

Consideration of Comments Submitted with Initial Ballot of Violation Severity Level Modifications for TOP-004-2 (Project 2008-16)

Summary Consideration of Comments: The balloters who indicated disagreement with the VSLs that were posted for comment did not disagree with the modifications that were made as part of this project – they all disagreed with the original set of VSLs.

Some balloters noted that Requirements R6.1 through R6.4 are “binary” subrequirements and noncompliance should be categorized as a “Severe” VSL. Making this change is outside the scope of this project.

The drafting team did not make any changes to the VSLs as a result of comments submitted during the initial ballot.

If you feel that your comment has been overlooked, please let us know immediately. Our goal is to give every comment serious consideration in this process! If you feel there has been an error or omission, you can contact the Vice President and Director of Standards, Gerry Adamski, at 609-452-8060 or at gerry.adamski@nerc.net. In addition, there is a NERC Reliability Standards Appeals Process.¹

Segment:	1, 3, 5, 6
Organization:	Salt River Project
Member:	Robert Kondziolka John T. Underhill Glen Reeves Mike Hummel
Comment:	SRP believes that there is overlap between the VSLs for TOP-004-2 R6.0 and the VSLs for R6.1 – R6.4. This overlap suggests that a Transmission Operator could be found non-compliant and possibly sanctioned twice or more for the same non-compliant finding. Example: The Moderate VSL for R6.0 states: “... but failed to include one of the elements listed in TOP-004-2 R6.1 through R6.4.” Requirements R6.1 – R6.4 each have VSLs for non-compliance. SRP suggests that the VSLs for R6.0 and the associated Sub-Requirements be coordinated to ensure that if a TOP is found non-compliant to a Requirement, it will only be sanctioned for non-compliance to the single Requirement, not multiple Requirements and/or Sub-Requirements.
Response:	The SAR for this project limits the scope to just those conforming changes associated with the modifications to TOP-004-1 that were made to support approval of FAC-010-2, FAC-011-2, and FAC-014-2.

¹ The appeals process is in the Reliability Standards Development Procedures: <http://www.nerc.com/standards/newstandardsprocess.html>.

This ballot is to approve the conforming changes made to the Violation Severity Levels – and the changes made to Requirement R6 and its subrequirements were limited to changing the subrequirement numbers and references to those numbers. The content language in the Violation Severity Levels was not changed.

Segment:	1
Organization:	Sierra Pacific Power Co.
Member:	Richard Salgo
Comment:	I disagree with the language in the "Lower VSL" for R6, specifically the inclusion of "but failed to include other Transmission Operators in the development of said policies and procedures". There may be instances where it is entirely appropriate to create such policies and procedures without including other Transmission Operators, and hence it should not necessarily be a violation of any severity level to not specifically include other TO's. (I recognize my comment here may pertain more to the Requirement text than the VSL table, but I still believe some discretion should be afforded in the VSL table.) Secondly, the table as proposed would assign "lower VSL" for violation of the individual sub-requirements under R6 (R6.1 through R6.4) AND at least a "Moderate VSL" under the parent Requirement R6 for the same violation. For instance, if for some reason an entity didn't include planned outages of transmission elements in their policies and procedures, they would be assessed a Lower VSL for R6.3 AND a Moderate VSL for R6. I believe that the VSL's for R6 are sufficient, and none are needed for the sub-requirements.

Response: The SAR for this project limits the scope to just those conforming changes associated with the modifications to TOP-004-1 that were made to support approval of FAC-010-2, FAC-011-2, and FAC-014-2.

This ballot is to approve the conforming changes made to the Violation Severity Levels – and the changes made to Requirement R6 and its subrequirements were limited to changing the subrequirement numbers and references to those numbers. The content language in the Violation Severity Levels was not changed. “Rolling up” the VSL for the subrequirements into the main requirement is beyond the scope of modifications associated with this SAR.

Segment:	5
Organization:	Reliant Energy Services
Member:	Thomas J. Bradish
Comment:	The VSL for R6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 should be severe since the TOP failed to include any of the sub requirements in their policies and procedures. Since they did not do what was outlined in the sub-requirement how can it be a lower VSL? Suggestion is to combine the 4 subrequirements into R6 and write the VSL's such that its lower if one the four items in the current sub-requirement is not in the polisieis and preecedures, moderate if two are missing, high if three are missing and severe if all four are missing.

Response: Requirements R6.1 through R6.4 are “binary” subrequirements and noncompliance should be categorized as a “Severe” VSL. However, making this change is outside the scope of this project.

Segment:	10
-----------------	----

Organization:	ReliabilityFirst Corporation
Member:	Jacque Smith
Comment:	By the rules, if there is only one VSL, it has to be severe because the requirement, a subrequirement in this case, is a simple “on/off” switch
Response: Requirements R6.1 through R6.4 are “binary” subrequirements and noncompliance should be categorized as a “Severe” VSL. However, making this change is outside the scope of this project.	