period should be much shorter.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: This information should be included under Section 1.2 Compliance Monitoring (Process) and Reset Time Frame.

The 'Additional Compliance Information' section should be supporting documents such as training manuals, reference documents, etc. which explain how the requirements are calculated. Draft standard COM-001 followed this format, not the one suggested in the yellow box above. Another good example is Standard PER-003.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1. Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2. Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1 Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2 Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3. Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4. Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1 Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2 There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the "Levels of Non-Compliance?" If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: The Level 1 non-compliance appears to be applicable for a very small group of entities which may give rise to the perception of discrimination.

NPCC participating members agree in concept with the approach taken by the CESDT but find using this Section very confusing. Perhaps a Table showing Levels of Non-compliance versus Requirements would better show what an entity will be evaluated against.

Also the footnote on page 4 states "The requirements referred to in R6 are the same as the responsibilities identified in Attachment 1-Com-001. However, the Attachment itself, lists "Violations" of the NERCnet Security Policy as the three bullets under User Accountability and Compliance and not the items listed under Responsibilities. Consistent terminology must be used. We would suggest that the measures be clear about what needs to be evaluated and not just reference the Attachment. Revise the Attachment to state "Requirements" and to remove "Violations" if that is what will be measured..

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: NPCC participating members agree "Yes", However, it is unclear what addition value they provide since all they state is you need to meet requirement X.

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: NPCC participating members believe;

(1) While this may be applicable for US jurisdictional entities, the Compliance monitoring process must also adhere to the Compliance framework(s) that will be established for Canadian Entities. Would suggest inclusion of "... as established by delegation agreements with the ERO or by the MOU with governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico as applicable..."

(2) No Criteria is defined for a triggered an investigation. Investigations are usually reserved for standards that have actions associated it and can only be measured if the event happens. Triggered Investigations need to have specific events that initiate the investigation. This standard does not have any such events and should only be evaluated using other appropriate monitoring methods.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: NPCC participating members agree in general with levels for R1 through R5 but not R6. In order to be a user of the NERCnet system the entity must complete and submit a User Application Form to NERC. By so doing it has incorporated the Policy and therefore Level 2 can never be violated. Levels 3 and 4 are not measurable.

There is a question with regards to relative importance.

Requirement 2.2.1 is the requirement to have the physical facilities. According to the Non-Compliance element proposal - not having a facility is deemed Level 2 non-compliance. Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.2.2 - it assesses a system at Level 2 for not having a plan to handle the fact that they don't have one of the needed communications facilities. This too should be easy to comply with, but if a system does not comply it would seem that there is a more significant risk to reliability then not having some documentation.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Non-Compliance element 2.4.1 requires that the facility be monitored. If a facility is not monitored that is deemed Level 4 non-compliance. Following this logic, it is better to have no facility at all, which is Level 2, than it is to have one and not monitor it.

Similarly with Non-Compliance element 2.4.2 which requires "written operating instructions". Not having instructions written down is Level 4 non-compliance - this seems to ignore a system may be following it rules exactly, but does not have the required documentation available. Which is better/worse, operationally following a set of plans but not having the documentation? or ignoring a set of plans but having the documentation? or is it not having the documentation but doing the right actions? We would suggest that a more appropriate order (based on relative importance) would be as follows:

Violations of R1 = Level 4

Violations of R2 = Level 3

Violations of R3 = Level 2

Violations of R4 = Level 1

Violations of R5 = Level 4

Violations of R6 = Level 1 / Level 2

Also See our response to Q5 on Level 1 non-compliance

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: On the standard itself, please note the missing word "FOR" in R1 of Section B. It should read "facilities FOR the exchange"

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:**
- Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 - Do** use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 - Do** use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 - Do** submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:**
- Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 - Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 - Do not** use quotation marks in any data field.
 - Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:	James H. Sorrels, Jr.	
Organization:	American Electric Power	
Telephone:	(614) 716-2370	
E-mail:	jhsorrels@aep.com	
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact E-mail:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1. Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2. Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1 Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2 Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3. Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4. Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1 Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2 There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: We agree with the concept of a separate finding of non-compliance for each of several different infractions within the same standard. However, how does this concept play out in the determination of fines? For example, above, if an entity is found level 2 non-compliant to both 2.2.1 and 2.2.2, are both treated as a first offense and thus the entity just receives a letter? Or is it viewed as two violations during an occurrence period, and thus they receive a financial penalty too? (2nd occurrence of a level 2 under the NERC Field test resulted in simulated financial penalty). We suggest that both be treated as first offense. Further, if it is deemed that violations of multiple Standard Requirements do deserve a financial penalty, then the levels of non-compliance should be written to be progressive similar to that in EOP-001-0.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Why does the Team believe it is a more serious offense (level 4 vs level 2) to not actively monitor or alarm telecommunications systems (2.4.1) then to not have adequate telecommunications systems at all (2.2.1)? It would seem that not having adequate facilities should be a worse offense than not monitoring those adequate facilities.

It would also seem that not having written operating instructions to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecom. facilities (2.4.2), which is a contingency situation, is a lesser offense than not having adequate telecom facilities (2.2.1) for the exchange of data during real-time for non-contingency or contingency situations. Also, how is 2.4.2 more serious than having an operator that tries to communicate in real-time in a language other than English (unless both parties already agreed to converse in another language) (2.1), which is only a level 1 violation? Sure hope they were not trying to communicate that their system was about to collapse and they needed immediate assistance.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: The Team has an unenviable task. The main reason these 22 Standards do not have measures and compliance elements is that the requirements for these Standards are fairly vague. To add the measures and compliance elements without re-writing the Requirements to be more "crisp", will require that the measures be fairly broad, which the Team did with COM-001-1.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:**
- Do enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 - Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 - Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 - Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:**
- Do not insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 - Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 - Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 - Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
E-mail:		
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: 2. Examples of evidence should be clearly labelled as "Typical" and should in no way prohibit the introduction of other types of evidence based on electronic data storage or other technologically advanced forms or evidence that may be developed. They should also be applied to groups of requirements/measures where feasible to avoid needless (and silly looking) repetition in lists of similar measures (such as the measures in COM-001).

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: In our opinion, the determination of "serious implications" should not be made by the CESDT alone or by the CCMC, but must be determined through the ANSI approved standards development process by a team of industry experts following standardized guidelines such as those that are currently being developed by Dave Hilt.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Operational performance measures generally fall within the relm of no. 2 above. In our opinion, such "real time" measures should be kept for the current year

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

plus one previous year. That is, on Dec.31 you would have two years of data. On Jan. 1, you would have one year (the previous year) of data.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Performance measures are reported periodically based on specific operational data. We are not sure if the 22 Ver. 0 standards include any such requirements.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the "Levels of Non-Compliance?" If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: In our opinion, the determination of "most critical" requirements should not be made by the CESDT alone or by the CCMC, but must be determined through the ANSI approved standards development process by a team of industry experts following standardized guidelines such as those that are currently being developed by Dave Hilt.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The idea of using examples of acceptable evidence of meeting the measures sound good in abstract terms, but looks somewhat ridiculous when written down on paper as in COM-001-1. We suggest that standard examples of acceptable evidence be grouped together and utilized once for similar sets of requirements.

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: D1.2 uses complete sentences while D1.1 does not. In our opinion, complete sentences should be used to clarify intent. Whichever is used, it should probably be standardized throughout.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: When there are multiple bullets under a single level of non-compliance, it should be explicitly stated that an entity is subject to multiple separate penalties if each of the bullets are violated, if that is your intention. If not, you should state that there is just one penalty.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: Will all 22 standards be sent to the industry for comments separately or will they be individually published? We suggest that they be sent individually to allow ample time for due process.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:**
- Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 - Do** use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 - Do** use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 - Do** submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:**
- Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 - Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 - Do not** use quotation marks in any data field.
 - Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:	William J. Smith	
Organization:	Allegheny Power	
Telephone:	(724) 838-6552	
E-mail:	wsmith1@alleghenypower.com	
NERC Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact E-mail:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team’s modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: No additional comments.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:	Jason Shaver	
Organization:	American Transmission Company LLC	
Telephone:	262 506 6885	
E-mail:	jshaver@atcllc.com	
NERC Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: In general ATC is in agreement with the CESDT approach to adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards referenced; however, ATC has a few concerns regarding the details of the approach.

ATC appreciates the CESDT's assistance in providing "examples" of evidence. If the "examples" are intended to be demonstrative but not exhaustive, the standard should explicitly state that other forms of "evidence" demonstrating an organization's compliance with the standard will also be allowed.

If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, ATC suggests that the industry be allowed to vote to remove the requirement from the Standard. It is inconceivable to hold the industry to a requirement that has no ability to be measured.

ATC believes that Item 5 requires clarification. In terms of, "a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure," ATC recommends the CESDT review each of the 22 Version 0 Standards and determine whether or not a standard or requirement is a duplicate of any other standard or requirement. If it is a duplicate, one or the other requirement should be deleted to avoid potential confusion and potential conflicts between standards. For example, if the requirements under COM-001 duplicate those under the Cyber Security Standard, ATC recommends that the CESDT eliminate the duplicate requirements by eliminating one of the requirements.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: In general, ATC supports the CESDT’s approach to adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards; however, “serious implications with regard to reliability of the Bulk Electric System” needs to be defined.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Comments: The CESDT has not identified the data retention period for a requirement/measure that will only be audited when triggered by an investigation. Please see ATC's comment to question 7.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: The example provided is too specific to determine the general approach of CESDT. Overall, ATC believes that when determining levels of non-compliance for a specific standard, the infraction should be considered in terms of impact to the reliability of the Bulk Electric System. ATC recommends that the CESDT create the appropriate levels of non-compliance for each standard with an eye toward consistency across standards such that Level 4 Non-Compliance items have similar levels of impact on the reliability of the Bulk Electric System. In other words, depending upon the requirement, there may not be a violation significant enough to warrant a Level 4 Non-Compliance liability. CESDT should review the levels of non-compliance for each measure relative to the level of non-compliance for all other measures (in all other standards) to determine the appropriate Non-Compliance Level; particularly if NERC is going to be utilizing the NERC Levels of Non-Compliance in a comparative fashion across standards and functional entities as a benchmark as to the severity of non-compliance.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team's modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Please clarify what the standard means by the word "telecommunication." Does this refer to voice, data or both?

Has the Standard Drafting Team reviewed the Cyber Security Standards in terms of duplicate efforts? ATC proposes that the CESDT review items having potential overlap and either clarify them as being distinctly separate or deleting them as duplicative where appropriate. ATC did not see a clear distinction between COM-001 and the Cyber Security standards.

In addition, ATC requests the CESDT to clarify Requirement 4 as it seems to be a duplicate of Standard EOP-005-1, Requirement 5: "Each Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority shall periodically test its telecommunications facilities needed to implement the restoration plan."

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The Compliance section has conflicting intentions.

R4 and R6 are triggered investigation events for which the RRO must notify the entity within 60 days of the event. Therefore, ATC proposes that the data retention requirement for R4 and R6 be 60 days. ATC is concerned with the following statement: "If the measure does not define a specific retention requirement for evidence,.....shall keep evidence for compliance for four rolling years."

ATC is concerned that a data retention requirement of "four rolling years" would be unduly burdensome for a measure that is only audited when an investigation is triggered. Most of the industry does not have a four year retention policy for electronic communication, i.e. e-mails.

ATC requests that the SDT review these conflicting statements and provide additional clarity to the standard. ATC supports a 60-day retention policy on R4 and R6.

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: When looking at non-compliance levels, is the CESDT determining the level of non-compliance solely in terms of a single standard and the worst violation that could occur under that standard, or is the CESDT looking at all of the NERC Standards and

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

determining the appropriate level of non-compliance based upon the severity of a violation in terms of all of the NERC standards? By looking at all of the items that are grouped into a non-compliance level, the SDT may achieve greater consensus within the industry when proposing the level for this standard.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven't already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:** **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:** **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:	Maurice Casadaban	
Organization:	Entergy Transmission	
Telephone:	601 339 2612	
E-mail:	mcasada@entergy.com	
NERC Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Measures” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires ‘evidence’, then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective “Measure” for a requirement, a ‘temporary’ comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Item 2 above. The wording used in the Measures is unclear. There are two problems; 1) It may still allow an auditor to require evidence in addition to the “examples” given in the Measure, and 2) it is potentially prescriptive in nature. In other words an auditor may require one of the “examples” as proof and not allow compliance to be proven by some other means. Suggested wording would be,

“Provide evidence of compliance with Requirement X. Examples of such evidence that would prove compliance are XXX, XXX and XXX. However, other evidence may be used to prove compliance exclusive of the examples listed above.”

Regarding Item 1, each requirement should be clearly correlated to the associated measure(s)

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Should say, within 24 hours of becoming aware of the violation.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1.** Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2.** Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1** Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2** Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3.** Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4.** Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1** Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2** There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: As written, overlapping requirements could require multiple penalties for the same infraction – i.e. double jeopardy. There should be a statement in this section which limits an entity to one penalty per infraction.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team’s modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: Requirements 1, 2 and 3 are too vague to be used in assessing a penalty. Requirements such as these should be better defined before assigning a penalty for non-compliance.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments:

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed revisions to COM-001-1, Telecommunications. Comments must be submitted by **March 20, 2006**. You may submit the completed form by e-mailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "Telecommunications Standard" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net or by telephone at 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE. IT IS THEREFORE IMPORTANT TO ADHERE TO THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

- DO:**
- Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 - Do** use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 - Do** use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 - Do** submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT:**
- Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 - Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 - Do not** use quotation marks in any data field.
 - Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
E-mail:		
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment	
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 — Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	2 — RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> MRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 — Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/>	4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> RFC	<input type="checkbox"/>	5 — Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/>	6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 — Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 — Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> NA – Not Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

Group Comments (Complete this page if comments are from a group.)

Group Name: NERC Standards Evaluation Subcommittee
Lead Contact: **Bill Bojorquez**
Contact Organization: **ERCOT**
Contact Segment:
Contact Telephone: **512-248-3036**
Contact E-mail: **bbojorquez@ercot.com**

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*

*If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on the prior page.

Background Information

The Compliance Elements Standard Drafting Team (CESDT) is responsible for adding the 'missing' measures and/or compliance elements to the 22 Version 0 Standards that were translated from Operating Policies and Operating Compliance Templates that did not contain this information. Note that the CESDT's scope **does not** allow making any modifications to the requirements in these standards – the CESDT is limited to adding measures and compliance elements that support the approved requirements. The drafting team will not be able to use comments suggesting modifications the requirements.

The CESDT developed an approach to these revisions that may work for all 22 standards. The CESDT applied its draft approach to modifying COM-001-0, and is seeking quick feedback on the acceptability of this approach before proceeding with revisions to the entire set of 22 standards¹.

¹ The comment period for this posting is 30-days, but successive postings will be 45 days long.

This first set of questions asks for feedback on the approach to modifying the Version 0 Standards. If you don't support the proposed approach, please be specific in identifying why you think the approach isn't appropriate, and provide an alternate approach if possible.

CESDT Approach to Adding "Measures" to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

1. Each Requirement will have at least one Measure; a Measure may be used for more than one Requirement.
2. If a Measure requires 'evidence', then examples of the types of evidence that would support compliance to the Requirement will be included in the measure.
3. If a Requirement is prescriptive, then the evidence required will match that prescription.
4. If the CESDT cannot develop an effective "Measure" for a requirement, a 'temporary' comment will be added to explain why no measure was added. The CESDT will recommend that either an interpretation be developed or a SAR be submitted to address the requirement.
5. If the CESDT determines that the intent of a Requirement is essentially duplicated in another Standard, and there is no Measure in the other Standard, the CESDT will develop a Measure, and a footnote will be added to identify the associated duplicate Measure. If there is a question about the duplication the drafting team will ask stakeholders for feedback.

1. Do you agree with the CESDT's approach to adding Measures as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The SES is charged by the Planning Committee to "assess the effectiveness of new reliability standards to ensure that they meet planning and analysis needs." Therefore, having reviewed this SAR, the SES commends the CESDT's work and in general supports its approach. The SES offers these comments in support of striving to improve the approach presented by the CESDT:

#1 & #4. The SES agrees, that each Requirement in a Reliability Standard should have at least one measure. The SES agrees with the CESDT that should the CESDT be unable to develop an effective measure, a 'temporary' comment should be added to explain why no measure was added. The SES however, believes this comment should trigger the SAC to initiate a SAR to either further refine or eliminate the Requirement from the Standards. The SES is concerned that in the future, NERC or its successor ERO, may try to hold the industry compliant for a Requirement for which no effective measure could be developed. In this respect, the SES believes the work of the CESDT is critical.

#2. The SES is of mixed opinion regarding this approach. The SES appreciates the effort made by the CESDT in providing samples and duly notes that in the standards there is the disclaimer that "...could include, but is not limited to..."; however, the SES is concerned that overtime these lists of measures may become defacto standards. The SES suggests the CESDT look at proposing a definition for 'Evidence'.

#3 & #5. The SES agrees with this approach.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” to the 22 Version 0 Standards:

If the violation or charge of violation of a Requirement is deemed to have serious implications with regards to reliability of the Bulk Electrical System, the entity involved will be directed to inform the Regional Reliability Organization within 24 hours of the violation or charge of violation, and the Regional Reliability Organization will notify NERC within 48 hours.

2. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Compliance Monitoring Period and Reset Time Frame” as identified above? If not, please explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The SES is uncertain if the CESDT with this effort is the best forum to deem whether a violation of a requirement will have a "serious implication" to the BES. The SES believes the current effort underway with the Violation Risk Matrix effort is the more appropriate place, with sufficient stakeholder review, for this determination.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Data Retention” Periods to the 22 Version 0 Standards

If a standard needs specific retention rules for evidential data these may be developed, otherwise the default retention periods for this set of standards will be:

1. If compliance is measured by routine periodic audit, evidential data must be retained for four years unless stated otherwise in the Measures. (This complements the three year periodic audit cycle.) However, if retaining a specific type of evidence would result in an unreasonable amount of information storage, the CESDT may define a shorter retention period than four years for that evidence.
2. If compliance is measured by self-certification, then evidential data used as proof of compliance for the self-certification audit must be retained until the next periodic audit.
3. If compliance is measured by spot audit, then evidential data must be retained for at least four years.
4. If an entity is found non-compliant the entity shall keep information related to the non-compliance until found compliant.
5. The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last periodic audit report and all subsequent compliance records.

3. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to adding the “Data Retention” periods as identified in the five items above? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The SES agrees with the CESDT's approach to adding Data Retention compliance issues. However, the SES believes it may be appropriate for some standards

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

with large data requirements to specify, within the standard itself, its own data retention. Unless a specific data retention statement is included, the CESDT approach should be utilized as a backstop.

CESDT Approach to Adding “Additional Compliance Information” to the 22 Version 0 Standards

Under the “Additional Compliance Information” each standard will include one or more of the following methods to assess compliance:

1. Self-certification (Conducted annually with submission according to schedule.)
2. Spot Check Audits (Conducted anytime with 30 days notice given to prepare.)
3. Periodic Audit (Conducted once every three years according to schedule.)
4. Triggered Investigations (Conducted within 60 days of an event or complaint of non-compliance with up to 30 days notice given to prepare.)

4. Do you agree with the CESDT’s approach to using the four methods of assessing compliance as identified above for the “Additional Compliance Information” section of the standards? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: The SES believes the more appropriate place for the information (4 compliance steps) listed above would be to include under Section 1.2 Compliance Monitoring and Reset Time Frame.

CESDT Approach to Adding Levels of Non-Compliance to the 22 Version 0 Standards

For the most critical requirements, there may be a **separate** finding of non-compliance for **each** of several different infractions within the same standard. The example below is from COM-001.

2. Levels of Non-Compliance for Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority and Reliability Coordinator

- 2.1. Level 1 —Used a language other than English without agreement as specified in R4.
- 2.2. Level 2 — There shall be a **separate** level-2 non-compliance for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.2.1 Does not have adequate communication facilities internally, or with one or more external entities as specified in R1.
 - 2.2.2 Did not coordinate, investigate, and recommend solutions to telecommunication problems as specified in R3.
- 2.3. Level 3 — Not applicable.
- 2.4. Level 4 — There shall be a **separate** Level 4 non-compliance, for **every one** of the following requirements that is in violation:
 - 2.4.1 Telecommunication systems are not actively monitored, tested, managed or alarmed as specified in R2.
 - 2.4.2 There are no written operating instructions and procedures to enable continued operation of the system during the loss of telecommunication facilities as specified in R5.

5. Do you agree with the approach that CESDT has taken as identified above for the “Levels of Non-Compliance?” If not, please explain why you disagree.

- Yes
- No

Comments: The SES provides comments in two parts. The SES is in general agreement with the approach provided; however the SES has difficulty with the example for COM-001. Specifically: The SES believes both 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 should be classified as Level 4 Non-Compliance; whereas, 2.4.2 should be no higher than a Level 2 Non-Compliance.

Comment Form – Draft 1, COM-001-1 – Telecommunications

The following questions address your reaction to the drafting team’s modifications to COM-001, made following the strategies addressed above.

6. Do you agree with the Measures drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: See comments in Question 1 above.

7. Do you agree with the Compliance Monitoring Process drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments:

8. Do you agree with the Levels of Non-compliance drafted for COM-001? If you disagree, please identify which item you disagree with and explain why you disagree.

Yes

No

Comments: See comments in Question #5 above.

9. If you have additional comments on the approach developed by the CESDT in completing the measures and compliance elements of the 22 Version 0 Standards or specific comments on COM-001 that you haven’t already mentioned above, please provide it here and be as specific as possible.

Comments: The SES commends the CESDT on an unenviable task. The SES has been concerned that many of the Reliability Standards have requirements which are vague and confusing, and as a result is planning to do a comprehensive review of all planning related standards to determine if any gap exist which should be covered or other clarifications can improve these standards. The SES will work to cooperate with the efforts of the CESDT in an effort to efficiently utilize our resources.