

Version 0 Risk Factors — Communications and Facilities

Summary Consideration: The industry determined the VRFs for the standards/requirements by majority vote. While several commenters made suggestions to change one or more of the ratings, there was no consensus to change any one of the ratings, therefore, no changes were made to the violation risk factors for this set of requirements.

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
ALCOA Yadkin/Tapoco Divisions	1	Marion Lucas	FAC-001-0 & FAC-002-0 is an administrative type standard requesting a document with the contents that are to be used in the document. The requirements should be rated as Lower not Medium. FAC-001-0 R1.1, R1.2 and R1.3 are lines of list items required in documentation that should have no rank or a lower rank. If these are to be rated then place all items in the list under 1 requirement, add the term Applicable elements, then give it a ranking of lower.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards/requirements you reference to override the industry's VRF values. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
APPA	1	E. Nick Henery	Requesting the SDT to reduce the VRF to the lowest amounts on all requirements in standards that have not been approved as mandatory and enforceable in the NOPR without requiring modification. If these standards are not sufficient to be made mandatory and enforceable without requiring the standard to be submitted to the industry for modification, exposure to anything but the minimum penalty will result in excessive appeals and that will hurt the compliance program for those standards that are mandatory and enforceable without need for modification.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the standards/requirements by majority vote. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details. Note that violation risk factors will only be applicable to standards that receive applicable regulatory approvals.			
JDRJC Associates	1	Jim Cyrulewski	Many of the standards will likely be revised because of the FERC NOPR. Thus voting on only risk factors is premature.
Response: NERC believes that FERC and other regulatory authorities will approve most of the standards and will direct NERC to follow through with its plan for upgrading the standards over the next several years. Note that violation risk factors will only be applicable to standards that receive applicable regulatory approvals.			
Manitoba Hydro	1	Robert George Coish	Manitoba Hydro votes against FAC-001 & 002. A connection document without the required elements does not meet to the current definition of a medium risk to reliability. The definition of a High risk factor is flawed because it excludes some important items

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
			that don't necessarily lead to an outage.
<p>Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards you reference to override the industry's VRF values. The drafting team cannot make changes to the definitions of the risk factors. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.</p>			
Pacific Gas & Electric PG&E	1	Chifong Thomas	<p>PG&E understands that the VRF Drafting Team assigned the Violation Risk Factors (VRF) based on the VRF definitions filed by NERC. However, PG&E continues to believe that inconsistency exists in the assignments of the VRFs -- High, Medium or Lower -- amongst similar Standards. That is, while the VRF assigned to each requirement may appear reasonable individually, they are not always consistent when compared to other similar requirements in similar standards. Therefore, PG&E's affirmative vote is made with the expectation that the VRFs will be further reviewed and refined during the three-year review of the entire set of standards planned to be accomplished by NERC's Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009. PG&E also urges that field tests be conducted to refine the VRFs and to ensure smooth implementation.</p>
<p>Response: Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.</p>			
Potomac Electric Power Company PEPW	1	Richard Kafka	The FAC standards are generally rated at a higher than needed risk factor.
<p>Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are 52 'FAC' Violation Risk Factors and only 4 of this are rated 'HIGH'.</p>			
Xcel Energy	1	Gregory Pieper	Requirements are rated high based on importance rather than their risk.
<p>Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are 67 Violation Risk Factors addressed with this ballot – and only 8 of these are rated, 'HIGH'.</p>			
British Columbia Transmission Corporation	2	Phil Park	See attached document which includes comments on two FAC VRFs.
<p>Response: The drafting team attached your comments to the end of this document. Please see the response to the attached document.</p>			
ISO New England Inc ISNE	2	Kathleen Goodman	<p>Although ISO New England is voting for the adoption of the Violation Risk Factors as drafted for adoption in these Standards, we believe that there is more work to be done in this area. We support adoption of these Risk Factors for the purpose of moving forward with enforceable Reliability Standards but request that, as these Standards are reviewed and revised to enhance and improve them, these facets, along with the Requirements and other aspects of the</p>

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
			Standards be revisited to achieve the ultimate goal of having specific, clear and unambiguous Reliability Standards as envisioned by the industry.
Response: Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc.	2	Terry Bilke	See comments for Modeling ballot.
Response: See response for modeling ballot			
Ontario - Independent Electricity Market Operator IMO	2	Don Tench	I also wish to note that COM-002 R3 requirement appears to be missing in the ballot.
Response: COM-002 R3 was missing from the survey that was conducted and cannot be added now.			
Carolina Power & Light Company	3	Sam Waters	Progress Energy would also like to point out that the Violation Risk Factors Matrices, for Version 0 and Version 1, were developed using Version 0 of the Vegetation Management Standard (FAC-003-0), which was replaced in early 2006 by FAC-003-1. The requirements in FAC-003-1, while similar, have been expanded and do not correspond to the requirements and requirement numbering of Version 0. For example, R.2 in FAC-003-0 (VM-Related Outage Reporting) corresponds to R.3 in FAC-003-1, which has been expanded from 2 to 3 VM-related outage categories. Could NERC please clarify why FAC-003-1 Violation Risk Factors were not included in the Version 1 matrix while the FAC-003-0 Violation Risk Factors were included in the Version 0 matrix?
Response: The drafting team missed adding the VRFs for FAC-003-1 to the survey for Version 1 Violation Risk Factors.			
Lincoln Electric System LES	3	Bruce E Merrill	Too many Requirements are rated as HIGH based on their importance rather than their risk.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are 67 Violation Risk Factors addressed with this ballot – and only 8 of these are rated, 'HIGH'.			
Manitoba Hydro MHEB	3	Ronald Dacombe	Manitoba Hydro votes against FAC-001 & 002. A connection document without the required elements does not meet to the current definition of a medium risk to reliability. The definition of a High risk factor is flawed because it excludes some important items that don't necessarily lead to an outage.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards you reference to override the industry's VRF values. The drafting team cannot make changes to the definitions of the risk factors. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia MPWR	3	Steven Jackson	There is still too much uncertainty and ambiguity with the final language and actual method of compliance with these standards to

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
			accept these risk factors.
Response: NERC expects that most of the standards will be approved by FERC and other regulatory authorities. Note that violation risk factors will only be applicable to standards that receive applicable regulatory approvals.			
Pacific Gas & Electric Company PGEU	3	Kevin Dasso	We believe a trial period should be included
Response: Based on the preliminary comments from FERC, we do not anticipate approval of a comprehensive trial period.			
Wisconsin Public Service Corporation WPS	3	James Maenner	Too many requirements within the Communications and Facilities Standards, which are important components of the standard and for compliance are rated too high relative to reliability risk impact.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are 67 Violation Risk Factors addressed with this ballot – and only 8 of these are rated, 'HIGH'.			
American Public Power Association	4	Allen Mosher	APPA support for these risk factors is predicated on their application only to TOPs that operate part of the Bulk Electric System as now defined. Application of medium or high VRF to violations by entities that have little or no potential to have a material impact on interconnected system operations of the BES is inappropriate. For example COM-002-0 R2 provides that "Each Balancing Authority and Transmission Operator shall notify its Reliability Coordinator, and all other potentially affected Balancing Authorities and Transmission Operators through predetermined communication paths of any condition that could threaten the reliability of its area or when firm load shedding is anticipated. The following information shall be conveyed to others in the Interconnection via an Interconnection-wide telecommunications system:" If the definition of the BES is modified, this requirement would require all TOPs to participate in an interconnection wide communication system even if the operator control no facilities that could case an SOL or IROL violation or create an energy emergency. This VRF is appropriately HIGH for major entities where the threat is to the interconnection (as provided in R2.2). However load shedding due to conditions on local systems (e.g. localized weather related events) do not constitute High" risks (as noted in R2.3).
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards/requirements you reference to override the industry's VRF values. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Grant County PUD No.2 GCPD	4	Kevin John Conway	Grant County Supports the development of these factors, but recommends that the violation penalties always be assessed at the

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
			lowest monitory levels.
<p>Response: The NERC and Regional Compliance Entities will determine penalties in accordance with the Sanctions Guidelines in the ERO Rules of Procedure.</p>			
Snohomish County PUD SNPD	4	John Martinsen	<p>It is difficult to assess violation levels of standards when the applicability of the standards is still unclear and has not been addressed. For example standards which apply to Transmission Operators or Transmission Planners should have a much different risk factor whether we are describing a 69 kV networked transmission line serving a local load area of 80 MW versus a 500 kV transmission line that is transferring firm power between large regions, and multiple balancing authorities. The functional model defines Transmission Operator, Transmission Planner, and so on, but does not define transmission, local networks, distribution, and so on. Using the definitions from the NERC reliability standards, "Bulk Electric System" or "Transmission Line" provides no distinction of scale of the system or whether they would have a material impact on reliability of the electric system beyond a local area. Transmission Line: A system of structures, wires, insulators and associated hardware that carry electric energy from one point to another in an electric power system. Lines are operated at relatively high voltages varying from 69 kV up to 765 kV, and are capable of transmitting large quantities of electricity over long distances Bulk Electric System: As defined by the Regional Reliability Organization, the electrical generation resources, transmission lines, interconnections with neighboring systems, and associated equipment, generally operated at voltages of 100 kV or higher. Radial transmission facilities serving only load with one transmission source are generally not included in this definition. Without clear definition of the applicability of the NERC reliability standards I cannot assess the reliability risk associated with violating a particular NERC reliability standard.</p>
<p>Response: The NERC Compliance Organizational Registration process will determine the entities that need to register with the Regional Entities for compliance with the Reliability Standards. The sanctions guidelines provide some latitude in assigning penalties. NERC recognizes the need to refine the applicability section of standards to add more specificity to the description of the entities and facilities addressed by each standard and included the upgrade of the applicability section of standards as one of the focus areas in the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.</p>			
APGI - Yadkin division	5	Alan Jones	FAC-001-0 There should be some consolidation of the requirements under this standard.

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
Response: The drafting team cannot make changes to the requirements in the standards. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Dairyland Power Cooperative DPC	5	Warren Schaefer	Risk factors too heavily weighted to HIGH rating
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are 67 Violation Risk Factors addressed with this ballot – and only 8 of these are rated, 'HIGH'.			
Detroit Edison	5	Ronald Bauer	Similar concerns as MISO.
Response: See MISO response.			
Florida Power & Light FPL	5	Bob Birch	FAC-001 - Transmission Owners must maintain Facility Connection Requirements document. The proposed VRFs are all Medium which is too high for requirements that are procedural. Further, the importance of the FCR document has been largely superseded by FERC's LGIA and LGIP orders. This standard requires written procedures for joint studies. In the FRCC Region, joint studies are done on a case by case basis and the procedures used for a specific joint study tend to be situation dependant. In short, FAC is a solution in search of a problem. FAC-002 Coordination of Plans All users of the grid must coordinate studies for the interconnection of new facilities. The proposed VRFs are all Medium which is too high for requirements that are ambiguous, unclear and will be very difficult to measure for compliance.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards/requirements you reference to override the industry's VRF values. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Manitoba Hydro Power Supply	5	Mark Aikens	Manitoba Hydro votes against FAC-001 & 002. A connection document without the required elements does not meet to the current definition of a medium risk to reliability. The definition of a High risk factor is flawed because it excludes some important items that don't necessarily lead to an outage.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards you reference to override the industry's VRF values. The drafting team cannot make changes to the definitions of the risk factors. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Michigan Public Power Agency MPPA	5	James Nickel	MPPA's support for these Risk Factors is predicated on the understanding that they will be applied only to those entities which actually have a significant impact on the Bulk Electric System as now defined. Application of medium or high VRFs to violations by entities that have little or no potential to have a material impact on

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
			interconnected system operations of the BES is inappropriate.
Response: The NERC Compliance Organizational Registration process will determine the entities that need to register with the Regional Entities for compliance with the Reliability Standards.			
Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia MEAG	5	Roger Brand	There is still too much uncertainty with the final language of these standards to accept these risk factors.
Response: NERC expects that most of the standards will be approved by FERC and other regulatory authorities. Note that violation risk factors will only be applicable to standards that receive applicable regulatory approvals. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Pacific Gas & Electric Company PGEU	5	Richard Padilla	"PG&E understands that the VRF Drafting Team assigned the Violation Risk Factors (VRF) based on the VRF definitions filed by NERC. However, PG&E continues to believe that inconsistency exists in the assignments of the VRFs -- High, Medium or Lower -- amongst similar Standards. That is, while the VRF assigned to each requirement may appear reasonable individually, they are not always consistent when compared to other similar requirements in similar standards. Therefore, PG&E's affirmative vote is made with the expectation that the VRFs will be further reviewed and refined during the three-year review of the entire set of standards planned to be accomplished by NERC's Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009. PG&E also urges that field tests be conducted to refine the VRFs and to ensure smooth implementation."
Response: Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
PPL Generation	5	Mark Heimbach	1) There are too many HIGH risks in almost all of the areas. The only HIGH ones should be related to "situational awareness" and "vegetation management." 2) There are several inconsistencies. A couple of examples: TOP-006-0 R3. Each Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, and Balancing Authority shall provide appropriate technical information concerning protective relays to their operating personnel. LOWER PRC-001-0 R1. Each Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority, and Generator Operator shall be familiar with the purpose and limitations of protection system schemes applied in its area. MEDIUM It is MEDIUM risk if a TOP doesn't know the protective schemes but it is LOWER risk if you are not provided with the information. VAR-001-0 R4. The Transmission Operator shall know the status of all transmission reactive power resources, including the status of voltage regulators and power system stabilizers. MEDIUM TOP-002-

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
			<p>0 R14. Generator Operators shall, without any intentional time delay, notify their Balancing Authority and Transmission Operator of changes in capabilities and characteristics including but not limited to: MEDIUM TOP-002-0 R14.1. Changes in real and reactive output capabilities. HIGH TOP-002-0 R14.2. Automatic Voltage Regulator status and mode setting. LOWER Is voltage regulator status and generator reactive capability, which is affected by the VR status during a disturbance, HIGH, MEDIUM, or LOW? IRO-002-0 R6. Each Reliability Coordinator shall monitor Bulk Electric System elements (generators, transmission lines, buses, transformers, breakers, etc.) that could result in SOL or IROL violations within its Reliability Coordinator Area. Each Reliability Coordinator shall monitor both real and reactive power system flows, and operating reserves, and the status of Bulk Electric System elements that are or could be critical to SOLs and IROLs and system restoration requirements within its Reliability Coordinator Area. HIGH PER-004-0 R5. Reliability Coordinator operating personnel shall place particular attention on SOLs and IROLs and inter-tie facility limits. The Reliability Coordinator shall ensure protocols are in place to allow Reliability Coordinator operating personnel to have the best available information at all times. MEDIUM Is paying attention to SOL & IROL limits HIGH or MEDIUM?</p>
<p>Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. Note that none of the standards you referenced are in the MOD sequence of standards. Only 8 of the Communications and Facilities' 67 requirements have a 'HIGH' violation risk factor.</p>			
Progress Energy - Carolinas	5	Wayne Lewis	<p>Progress Energy would also like to point out that the Violation Risk Factors Matrices, for Version 0 and Version 1, were developed using Version 0 of the Vegetation Management Standard (FAC-003-0), which was replaced in early 2006 by FAC-003-1. The requirements in FAC-003-1, while similar, have been expanded and do not correspond to the requirements and requirement numbering of Version 0. For example, R.2 in FAC-003-0 (VM-Related Outage Reporting) corresponds to R.3 in FAC-003-1, which has been expanded from 2 to 3 VM-related outage categories. Could NERC please clarify why FAC-003-1 Violation Risk Factors were not included in the Version 1 matrix while the FAC-003-0 Violation Risk Factors were included in the Version 0 matrix?</p>
<p>Response: The drafting team missed adding the VRFs for FAC-003-1 to the survey for Version 1 Violation Risk Factors.</p>			
Florida Municipal Power Agency FMPA	6	Robert C Williams	<p>Agree with APPA comments made separately.</p>

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

Company	Segment	Balloter	Comments
Response: See APPA response.			
Manitoba Hydro Electric Board MHEB	6	Daniel C Prowse	Manitoba Hydro votes against FAC-001 & 002. A connection document without the required elements does not meet to the current definition of a medium risk to reliability. The definition of a High risk factor is flawed because it excludes some important items that don't necessarily lead to an outage.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards you reference to override the industry's VRF values. The drafting team cannot make changes to the definitions of the risk factors. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Xcel Energy Services Inc	6	David Lemmons	Generally, the standards are still heavily weighted to the high risk end of the matrix and this does not seem reasonable.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. Only 8 of the Communications and Facilities' 67 requirements have a 'HIGH' violation risk factor.			
ALCOA Inc.	7	Thomas Gianneschi	FAC-001-0 & FAC-002-0 is an administrative type standard requesting a document with the contents that are to be used in the document. The requirements should be rated as Lower not Medium. FAC-001-0 R1.1, R1.2 and R1.3 are lines of list items required in documentation that should have no rank or a lower rank. If these are to be rated then place all items in the list under 1 requirement, add the term Applicable elements, then give it a ranking of lower
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards/requirements you reference to override the industry's VRF values. Changes to Standards will be addressed by the NERC Reliability Standards Development Plan: 2007-2009 which will review and revise as necessary all reliability standards. Please refer to the posted work plan for details.			
Alcoa Inc.	8	Michael Caufield	In general standards FAC-001-0 & FAC-002-0 do not seem to warrant a medium ranking. Lower seems more appropriate.
Response: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards you reference to override the industry's VRF values.			

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

BCTC has some concerns with the recommended VRFs. However, the value of implementing the majority of VRFs for this group of standards overrides the need to resolve our remaining concerns at this time. We provide the following comments for future consideration.

<u>Standard Requirement</u>	<u>NERC VRF</u>	<u>BCTC VRF</u>	<u>Explanation of BCTC VRF</u>
FAC-005-0 R1	Lower	Medium	This VRF refers to having the rating data and should be consistent with R1.1. R1.1 refers to the requirement of rating methodology consistency and has VRF of Medium.
FAC-005-0 R2	Lower	Medium	This VRF refers to the need of providing the rating data and should be consistent with R1.
INT – 001–0 R1 to R5.	Medium	Lower	Violation Risk Factor should be “Lower” as all tagging issues are prior to check out for next hour and implementation into AGC.
INT – 002–0 R1 to R5.	Medium	Lower	Violation Risk Factor should be “Lower” as all tagging issues are prior to check out for next hour and implementation into AGC.
MOD-010-0 R1	Lower	Medium	This is the Requirement for Functional Entities to submit data to RROs, in conjunction with MOD-011-0 R1. This data is used by RROs and other parallel Functional Entities to model interconnected system performance. RROs make this data available for Functional Entities to model other interconnected Entities systems, and this is often the primary source of data. Although the violation risk is not well defined by the Medium category, the risk is certainly higher than that associated with an administrative function. Also, MOD-011-0 R1 is considered High. Violation of MOD-010-0 R1 impinges on the results of performing MOD-011-0 R1, which also supports at least a Medium VRF for MOD-010-0 R1. VRF for MOD-010-0 R1 should be the same as MOD-012-0 R1, R2, and Version 1 MOD Requirements, which are Medium.
MOD-010-0 R2	Lower	Medium	Same explanation as for MOD-010-0 R1. This will make the VRF for MOD-010-0 R2 consistent with the VRF for MOD-011-0 R1.
MOD-011-0 R1	High	Medium	This Requirement is a reporting procedure that applies in conjunction MOD-010-1 R1, specifying how the data is to be reported. While it is certainly an important Requirement, it does not equate to the risk level that could contribute to a widespread outage or delay system restoration. Literally read, it appears to be an administrative function. For the same reasons as MOD-010-0 R1, BCTC believes this requirement should have a VRF of Medium.
MOD-004-0 R1	Lower	Medium	This Requirement is for development and documentation of a methodology. We accept that the documentation is a Lower VRF. However, the development methodology, how CBM is determined, can affect the state of the electrical system, and is therefore a Medium VRF. Subrequirements can remain Lower as they primarily address the requirements of the documentation. Possibly these subrequirements would be more appropriately listed under MOD-005-0 R2, although we understand this is beyond the scope of the Drafting Team. A Medium VRF is consistent with Version 1 MOD

Consideration of Comments on Initial Ballot of Version 0 Violation Risk Factors for Communications and Facilities Standards

			Requirements which are Medium.
MOD-008-0 R1	Lower	Medium	Same as for MOD-004-0 R1. A Medium VRF is consistent with Version 1 MOD Requirements which are Medium.
MOD-016-0 R1 and MOD-017-0 R1	Medium Lower	Lower Medium	The VRFs for these two Requirements are reversed. Provision of the data is Medium, documentation is administrative and is Lower.
PRC-005-0 R1.1 to R1.6	High	Medium	PRC-005-0 R1 has a Violation Risk Factor of "Medium" all subsections should have a Violation Risk Factor equal to or less than Medium.
TOP-002-0 R2	Medium	Lower	This is a requirement to ensure Balancing Authority and Transmission Operator personnel participate in system planning and design process. Failure to comply will not lead to a violation that could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system.
TOP-002-0 R3 & R4	Medium	Lower	This is a requirement that only applies if confidentiality agreements are in place and does not apply to the whole of the bulk power system therefore the factor should be lower.
TOP-002-0 R14.1	High	Medium	The "High" Violation Risk Factor should be reduced to "Medium" as a change in the generator real or reactive power output limit will not lead in itself system instability or cascading.
TOP-002-0 R18	Medium	Lower	Failure to use uniform line identifiers will not affect the state of the electric system. Line identifiers are an administrative matter.
VAR-001-0 R4	Medium	High	If a Transmission Operator of these facilities, incorrect assumptions can directly contribute to widespread outage. Incorrect assumptions regarding reactive power sources can directly contribute to voltage instability. Incorrect assumptions on PSS can directly contribute to transient instability.

Consideration: The industry determined the VRFs for the Standards/requirements by majority vote. There are not enough comments on the standards/requirements you reference to override the industry's VRF value(s).