

Consideration of Comments on 1st Draft of the SAR to Revise Violation Severity Levels in EOP Standards — Project 2008-08

The EOP VSL Drafting Team thanks all those who submitted comments on the 1st draft of the SAR to revise the VSLs in EOP standards and the associated VSLs. This SAR was posted for a 30-day public comment period from April 18, 2008 through May 19, 2008.

Stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on the SAR through a special Comment Form.

There were 23 sets of comments, including comments from more than 70 different people from approximately 50 companies representing 8 of the 10 Industry Segments as shown in the table on the following pages.

The comments submitted have been reformatted so it is easier to see whether there is consensus on each of the questions and on each set of proposed VSLs. The comments can be viewed in their original format at the following site:

http://www.nerc.com/~filez/standards/EOP_VSLs_Project_2008-08.html

Several stakeholders suggested making modifications to all of the VSLs associated with requirements that include subrequirements. The drafting team modified the VSLs as follows:

1. Where there was a VSL that included generic language, either the generic language was replaced with specific language, or the VSL was removed.
2. Where FERC directed NERC to modify a specific VSL, the drafting team has provided the FERC-directed VSL and its own proposed VSL. In some cases, there are minor modifications to the FERC-directed VSLs, but in all situations the drafting team agreed that the FERC-directed VSLs were an improvement over the originally proposed VSLs.
3. Where there was a requirement that contained multiple subrequirements – and each subrequirement described a distinct task or activity, then the drafting team assigned a set of VSLs to each of the separate subrequirements. If such a requirement were written today, the requirement would be separated into individual requirements without separate subrequirements.
4. Where there was a requirement that contained multiple subrequirements, and each subrequirement contributed to achieving the main requirement, then the subrequirements were “rolled up” into the main requirement and a single set of VSLs that address the “total” requirement was developed. The single set of VSLs references each of the subrequirements so that if an entity is noncompliant with a specific subrequirement, there is an associated VSL for that noncompliant performance.
5. Note that the drafting team reviewed each subrequirement to ascertain the impact of a violation of that subrequirement in meeting the intent of the requirement. There are some situations where the subrequirements are all of equal or almost equal weight in contribution to the intent of the requirement this is reflected in the revised set of VSLs. Where subrequirements are of “unequal” weight in contributing to the intent of the requirement this is reflected in the revised VSLs.

In addition, the drafting team reviewed FERC's guidelines for modifying VSLs and made some changes to VSLs in order to meet the specific guidelines. The four FERC Guidelines for Approving VSLs are:

1. VSLs should not have the unintended consequence of lowering the current level of compliance
2. VSLs should ensure uniformity and consistency in the determination of penalties
 - a. Be consistent with "Binary" VSLs
 - b. Don't use ambiguous language
3. VSLs not expand on what is required in the requirement.
4. VSLs should be based on a single violation, not an a cumulative number of violations.

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

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

Consideration of Comments on 1st Draft of SAR and Revised EOP VSLs - Project 2008-08

The Industry Segments are:

- 1 — Transmission Owners
- 2 — RTOs, ISOs
- 3 — Load-serving Entities
- 4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
- 5 — Electric Generators
- 6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
- 7 — Large Electricity End Users
- 8 — Small Electricity End Users
- 9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
- 10 — Regional Reliability Organizations, Regional Entities

Commenter		Organization	Industry Segment										
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1.	Anita Lee (G2)	AESO		x									
2.	Ken Goldsmith (G3)	ALTW				x							
3.	Kirit Shah (G4)	Ameren	x										
4.	Thomas Fung	BCTC		x									
5.	Dave Rudolph (G3)	BEPC	x		x			x	x				
6.	Denise Koehn (G7)	Bonneville Power Administration	x		x			x	x				
7.	Francis Halpin (G7)	Bonneville Power Administration						x					
8.	Robin Chung (G7)	Bonneville Power Administration			x			x	x				
9.	Terry Doern (G7)	Bonneville Power Administration	x										
10.	Jim Burns (G7)	Bonneville Power Administration	x										
11.	Brent Kingsford (G2)	CAISO		x									
12.	Mike Murray (G9)	City of Independence	x		x			x					
13.	Alan Gale	City of Tallahassee						x					
14.	Ed Thompson (G1)	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.						x					

Consideration of Comments on 1st Draft of SAR and Revised EOP VSLs - Project 2008-08

Commenter		Organization	Industry Segment										
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
15.	Michael Gildea (G1)	Constellation Energy							x				
16.	Vic Davis (G6)	Delmarva Power	x										
17.	Michael A. Yentzer	Detroit Edison/DTE Energy Fossil Generation NERC Compliance Manager						x					
18.	Louis Slade, Jr. (G8)	Dominion											
19.	Jalal Babik (G8)	Dominion			x	x	x						
20.	Ronald Hart (G8)	Dominion			x	x	x						
21.	Ron Hart (G1)	Dominion Resources, Inc.	x										
22.	Jack Kerr	Dominion Virginia Power	x										
23.	Greg Rowland	Duke Energy Corporation	x		x			x	x				
24.	Ed Davis	Entergy Services	x										
25.	Will Franklin	Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)							x				
26.	Steve Myers (G2)	ERCOT		x									
27.	Sam Ciccone (G6)	FirstEnergy	x		x			x	x				
28.	Dave Folk (G5)	FirstEnergy	x		x			x	x				
29.	Doug Hohlbaugh (G5)	FirstEnergy	x		x			x	x				
30.	Joseph Knight (G3)	GRE	x		x			x	x				
31.	Alessia Dawes	Hydro One Networks, Inc.	x		x								
32.	David Kiguel (G1)	Hydro One Networks, Inc.	x										
33.	Roger Champagne (G1)	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie		x									
34.	Sylvain Clermont (G1)	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie	x										
35.	Ron Falsetti (I) (G1) (G2)	Independent Electricity System Operator		x									
36.	Kathleen Goodman (G1)	ISO – New England		x									

Consideration of Comments on 1st Draft of SAR and Revised EOP VSLs - Project 2008-08

Commenter		Organization	Industry Segment											
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
37.	Matt Goldberg (G2)	ISO – New England		x										
38.	Mike Gammon (G9)	Kansas City Power and Light	x		x			x						
39.	Eric Ruskamp (G3)	LES	x		x			x	x					
40.	Craig McLean	Manitoba Hydro	x		x			x	x					
41.	Don Nelson (G1)	Massachusetts Dept. of Public Utilities											x	
42.	Tom Mielnik (G3)	MEC	x		x			x	x					
43.	Joe DePoorter (G3)	MGE	x		x			x	x					
44.	Jason L. Marshall (G4)	Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators		x										
45.	Michael Brytowski (G3)	Midwest Reliability Organization		x										
46.	Bill Phillips (G2)	MISO		x										
47.	Terry Bilke (G3)	MISO		x										
48.	Carol Gerou (G3)	MP	x		x			x						
49.	Larry Brusseau (G3)	MRO												x
50.	Nabil Hitti (G1)	National Grid US				x								
51.	Michael Schiavone (G1)	National Grid US	x											
52.	Randy MacDonald (G1)	New Brunswick System Operator		x										
53.	William DeVries (G1)	New York Independent System Operator		x										
54.	Jim Castle (G2)	New York ISO		x										
55.	Ralph Rufrano (G1)	New York Power Authority						x						
56.	Lee Pedowicz (G1)	Northeast Power Coordinating Council												x
57.	Guy Zito (G1)	Northeast Power Coordinating Council												x

Consideration of Comments on 1st Draft of SAR and Revised EOP VSLs - Project 2008-08

Commenter		Organization	Industry Segment										
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
58.	Don Hargrove (G9)	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	x		x		x						
59.	Greg Ward / Darryl Curtis	Oncor Electric Delivery	x										
60.	Ron Falsetti	Ontario IESO		x									
61.	Dave Thorne (G6)	Pepco	x										
62.	Richard Kafka (G5)	Pepco Holdings, Inc. - Affiliates	x		x		x						
63.	Patrick Brown (G2)	PJM Interconnection		x									
64.	Phil Riley	Public Service Commission of South Carolina										x	
65.	James Y. Busbin	Southern Company Transmission							x				
66.	Robert Rhodes	Southwest Power Pool	x	x	x		x						
67.	Robert Rhodes (G9)	Southwest Power Pool											x
68.	Charles Yeung (G2)	Southwest Power Pool											
69.	Kyle McMenamin (G9)	Southwest Public Service	x		x		x						
70.	Jim Haigh (G3)	WAPA	x						x				
71.	Howard Rulf	We Energies			x	x	x						
72.	Neal Balu (G3)	WPA			x	x	x	x					
73.	Pam Oreschnick (G3)	Xcel	x		x		x	x					

I — Individual

G1 — NPCC Reliability Standards Committee

G2 — ISO/RTO Council

G3 — Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO) NERC Standards Review Subcommittee

G4 — MISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators

G5 — FirstEnergy Corp.

G6 — Pepco Holdings, Inc. Affiliates

G7 — Bonneville Power Administration

G8 — Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

G9 — SPP Operating Reliability Working Group

Index to Questions, Comments, and Responses

1. Do you agree with the need to modify the EOP VSLs as rapidly as practical, using the standards development process? 8

2. Do you agree with the scope and applicability of the SAR?..... 14

3. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-001-0 — Emergency Operations Planning. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you. 20

4. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-002-2 — Capacity and Energy Emergencies. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you. 51

5. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-003-1 — Load Shedding Plans. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you?..... 88

6. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-004-1 — Disturbance Reporting. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.109

7. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-005-1 — System Restoration Plans. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you. ...128

8. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-006-1 — Reliability Coordination – System Restoration. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.....154

9. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-008-0 — Plans for Loss of Control Center Functionality. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.....164

10. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-009-0 — Documentation of Blackstart Generating Unit Test Results. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.174

11. If you have any other comments on the SAR or the proposed set of EOP VSLs, please provide them here..... 182

1. Do you agree with the need to modify the EOP VSLs as rapidly as practical, using the standards development process?

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders who responded to this question indicated that there is a need to modify the EOP VSLs as rapidly as possible, using the standards development process. Several commenters indicated that the need to modify these VSLs is not reliability-related, and several also indicated that revisions already underway for this set of standards and the modifications could or should wait until the requirements are modified. Since most commenters agreed with moving the modifications to the EOP VSLs forward now, that is the direction the drafting team has adopted.

Organization	Question 1:	Question 1 Comments:
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)		(YES and NO) The Question is unclear. No. The SRC does not agree that there is a need to modify the VSLs for the current EOP standards "as rapidly as possible" for the following reasons: It seems inappropriate to assign levels of non-compliance to requirements that have not been vetted. Some EOP standards are Version 0 standards and some people would argue that some requirements are not reliability requirements at all? Some Measures cannot be linked directly to a specific Requirement, making VSLs in some cases useless for identifying how well an entity has complied with the requirement? It is more important to have a clear unambiguous requirement, than it is to have a VSL just for the sake of having a VSL? Having a VSL does nothing to improve reliability if the requirement is not valid? The system restoration and blackstart draft standards implementation plan call for retiring four of these EOP standards. That effort is already well underway and further obviates the need for an urgent action SAR. Yes. The SRC does agree that it is better to use the approved Standard Development Process, then it would be for NERC staff or a NERC committee to dictate those VSLs.

Response: Thank you for your comments. The SAR does not identify this as an "Urgent Action. Urgent action would have allowed bypassing certain steps such as posting following the changes and going directly to ballot. The revised VSLs for the EOP group will be posted as required by the Standards Development Process. NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs. While the process is moving in an expedited manner it is still within the limits of the Standards Development Process.

As stated in the SAR, the VSLs for the EOP group of standards failed to obtain the required 2/3 majority for approval therefore they are being revised and will again be balloted. The standards development process has been followed throughout this process. The concerns that you express with the clarity of the standards and the requirements are being addressed as the standards are revised. The directives of FERC and the BOT must be followed for this group of standards (as it was for the other groups) regardless on how soon the standards may be revised or removed and replaced by others.

Need to Modify EOP VSLs as Rapidly as Practical, Using the Standards Development Process

Organization	Question 1:	Question 1 Comments:
Detroit Edison/DTE Energy Fossil Generation NERC Compliance Manager	No	Severity level is important but is not paramount in revising standards. Clarification of vagueness for the regulated entities is by far a much more important issue.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. Revision of standard will continue through the Standards Development Process. NERC has a published work plan for evaluating and revising the standards.</p> <p>The VSLs for this group of standards are being developed as directed by the BOT to complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs in its Order on Compliance dated June 7, 2007 for the 83 approved standards in a timely manner. The VSLs for the EOP group of standards failed to obtain the required 2/3 majority for approval (the other groups received the necessary majority) therefore they are being revised (using the standards development process) and will again be balloted.</p>		
Manitoba Hydro	No	There is no reliability need to develop the EOP VSLs as rapidly as possible. The Standards which are in the process of being re-written (EOP-005, EOP-006, EOP-007, and EOP-009) and are currently in the comment phase of development should be left and VSLs applied to when the new standards are approved.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. The VSLs for this group of standards are being developed as directed by the BOT to complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs in its Order on Compliance F dated June 7, 2007, to replace Levels on non compliance with VSL for the 83 approved standards in a timely manner. The VSLs for the EOP group of standards failed to obtain the required 2/3 majority for approval (the other groups received the necessary majority) therefore they are being revised (using the standards development process) and will again be balloted. When the standards currently under revision are approved by industry and the FERC they will become effective and replace the existing standards.</p>		
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	No	The MRO commends the VSL drafting team. The VSL drafting team has done good job on these VSLs considering the difficulty to measure some of the requirements. The MRO believes there is no reliability need to develop the EOP VSLs as rapidly as possible. However this approach, while having its flaws will provide for industry input before the VSLs are implemented. It's the MRO's understanding that the NERC Board of Trustees has asked the NERC Standards Committee to expedite the EOP VSL modifications.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. The reason for developing the EOP VSLs as rapidly as possible while still following the standard</p>		

Need to Modify EOP VSLs as Rapidly as Practical, Using the Standards Development Process

Organization	Question 1:	Question 1 Comments:
<p>development process is to meet the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive to replace the levels of non compliance with VSLs for the standards that are currently enforceable.</p>		
Dominion Virginia Power	No	That approach didn't work out very well the first time around for this set of VSLs.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment The approach used was and continues to be the Standards Development Process which is used to provide for industry input to the development of the VSLs. The process does work since an industry team developed the initial set of VSLs, obtained industry comments, responded to the comments and balloted the VSLs. All but one group (the EOP VSLs) received the necessary 2/3 positive vote. A measure of success of the approach (the standards development process) is obtaining industry input and following the industry wishes by revising the standards (in this case the VSLs for the EOP group) and submitting once again for comments and then for a vote. Considering that the alternative for following the initial FERC directive (to replace the level of non compliance with VSLs) would be either developing the VSLs without industry participation or having FERC assign VSLs, the approach (the standard development process) seems preferable.</p>		
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	No	<p>There is no reliability need to develop the EOP VSLs as rapidly as possible. While these elements are important and will be helpful in determining sanctions for any compliance violations, the ERO and FERC still possess the legal authority necessary to issue sanctions without these VSLs. Furthermore, the draft standards of the System Restoration and Blackstart drafting team propose to retire EOP-001-0, EOP-005-1, EOP-006-1, EOP-007-0 and EOP-009-0. How can developing VSLs for standards that no longer will be needed be urgent? We also do not believe that sub-requirements should have VSLs.</p>
<p>Response: Thank you for your comments. The SAR does not identify this as an "Urgent Action." Urgent action would have allowed bypassing certain steps such as posting following the changes and going directly to ballot. The revised VSLs for the EOP group will be posted as required by the Standards Development Process. NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs. While the process is moving in an expedited manner it is still within the limits of the Standards Development Process.</p> <p>When any of the standards under revision (such as the group you mention in your comments) are approved by industry, FERC and other governmental authorities, they will become effective and replace the existing standards. The FERC order is very specific that VSLs must be assigned to the existing standards, regardless if they are being revised or may even be replaced in the near future.</p> <p>When standards are revised the VSLs will be revised along with the requirements, measures etc. As standards are revised VSLs will only be assigned to the primary requirements and not to the sub-requirements.</p>		

Need to Modify EOP VSLs as Rapidly as Practical, Using the Standards Development Process

Organization	Question 1:	Question 1 Comments:
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	No	There is no reliability reason to expedite crafting of VSLs. VSLs should be developed using a methodical approach and approved by the industry process.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comments. This effort has and continues to follow the Standards Development Process. NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs. While the process is moving in an expedited manner it is still within the limits of the Standards Development Process. The EOP group of VSLs failed to meet the required 2/3 majority of votes, therefore, using an industry drafting team (part of the standards development process) the comments provided by industry will be considered, modifications made as required and presented to the industry for a ballot. The Standard Development Process does allow posting of a proposed standard with a SAR (as has been done here with the proposed VSLs) The proposed set of VSL were derived using the comments provided by the industry.</p>		
City of Tallahassee	No	This need is political to satisfy the FERC directive. It is not based on improving the reliability of the BES.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. Standards will continue to be developed through the standard process. NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs. While the process is moving in an expedited manner it is still within the limits. The VSLs for the EOP group of standards failed to obtain the required 2/3 majority for approval (the other groups received the necessary majority) therefore they are being revised (using the Standards Development Process, in order to get input from the industry) and will again be balloted.</p>		
NPCC	Yes	We strongly support the development of standards elements, which include VRFs and VSLs, through the standards development process.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment</p>		
Operating Reliability Working Group	Yes	While we agree with the need to move as quickly as possible to establish the VSLs for the EOP standards, we do not support bypassing the standards development process as was done with this effort.

Need to Modify EOP VSLs as Rapidly as Practical, Using the Standards Development Process

Organization	Question 1:	Question 1 Comments:
(ORWG)		
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. As stated in the NERC Reliability Standards Process Manual, an expedited process is allowed. Therefore, the Standard development process was not bypassed.</p> <p>NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs. While the process is moving in an expedited manner it is still within the limits of the Standards Development Process</p> <p>This group of VSLs failed to meet the required 2/3 majority of votes and using an industry drafting team (part of the standards development process) the comments provided by industry will be considered, modifications made as required and presented to the industry for comment and ballot. The standard development process does allow posting of a proposed standard with a SAR (as has been done here with the proposed VSLs) The proposed set of VSLs were derived using the comments provided by the industry at the time of balloting.</p>		
Ontario IESO	Yes	We strongly support the development of standards elements, which include VRFs and VSLs, through the standards development process.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment.</p>		
Bonneville Power	Yes	Should be done as rapidly as can be done in a competent steady fashion. The VSLs should be clearly understood, technically justified and readily applicable and easily understood.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. The proposed set of VSLs were derived using the comments provided by the industry at the time of balloting and application of FERC's VSL guidelines.</p>		
Entergy Services	Yes	NERC requests comments on specific VSLs but provides no easy way to supply those comments. Therefore, I have incorporated comments in the comment boxes and in the marked up SAR contained in the file "SAR_EOP_VSLs_1st_Posting_18April Entergy Comments.pdf." Comments are contained in popup windows which are part of the yellow highlighted entries in the file.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comments. The specific VSL comments/changes that you have proposed in the marked up SAR are being considered by the drafting team, along with other comments received, in revising the specific VSLs.</p>		
Southern Company	Yes	None

Need to Modify EOP VSLs as Rapidly as Practical, Using the Standards Development Process

Organization	Question 1:	Question 1 Comments:
FirstEnergy	Yes	
Oncor Electric Delivery	Yes	
Dominion	Yes	
BCTC	Yes	
Hydro One Networks	Yes	
We Energies	Yes	
Public Service Commission of South Carolina	Yes	
Pepco Holdings, Inc. - Affiliates	Yes	

2. Do you agree with the scope and applicability of the SAR?

Summary Consideration: In general, stakeholders responded the same way they responded to the first question. Those commenters who agreed that the EOP VSLs should be modified as rapidly as possible also agreed with the scope and applicability of the SAR – and those commenters who indicated there is no reliability-related reason to modify the VSLs or indicated that modifying the VSLs should wait until the associated requirements were modified repeated those comments in response to this question. Since most stakeholders did indicate support for the scope and applicability of the SAR, the drafting team did not make any modifications to the SAR.

Organization	Question 2:	Question 2 Comments:
Manitoba Hydro	No	There is no reliability need to develop the EOP VSLs as rapidly as possible. The Standards which are in the process of being re-written (EOP-005, EOP-006, EOP-007, and EOP-009) and are currently in the comment phase of development should be left and VSLs applied to when the new standards are approved.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. The VSLs for this group of standards are being developed as directed by the BOT to complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs in its Order on Compliance dated June 7, 2007, to replace Levels on non compliance with VSL for the 83 approved standards in a timely manner. The VSLs for the EOP group of standards failed to obtain the required 2/3 majority for approval (the other groups received the necessary majority) therefore they are being revised (using the standards development process) and will again be balloted. When the standards currently under revision are approved by industry and the FERC they will become effective and replace the existing standards.</p>		
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	No	The SRC does not agree with the scope of the SAR for the reasons noted in the comments to Question 1. The Scope also includes a fundamental point of contention. The scope is predicated on the fact that the NERC Board directed the Standards Committee to expedite the development of a revised group of VSLs. While there is no question that the NERC Board has the right, the power and the authority to approve or not approve standards. There maybe some question about their authority to intervene in imposing their ideas on ad hoc parts of reliability standards. If the Board had proposed to initiate an entire standard and allow the Industry a complete review of the standards, that would seem a relevant application of their power. But when the Board intervenes on just one piece of a standard, the Board is in fact ignoring the other parts of the process and is in effect validating requirements that may not be appropriate. The Board's intervention also calls into question the meaning of Urgent Actions. Are VSLs for these standards so important to reliability that this SAR should be given special consideration, particularly after having been voted down? Is Urgent Action defined by a reliability need or by fiat? While this question would not normally be posed to a SAR Team, it is the SAR Team that has made the point of justifying the SAR based on Board direction. Has the Standards Committee deemed this SAR one of the higher priority matters facing the Industry? Even higher then the IRO and TOP standards on IROs? The Standard Drafting Team has appropriately crafted a request to vet new VSLs. However, these standards

Scope and Applicability of SAR

Organization	Question 2:	Question 2 Comments:
		need more then the VSLs to be vetted - as will be discussed in comments below.
		<p>Response: The SAR does not identify this as an “Urgent Action.” Urgent action would have allowed bypassing certain steps such as posting following the changes and going directly to ballot. The revised VSLs for the EOP group will be posted as required by the Standards Development Process. NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs. While the process is moving in an expedited manner it is still within the limits of the Standards Development Process. The BOT and NERC are not imposing their ideas but rather are using the Standards Development Process to get industry input and are using the voting process to obtain industry consensus.</p> <p>The reason for assigning VSLs was the FERC order on Compliance dated June 7, 2007, to replace Levels of non compliance with VSLs for the 83 FERC-approved standards. The industry failed to give the VSLs for the EOP group the required 2/3 majority yes vote, (the other groups of VSLs did pass). Therefore, in accordance with the Standards Development Process, the VSLs for this group of standards are being revised based on the industry comments received using a team of industry representatives. This project does not impact the work of other drafting teams that are revising these or any other group of standards. VSLs must be assigned to all 83 of the previously approved standards to complete the process of meeting the FERC directive.</p> <p>As stated in your comments to question 1, several of the standards in the EOP group are in the process of being revised and combined and some have been proposed to be eliminated. This shows that the process that you suggest (the Standard Development Process) is being used to review and modify standards. The drafting team(s) working on the group of standards that you mention will be evaluating all aspects of the standards including VRFs and VSLs and will be proposing changes, additions, removals etc. to the industry for comments and for voting. When this work is complete and the new/revised standards are approved, they will replace the standards that are currently approved and enforceable.</p>
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	No	<p>This SAR should not be an urgent action. While we believe the scope is reasonable considering the framework that the previous set of VSLs was developed under, we believe the scope does not go far enough. The SAR still focuses on fitting a square peg into a round hole. It appears only to focus on finding a smaller square peg that fits loosely into the round hole. Many requirements are binary in nature. Either you meet them or you do not meet them. Many NERC staffers have expressed the opinion that non-compliance with a binary requirement should result in a Severe VSL. This is equivalent to saying you finished last in a one person race. Well you also finished first, second and third if you consider that VSLs have four categories. NERC needs to shift its paradigm to reflect that in reality the runner didn't finish the race and the measure is simply whether or not he finished the race. We further urge the SAR drafting team to consider the resounding message the Registered Ballot Body (RBB) sent in defeating this set of VSLs the first time. The SAR drafting should not rush through another set of VSLs that do not address the industry concerns through an urgent action. Rather, the SAR drafting team should follow the normal Reliability Standards Drafting Procedure that will allow them to address the RBB's concerns. We also believe many of the requirements in these EOP standards need to be revised prior</p>

Scope and Applicability of SAR

Organization	Question 2:	Question 2 Comments:
		to assigning VSLs. Assignment of VSLs implies that the requirement is measurable. Many of the requirements don't have measures because they are not measurable. We do applaud NERC for their effort to achieve consensus on the EOP VSLs and believe the RSDP is the proper place to develop VSLs.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comments. The SAR does not identify this as an "Urgent Action." Urgent action would have allowed bypassing certain steps such as posting following the changes and going directly to ballot. The revised VSLs for the EOP group will be posted as required by the Standards Development Process. NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs. While the process is moving in an expedited manner it is still within the limits of the Standards Development Process. The VSLs for the EOP group of standards failed to obtain the required 2/3 majority for approval therefore they are being revised based on industry comments and the FERC VSL guidelines. Following the standards development process, these standards will again be balloted before filing with FERC and other governmental authorities.</p> <p>The concerns that you express regarding the measurability of the requirements and the wording of the requirements is being addressed by other drafting teams as standards are revised. As mentioned by other commentators, several of the EOP standards are being revised under a separate project. The drafting team(s) working on these standards will be evaluating all aspects of the standards including VRFs and VSLs and will be proposing changes, additions, removals etc. to the industry for comments and for voting. When this work is complete and the new/revised standards are approved, they will replace the standards that are currently approved and enforceable.</p>		
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	No	Based on the Reliability Standards Development Procedure, it does not seem appropriate to use the SAR process to propose VSLs and seek comment. This should come after the SAR has been approved for work.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comment. The standard development process does allow posting of a proposed standard with a SAR (as has been done here with the proposed VSLs). The proposed set of VSLs was derived using the comments provided by the industry at the time of balloting and the FERC VSL guidelines. The comments received with the SAR will also be considered by the drafting team in revising the VSLs.</p>		
Entergy Services	No	The scope contained in the SAR is not clear about how the VSLs should be revised. In addition, it seems the SDT did not include industry comments on the final draft standards submitted during the drafting of the standard so approval of the standard failed. Therefore, the first sentence of the Detailed Description should read: "Revise the VSLs for the eight EOP standards that were not approved in the balloting process for Project 2007-23 to conform to the stakeholder comments submitted during the balloting process."

Scope and Applicability of SAR

Organization	Question 2:	Question 2 Comments:
<p>Response: Thank you for your comments. The intent of the project is to revise the VSLs for this group of standards based on all the industry comments received. The comments received during balloting were answered and the proposed VSL revisions (based on those comments) were incorporated in the VSLs posted with the SAR. The comments received during the SAR comment period will be incorporated by the drafting team using the standards development process. This drafting team will evaluate all the industry proposed changes to the VSLs and the FERC VSL guidelines to determine if and how to change a specific VSL. This group of standards (for which VSLs are to be evaluated) is part of the 83 approved standards and NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs.</p> <p>The drafting team's understanding of the description of the SAR is similar to your proposed description for revision of the VSLs for the eight EOP standards that were not approved. The comments from the balloting process were used to develop the proposed set of VSLs posted with the SAR, and the EOP drafting team will also use the comments received with the SAR to modify the VSLs. The Standards Development Process is geared to obtain industry input and use that input in the drafting of the standard, or in this case the VSLs.</p>		
Detroit Edison/DTE Energy Fossil Generation NERC Compliance Manager	Yes	It appears that the SAR is complete for its intended purpose.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comments.</p>		
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	Yes	The MRO believes the scope is reasonable considering the framework that the previous set of VSLs was developed under; we believe the scope does not go far enough. We believe many of the requirements in these EOP standards need to be revised prior to assigning VSLs since assigning VSLs implies that the requirement is measurable. Many of the requirements are not measurable. The MRO applauds NERC for their effort to achieve consensus on the EOP VSLs and believes the RSDP is the proper place to develop VSLs.
<p>Response: Thank you for your comments. The scope of this project is to complete the assignment of VSLs to the 83 approved standards. This is the only group of VSLs that failed to get the required 2/3 approval vote. NERC is required to follow the BOT directive to the Standards Committee to take the steps needed to expedite the development of a revised group of EOP VSLs for filing with FERC. This will complete the process of meeting the FERC directive of replacing levels of non compliance with VSLs.</p>		

Scope and Applicability of SAR

Organization	Question 2:	Question 2 Comments:
<p>Other revisions to the standards and requirements will be done (or are being done) by drafting teams addressing those standards. When standards are revised the VSLs will be revised along with the requirements, measures etc. As standards are revised VSLs will only be assigned to the primary requirements and not to the sub-requirements. When the revised standards are approved they will replace the existing standards.</p>		
Southern Company	Yes	None
Dominion Virginia Power	Yes	
We Energies	Yes	
Public Service Commission of South Carolina	Yes	
Pepco Holdings, Inc. - Affiliates	Yes	
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	Yes	
FirstEnergy	Yes	
Oncor Electric Delivery	Yes	
Ontario IESO	Yes	

Scope and Applicability of SAR

Organization	Question 2:	Question 2 Comments:
Bonneville Power	Yes	
City of Tallahassee	Yes	
Dominion	Yes	
BCTC	Yes	
NPCC	Yes	
Hydro One Networks	Yes	

3. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-001-0 — Emergency Operations Planning. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.

EOP-001-0 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: Several stakeholders noted that there was an interpretation for this requirement, and the VSLs were modified to reflect the interpretation that indicates the responsible entity must have an agreement with “at least one” adjacent Balancing Authority, but not with “all” adjacent Balancing Authorities. Since these VSLs were developed, EOP-001-1 was approved by a ballot pool and adopted by the Board of Trustees. With the adoption of EOP-001-1, Requirement R2 was retired. As EOP-001-1 has not been approved by FERC, the drafting team has retained the VSLs for Requirement R2, and will retire those when FERC and applicable Canadian governmental authorities approve EOP-001-1.

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.	The Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of operating agreements containing provisions for emergency assistance between the Balancing Authority itself and less than 100% but more than 75% of its adjacent Balancing Authorities.	The Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of operating agreements containing provisions for emergency assistance between the Balancing Authority itself and less than or equal to 75% but more than 50% of its adjacent Balancing Authorities.	The Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of operating agreements containing provisions for emergency assistance between the Balancing Authority itself and less than or equal to 50% but more than 25% of its adjacent Balancing Authorities.	The Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of operating agreements containing provisions for emergency assistance between the Balancing Authority itself and for less than or equal to 25% of its adjacent Balancing Authorities.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R1	N/A	The Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of an operating agreement with at least one adjacent Balancing Authority for emergency assistance, but the agreement did not include provision for obtaining emergency assistance from any remote Balancing Authority.	N/A	The Balancing Authority did not demonstrate the existence of any operating agreements with adjacent Balancing Authorities that include provision for emergency assistance.

Company	Comment	Response
BCTC	R1 and R5 - typos in the VSL descriptions. Should be "than" instead of "then"	Thank you for your comments the VSLs have been revised.
Detroit Edison/DTE Energy Fossil Generation NERC Compliance Manager	Not effected directly by this Standard	
Hydro One Networks	For R1: as part of the Severe VSL includes the statement "OR The Balancing Authority cannot demonstrate the existence of operating agreements with adjacent Balancing Authorities."	Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with "at least one" adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with "all" adjacent Balancing Authorities, therefore your suggestion was not adopted.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	<p>R1 - The VSLs assume that agreements are required with each adjacent BA. Yet, the requirement does not specify how many agreements are needed. Furthermore, the definition (can be verbal and not enforceable) of agreement in NERC glossary of terms makes this requirement nearly impossible to measure. We suggest that the VSLs should be:</p> <p>Lower — The Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of operating agreements that contain provisions for emergency assistance with adjacent BAs. We further note that the word neighboring is not clear in the requirement or VSL. Are these only those entities that you share a tie-line with? What about entities that are jointly registered? For example, the Midwest ISO will consolidate the BAs in its footprint to operate a single BA on Sept. 9. Yet the existing BAs that will remain registered as BAs (let's call these LBAs) will continue to be partly responsible for the NERC requirements. Does this mean the Midwest ISO BA and LBAs are neighboring?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, the drafting team is assuming that demonstration of operating agreements requires some form of evidence. Note that in this standard, the word, "agreement" is not capitalized – therefore we cannot assume that the intended definition of "agreement" as used in this standard, includes "verbal" agreements. Since the VSLs were originally developed there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with "at least one" adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with "all" adjacent Balancing Authorities.</p> <p>The questions that you bring up regarding adjacent BA, jointly registered etc. require an interpretation of the requirement that is beyond the scope of this drafting team.</p>
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	<p>R1 - The VSLs assume that agreements are required with each adjacent BA. Yet, the requirement does not specify how many agreements are needed. Furthermore, the definition (can be verbal and not enforceable) of agreement in NERC glossary of terms makes this requirement nearly impossible to measure. We suggest that the VSLs should be:</p> <p>Lower — The Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of operating agreements that contain provisions for emergency assistance with adjacent BAs. We further note that the word neighboring is not clear in the requirement or VSL. Are these only those entities that you share a tie-line with? What about entities that are jointly registered? For example, the Midwest ISO will consolidate the BAs in its footprint to operate a single BA on Sept. 9. Yet the existing BAs that will remain registered as BAs (let's call these LBAs) will continue to be partly responsible for the NERC requirements. Does this mean the Midwest ISO BA and LBAs are neighboring?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments, the drafting team is assuming that demonstration of operating agreements require some form of evidence.</p> <p>Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with "at least one" adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with "all" adjacent Balancing Authorities, therefore your suggestion was not adopted.</p> <p>The questions that you bring up regarding adjacent BA, jointly registered etc. require an interpretation of the requirement and this is beyond the scope of this drafting team.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R1 — Typo in all VSLs 'than' for 'then'. Also, as proposed the VSLs do not address the remote BA portion of the requirement. Rather than use percentages as the measure in the VSLs use raw numbers. Percentages skew the outcome depending upon the number of adjacent BAs a particular BA has. We suggest using agreements exist with all but one adjacent BA for the Lower, all but two for Moderate, all but three for High and four or more for Severe.	Thank you for your comments – the typographical errors have been fixed. The VSLs have been revised to include the remote BA portion of the Requirement and percentages are no longer used. Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with “at least one” adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with “all” adjacent Balancing Authorities, therefore your suggestion was not adopted – so the suggestion to use the number of agreements as the threshold for various levels of VSLs was not adopted.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	The proposed VSLs for EOP-001 R1 contradict the proposed interpretation of R1 that is currently under pre-ballot review, with respect to not requiring agreements with all neighboring BAs ("neighboring" needs definition). Align the VSLs to interpretation (when approved). The Severe VSL should be applicable only if the BA fails to have an agreement with at least one adjacent BA.	Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with “at least one” adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with “all” adjacent Balancing Authorities. The revised Severe VSL reflects your suggestion.
City of Tallahassee	R1. The VSLs contradict the proposed interpretation under project 2008-09 which indicates that an agreement is NOT needed with EVERY adjacent BA, but only enough to get the job done, especially if the BA is a member of a Reserve Sharing Group. This VSL is changing the requirement to state "an agreement is needed with every adjacent BA." This is creating a standard outside the scope of this SAR and outside of the ANSI Process	Thank you for your comment. Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with “at least one” adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with “all” adjacent Balancing Authorities. The VSLs have been revised; the revised VSLs address your concerns.
Dominion	R1 — I suggest changing HIGH to read — The Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of operating agreements containing provisions for emergency assistance between the Balancing Authority itself and, at least one but more than 25% of its adjacent Balancing Authorities. I suggest changing SEVERE to read ?The Balancing Authority has not demonstrated the existence of operating agreements containing provisions for emergency assistance between the Balancing Authority itself and any of its adjacent Balancing Authorities.	Thank you for your comments. Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with “at least one” adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with “all” adjacent Balancing Authorities. The VSLs have been revised and reflects your suggested language.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion Virginia Power	For R1, the Severe VSL is worded poorly. How can a BA demonstrate the existence of an operating agreement between itself and none of its adjacent BAs?	Thank you for your comment. Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with “at least one” adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with “all” adjacent Balancing Authorities. The revised language should be clearer that failure to demonstrate the existence of the required operating agreement with any adjacent BA would be a Severe VSL.
Southern Company	General: A search on the phrasing "less then" reveals several instances where the appropriate phrasing should be "less than". (Cite Attachment 1, EOP-001-0, R1, Lower VSL ... for emergency assistance between the Balancing Authority itself and less then 100% but more then 75% of its adjacent Balancing Authorities.)	Thank you for your comment. Since the EOP VSLs were originally developed, there has been an interpretation of EOP-001 Requirement R1 that indicates the Balancing Authority must have an agreement with “at least one” adjacent Balancing Authority – but not with “all” adjacent Balancing Authorities. The VSLs have been revised based on the interpretation and don't reflect percentages.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 Requirement R2

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders supported the VSLs for EOP-001 R2 as proposed, and no changes were made to these. Note that when EOP-001-1 becomes effective, Requirement R2 and its VSLs will be retired.

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R2.	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator demonstrated the existence of an emergency load reduction plan for each identified IROL but at least one of the plans will take longer than 30 minutes to implement.	The Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate the existence of an emergency load reduction plan for all identified IROLs.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R2 Load Reduction (if it means load shedding) may not be required for an identified IROL and in many cases load reduction will worsen the IROL condition. The VSL should have wording to cover this. It should be those IROLs requiring load reduction	Thank you for your comment. Your question requires an interpretation of the requirement which is beyond the scope of the drafting team. The VSLs categorize whether plans exist to mitigate all identified IROL violations.
Manitoba Hydro	R2: I suggest moving the statement under High VSL to Moderate VSL, add a new statement for the High VSL indicating it is missing a plan for at least one IROL.	Thank you for your comments. The drafting team believes that no changes are required to the VSLs. The absence of an emergency load reduction plan for any single identified IROL would not be compliant with R2.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

<p>Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators</p>	<p>R2 - As they are currently written, the VSLs do not fit any category in the VSL Development Guidelines develop by the original VSL drafting team.</p> <p>We suggest:</p> <p>Lower - The Transmission Operator either does not have an emergency load reduction plan for 25% or less of the IROLs or implementation of the load reduction plan will take more than 30 minutes for 25% or less of the IROLs.</p> <p>Medium — The Transmission Operator either does not have an emergency load reduction plan for 50% or less but greater than 25% of the IROLs or implementation of the load reduction plan will take more than 30 minutes for 50% or less but greater than 25% or less of the IROLs.</p> <p>High — The Transmission Operator either does not have an emergency load reduction plan for 75% or less but greater than 50% of the IROLs or implementation of the load reduction plan will take more than 30 minutes for 75% or less but greater than 50% or less of the IROLs.</p> <p>Severe — The Transmission Operator either does not have an emergency load reduction plan for less than 100% but greater than 75% of the IROLs or implementation of the load reduction plan will take more than 30 minutes for less than 100% but greater than 75% or less of the IROLs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The VSL drafting team believes that a percentage approach is not appropriate for this requirement. The absence of an emergency load reduction plan for any single identified IROL would not be compliant with R2.</p>
---	--	--

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

<p>Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)</p>	<p>R2 — We suggest the following changes: Lower — The Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate the existence of an emergency load reduction plan capable of implementation within 30 minutes for one identified IROL. Moderate — The Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate the existence of an emergency load reduction plan capable of implementation within 30 minutes for two identified IROLs High — The Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate the existence of an emergency load reduction plan capable of implementation within 30 minutes for three identified IROLs. Severe —The Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate the existence of an emergency load reduction plan capable of implementation within 30 minutes for four or more identified IROLs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The drafting team believes that no changes are required to the VSLs. The absence of an emergency load reduction plan for any single identified IROL would not be compliant with R2.</p>
<p>ISO / RTO Council (IRC)</p>	<p>R2 - The proposed HIGH VSL is not appropriate because it would require that compliance auditor “project” an implementation time of a set of ?Plans?. Such projections would be subjective and not a good evaluator for a VSL. The SRC proposes that a single SEVERE VSL be used</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The drafting team believes that no changes are required to the VSLs. The language in the High VSL reflects the language used in the Requirement which states the 30 minute implementation time constraint.</p>
<p>MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee</p>	<p>For EOP-001-0 R2, what if a Transmission Operator demonstrated the existence of an emergency load reduction plan but the load reduction was not sufficient? The MRO believes that there are separate conditions in the requirement and the VSLs should address these conditions. There is the time component and an amount component for either a separation or a collapse.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. An answer to your questions requires an interpretation of the requirement which is beyond the scope of the drafting team. The language in the High VSL reflects the language used in the Requirement which states the 30 minute implementation time constraint.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 Requirement R3

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders disagreed with the “Lower” VSLs for all the subrequirements and these have been deleted.

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R3.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with one (1) of the sub-components.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with two (2) of the sub-components.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has failed to comply with three (3) of the sub-components.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has failed to comply with four (4) of the sub-components.
Revised R3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R3.1	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies for insufficient generating capacity but the plans are missing one or more program/procedural elements.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies for insufficient generating capacity and the plans are implemented but the plans are not maintained.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies for insufficient generating capacity but the plans are not maintained nor implemented.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies for insufficient generating capacity.
Revised R3.1	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies for insufficient generating capacity and the plans are implemented but the plans are not maintained.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies for insufficient generating capacity but the plans are neither maintained nor implemented.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies for insufficient generating capacity.
Original R3.2	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies on the transmission system but the plans are missing one or more	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies on the transmission system and the plans are implemented but the	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies on the transmission system but the plans are not maintained nor	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies on the transmission system.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
	program/procedural elements.	plans are not maintained.	implemented.	
Revised R3.2	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies on the transmission system and the plans are implemented but the plans are not maintained.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies on the transmission system but the plans are neither maintained nor implemented.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of a set of plans to mitigate operating emergencies on the transmission system.
Original R3.3	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for load shedding but the plans are missing one or more program/procedural elements.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for load shedding and the plans are implemented but the plans are not maintained.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for load shedding but the plans are not maintained nor implemented.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of a set of plans for load shedding.
Revised R3.3	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for load shedding and the plans are implemented but the plans are not maintained.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for load shedding but the plans are neither maintained nor implemented.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of a set of plans for load shedding.
Original R3.4	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority’s system restoration plans are missing minor details or minor program/procedural elements.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for system restoration but the plans are missing one or more program/procedural elements.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for system restoration and the plans are implemented but the plans are not maintained.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for system restoration but the plans are not maintained nor implemented.
Revised R3.4	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for system restoration and the plans are implemented but the plans are	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a set of plans for system restoration but the plans are neither maintained nor	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of a set of plans for system restoration.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
		not maintained.	implemented.	

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R3.1 to R3.4: The elements are for consideration because some may not be applicable to an entity. The VSL requires all elements to be in the plan. The VSL really should apply to the applicable elements only. Note that the wording "Applicable elements" is used in the levels of non-compliance. Also since the elements for consideration are used for requirements R3.1 to R3.4 which span a variety of situations it should be understood that all elements would not apply to all situations.	The EOP VSL drafting team has removed the Lower VSL for R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, and R3.4 in response to the comments received. The requirement does not include any reference to "applicable" – the requirement clearly states that the responsible entity "shall have" the various types of plans identified in R3.1 through R3.4.
Manitoba Hydro	R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, R3.4: remove the Lower VSL from each the subrequirements or define what the "program/procedural elements" are. Makes it too vague	The EOP VSL drafting team has removed the Lower VSL for R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, and R3.4 in response to the comments received.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The "parent" requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document.	In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary requirements only. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to VSLs to all requirement and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams. There is a plan to update the Drafting Team Guidelines. Part of this planned update does include adding the elements from the VSL Guideline document and the guidelines in a draft document that addresses development of measures and compliance elements into the Drafting Team Guidelines.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
We Energies	<p>R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, R3.4: Lower VSL: Where is the list of "program/procedural elements" that might be used to judge what is missing? Moderate and High VSL: implemented=carried out. I believe "implemented" in the requirement means that these plans are carried out during an emergency. The "implemented" in these VSLs needs to be reworded, or explained if the team believes its usage is correct</p>	<p>The EOP VSL drafting team has removed the Lower VSL for R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, and R3.4 in response to the comments received. The Measure for this requirement is associated with having evidence that the documents exist – the VSL DT assumes the word, "implement" means to have the plan available for use.</p>
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	<p>R3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 — We believe the phrase 'program/procedural elements' needs to be specifically defined rather than left open-ended and vague as proposed. We suggest adding the phrase 'as contained in R4' to the Lower VSLs for R3.1, R3.2, R3.3 and R3.4.</p>	<p>The EOP VSL drafting team has removed the Lower VSL for R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, and R3.4 in response to the comments received.</p>
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	<p>EOP-001 R3.1 - 3.4 refer to program/procedural elements in the LOWER VSL. This does not appear to appropriate since other requirements in the standard refer to the elements required. The requirements specify maintaining documents but do not specify to what degree. Recommend: Severe — no plan has been developed High — plan is not implemented Moderate — n/a Lower — ?plan has not been "maintained" EOP-001 R4 It is not clear as to what "operating emergencies" that R4 is alluding to that are not addressed in R3. If it is duplicative of R3 operating emergencies then it should not have a VSL associated with it. Also, attempting to scale it based on the number of sub-requirements met creates the multiple penalty for the same violation scenario</p>	<p>The EOP VSL drafting team has removed the Lower VSL for R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, and R3.4 in response to the comments received.</p> <p>Your recommendation regarding R3 and R4 requires an interpretation of the requirements which is beyond the scope of the drafting team.</p> <p>The double jeopardy issue is beyond the scope of the EOP VSL drafting team. This is a compliance issue and we refer you to section 3.10 of the NERC Sanctions Guidelines for information on this issue.</p> <p>The modification made to remove the "lower" VSLs eliminates the duplication identified.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Bonneville Power	In the VSLs for EOP 001 - 0, Requirements 3.1 through 3.4, the term maintain is used but not defined. A Moderate or High VSL is assessed for plans that are "not maintained" yet it is not clear how a TO or BA can prove they maintained their plan. Does "maintain" mean "review and update"; a phrase used in VSLs for this and several other standards. If so the VSLs for R. 6. would cover the "maintenance" issues of these requirements under the "review and update" requirement of R.6. Lack of such review and updating ("maintenance") resulting in a Severe VSL. The Moderate VSL for 3.1 through 3.4 could be eliminated and the HIGH VSL language for R 3.1 through 3.4 could then read "The TO or BA demonstrated the existence of a set of plans ??.. but the plans are not implemented. Again eliminating the "maintain" language from those VSLs and have it covered under the VSL for R.6. "review and update". If "maintain" means more than "review and update" then the VSL needs to clearly state what is meant by that term so that BAs and TOs can know what they must do in order to avoid Moderate and High violations for not "maintaining" their emergency plans. Without that clarification they can't know what they are expected to do.	The language in the VSLs reflects the language in the requirements. Interpretation of the language in the requirements is beyond the scope of this drafting team.
City of Tallahassee	R3.1–R3.4. The Lower VSLs end with "missing one or more program/procedural elements". To what elements are the VSLs referring to? Is this a repeat of R5–R6.	The EOP VSL drafting team has removed the Lower VSL for R3.1, R3.2, R3.3, and R3.4 in response to the comments received.
Entergy Services	It appears the double jeopardy exposure has been removed from EOP-001-0 R3.	Thank you for your comment.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.1 - SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement.	The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs by removing the Lower VSL. The drafting team also believes that a binary approach would not be appropriate for this subrequirement since the subrequirement has three distinct elements (develop, maintain, implement) and it is possible to have noncompliant performance that involves partial compliance.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.2 - The SRC proposes that all references to BAs be dropped for these VSLs. The SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement	Rewording of language in the requirements is beyond the scope of this drafting team. Several of the EOP group of standards are currently under revision by other drafting teams. The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs by removing the Lower VSL. The drafting team also believes that a binary approach would not be appropriate for this subrequirement since the subrequirement has three distinct elements (develop, maintain, implement) and it is possible to have noncompliant performance that involves partial compliance.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.3 - The SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement.	The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs by removing the Lower VSL. The drafting team also believes that a binary approach would not be appropriate for this subrequirement since the subrequirement has three distinct elements (develop, maintain, implement) and it is possible to have noncompliant performance that involves partial compliance.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.4 - The SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement.	The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs by removing the Lower VSL. The drafting team also believes that a binary approach would not be appropriate for this subrequirement since the subrequirement has three distinct elements (develop, maintain, implement) and it is possible to have noncompliant performance that involves partial compliance.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 Requirement R4

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the VSLs, as proposed, subjected stakeholders to “double jeopardy” and the drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs so that each subrequirement is identified in a VSL, but no attempt was made to provide a distinct set of VSLs for each subrequirement. The drafting team believes this modification supports the intent of the Commission’s directives as there is a VSL for noncompliance associated with each of the subrequirements.

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R4.	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing two (2) of the sub-requirements identified for R4.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing three (3) or four (4) of the sub-requirements identified for R4.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies.
Original R4.1	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing the communications protocols to be used during emergencies.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R4.2	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing a list of controlling actions to resolve the emergency.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R4.3	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing a list the tasks to be coordinated with and among adjacent Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R4.4	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing the staffing levels for the emergency.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R4.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans do not include sub-requirement R4.4.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans do not include sub-requirement R4.3.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans do not include either sub-requirement R4.1 or R4.2.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing two (2) or more of the sub-requirements identified for R4.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R4 - The VSLs do not follow the VSL Guidelines Development Criteria (VSLGDC) as established by the VSL drafting team. The VSLGDC specifies quartiles as the preferred approach for establishing VSLs for multi-component requirements. Omission of a Lower VSL and integer selections of the number of missed sub-requirements do not follow the quartile approach. There should be four VSLs defined based on each VSL including successively 25% fewer or more violations of the sub-requirements.	The EOP VSL drafting team does not feel the quartile approach is appropriate for this requirement. The VSLs have been revised so that subrequirements are related to specific VSLs with a Severe VSL associated with violation of multiple sub-requirements.
NPCC	R4 should have an entry in the Low column which reads: "The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing one (1) of the subrequirements identified for R4."With this change, there is no longer a need for an entry in each of R4.1 to R4.4, which as written has a Low VSL which in our view is incorrect for a binary type of requirement. For these requirements, a Severe should be assigned (i.e. either met or not met).	Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	The issue of VSLs for main requirements and each sub-requirement is apparently still with us. Defining VSLs in this way exposes the subject entity(ies) to a double jeopardy situation. As proposed if an entity is not compliant with two sub-requirements, the entity is also non-complaint with R4. We would propose eliminating all VSLs for the sub-requirements, which are simply a listing of items to include in the main requirement, and modify the VSLs for the main requirement to the following: Lower — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing one (1) of the sub-requirements identified for R4.Moderate - The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing two (2) of the sub-requirements identified for R4.High - The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of	Thank you for your comment. In response to industry comments, VSLs have been removed from individual sub-requirements. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
	<p>emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing three (3) of the sub-requirements identified for R4. Severe —The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing the four (4) sub-requirements identified for R4.</p>	
<p>ISO / RTO Council (IRC)</p>	<p>R4 - The SRC would suggest that the VSLs for R4 and its subrequirements be combined into R4. Thus if any one sub-requirement is missing then the VSL is LOWER. If two or three are missing then VSL is MODERATE; if all four are missing then HIGH; and if no plan at all then SEVERE. If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. In response to industry comments, VSLs have been removed from individual sub-requirements. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).</p>
<p>Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)</p>	<p>The LOWER VSL for 4.1–4.4 is appropriate.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs based on industry comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL.</p>
<p>Ontario IESO</p>	<p>R4 should have an entry in the Low column which reads: "The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of emergency plans that will enable it to mitigate operating emergencies but the plans are missing one (1) of the subrequirements identified for R4." With this change, there is no longer a need for an entry in each of R4.1 to R4.4, which as written has a Low VSL which in our view is incorrect for a binary type of requirement. For these requirements, a Severe should be assigned (i.e. either met or not met).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Duke Energy Corporation	We do not agree that sub-requirements should always be assigned VSLs. Requirements R4 and R7 have sub-requirements. Violation of multiple sub-requirements would result in a "Lower" VSL for each sub-requirement violation, and also a "Moderate", "High" or "Severe" VSL for the main requirement. The "Lower" VSL for the main requirement should apply for missing any one of the sub-requirements. VSLs for each sub-requirement should be deleted. Requirement R5 VSLs refer to "applicable" elements in Attachment 1-EOP-001-0. Who determines what is "applicable"?	Thank you for your comment. In response to industry comments, VSLs have been removed from individual sub-requirements. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R4.1 - See comment to R4.If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement.	Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs based on industry comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL.
Bonneville Power	R4.1 Communications protocols are very important in emergencies and have been an issue during large disturbances; please rise to moderate or high VSL. In R4 there may be double counting of VSL penalties.	Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs based on industry comments. As suggested, violation of R4.1 would result in a High VSL. Assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs eliminates the double counting issue.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R4.2 - See comment to R4.If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement	Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs based on industry comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL.
Hydro One Networks	R4.2 contains 2 requirements (1) for a list of controlling actions and (2) load reduction to be part of the list. We suggest including the statement into the Lower VSL "OR The list of controlling actions to resolve the emergency does not include load reduction in sufficient quantity to resolve the emergency within NERC-established timelines."	Thank you for your comment. The VSL for R4.2 has been deleted.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R4.3See comment to R4.If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement.	Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs based on industry comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
		VSL.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R4.3 — There appears to be the word "of" missing after "list" in the VSL.	Thank you for your comment. The VSL for R4.3 has been deleted.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R4.4 - See comment to R4.If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement	Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has revised the VSLs based on industry comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R4. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001 R5

Summary Consideration: Most commenters agreed with the VSLs as proposed, and no changes were made. Some commenters suggested the drafting team use the “quartile” approach in determining applicable percentages but the drafting team does not believe the quartile approach is appropriate. If the responsible entity has an emergency plan that is missing 25% of the applicable items, then the impact to the plan is significant, and should therefore be assigned a VSL that reflects that significance – which is at least a “Moderate” VSL.

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R5.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority included less than 100% but more than 90% of the applicable elements in Attachment 1-EOP-001-0 in its emergency plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority included less than or equal to 90% but more than 70% of the applicable elements in Attachment 1-EOP-001-0 in its emergency plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority included less than or equal to 70% but more than 50% of the applicable elements in Attachment 1-EOP-001-0 in its emergency plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority included less than or equal to 50% of the applicable elements in Attachment 1-EOP-001-0 in its emergency plan.

Company	Comment	Response
Manitoba Hydro	R5. How is this enforceable at any level when it's left up to the entity to determine if an element in Attachment 1 is applicable? The elements in the attachment have to be made requirements before a VSL can be assigned.	The EOP VSL drafting team does not believe that any changes are required to the VSLs. The question of applicability is one of interpretation and is beyond the scope of this drafting team.
NPCC	R5: We do not have a major problem with the various levels but according to the general guideline in the VSL criteria document, shouldn't these be assessed at 25% blocks? Note that the requirement R3 does not refer to the "applicable elements". It appears that applying VSLs to this requirement as well as R3 would be a repeat. Would one be non-compliant with two requirements and VSLs applied to both? Consider using the "applicable elements" VSL in only one of the requirements (R3 or R5) but not both	The VSL drafting team does not feel the quartile approach is applicable to this requirement. Your comment regarding the linkage between R3 and R5 is beyond the scope of this project.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R5 - The SRC recommends no VSLs for this requirement	The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VRF and VSLs to all requirements. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-01 R5 recommendation: Severe — no elements of 1-EOP-001 are included in the plan High — less than 25% of the elements of 1-EOP-001 are included in the plan Moderate — less than 50% of the elements of 1-EOP-001 are included in the plan Lower — less than 75% of the elements of 1-EOP-001 are included in the plan.	The VSL drafting team does not feel the quartile approach is applicable to this requirement.
FirstEnergy	R5 — (1) The quartile approach is not being used correctly. Should be evenly divided into quarters across the four VSL. (2) This requires the inclusion of the applicable elements in Attachment 1- EOP-001-0 when developing an emergency plan. This list includes an item 3. Environmental constraints ? Plans to seek removal of environmental constraints for generating units and plants. Some organizations may choose not to seek the approval for removal of environmental constraints for generating units and plants in an emergency under their plan. The VSL for this requirement means that those organizations would have a consistent lower VSL violation for implementing one regulatory requirement over another. A violation should not occur when organizations choose to abide by a regulatory requirement in all situations.	The VSL drafting team does not feel the quartile approach is applicable to this requirement. The plan should address all elements listed on Attachment 1-EOP-001-0. Exceptions taken to the implementation of a specific element is a compliance issue and outside the scope of this project.
Ontario IESO	R5: We do not have a major problem with the various levels but according to the general guideline in the VSL criteria document, shouldn't these be assessed at 25% blocks?	The VSL drafting team does not feel the quartile approach is applicable to this requirement.
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R5 VSLs refer to "applicable" elements in Attachment 1-EOP-001-0. Who determines what is "applicable"?	The SDT cannot change the language of the requirement which does use the term, "applicable."

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 Requirement R6

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the Severe VSL should include a reference to the “annual update” and the drafting team did make this modification. The DT modified the second Severe VSL to align with FERC’s Guideline 4 – VSL assignment should be based on a single violation, not on a cumulative number of violations.

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R6	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it reviewed, and updated as appropriate, each of its emergency plans at least once in the past thirteen calendar months.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to provide a copy of an updated emergency plan to its Reliability Coordinator, all its neighboring Transmission Operators, and all its neighboring Balancing Authorities.</p>
Revised R6.	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it completed an annual review, and updated as appropriate, each of its emergency plans.</p> <p>OR</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

				The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to provide a copy of one of its updated emergency plans to its Reliability Coordinator, all its neighboring Transmission Operators, and all its neighboring Balancing Authorities.
--	--	--	--	---

Company	Comment	Response
Manitoba Hydro	R6. I would suggest making the VSL that states the entity failed to provide a copy of emergency plan to its RC and neighbors be moved to high from severe.	R6 has 2 components - 1) emergency plan updating and 2) emergency plan distribution. The Requirement is not met if either component is not met. Unless the components are binary, multiple combinations of timely updating and distribution of emergency plans are possible. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting each component of the Requirement.
City of Tallahassee	Severe VSL is defining what "annual review" is. This is not the avenue to change the standard. The interpretation of "annual review" is set out in my Document Control Procedure since it was not previously identified by NERC. This insertion of 13 months is contrary to the previous response to comments submitted in the 2007-23 project.	The "annual review" language has been edited as suggested by comments received.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R6 - LOWER — Plan not —updated or reviewed MODERATE — Plan not distributed to 25% or less of adjacent entities HIGH — Plan not distributed to everybody SEVERE — Plan not distributed at all	R6 has 2 components - 1) emergency plan updating and 2) emergency plan distribution. The Requirement is not met if either component is not met. VSLs are a measure of the extent to which Requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. Unless the components are binary, multiple combinations of timely updating and distribution of emergency plans are possible. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting each component of the Requirement.
Hydro One Networks	There should be a High VSL for R6 reflecting that the TOP or BA failed to provide a copy of an updated emergency plan to one of the applicable entities and then reword the Severe VSL to reflect failing to provide a copy of an updated emergency plan to two or more of the applicable entities.	R6 has 2 components - 1) emergency plan updating and 2) emergency plan distribution. The Requirement is not met if either component is not met. VSLs are a measure of the extent to which Requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. Unless the components are binary, multiple combinations of timely updating and distribution of emergency plans are possible. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting each component

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
		of the Requirement.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	R6: This requirement has two components, and currently both are in the Severe VSL column. Recommend keeping the first VSL as is, but taking the second VSL and spreading it across the 4 VSL levels on a percentage basis. So if the entity has one RC and 3 neighboring BAs and TOs that is 4 total entities to share the program with. If the entity does not provide the program to one of these (25%) that would be a Low VSL and so on	R6 has 2 components - 1) emergency plan updating and 2) emergency plan distribution. The Requirement is not met if either component is not met. VSLs are a measure of the extent to which Requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. Unless the components are binary, multiple combinations of timely updating and distribution of emergency plans are possible. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting each component of the Requirement.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R6 — We suggest the following changes: Moderate — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to provide a copy of an updated emergency plan to all its neighboring Transmission Operators and all its neighboring Balancing Authorities.	R6 has 2 components - 1) emergency plan updating and 2) emergency plan distribution. The Requirement is not met if either component is not met. VSLs are a measure of the extent to which Requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. Unless the components are binary, multiple combinations of timely updating and distribution of emergency plans are possible. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting each component of the Requirement.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-001 R6 should be rated as LOWER or MODERATE as this is primarily administrative. Annually needs definition for use throughout the standards.	R6 has 2 components - 1) emergency plan updating and 2) emergency plan distribution. The Requirement is not met if either component is not met. VSLs are a measure of the extent to which Requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. Unless the components are binary, multiple combinations of timely updating and distribution of emergency plans are possible. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting each component of the Requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
FirstEnergy	R6 — In the Severe VSL category, we believe the phrase "once in the past thirteen calendar months" should be changed to "annually". The requirement uses the term annually and therefore the VSL should as well. The VSL is attempting to clarify the requirement which is not the intent of a VSL. If the periodicity needs to be clarified, it should be done on requirement R6 through the standards development process.	The "annual review" language has been edited as suggested by comments received.
Bonneville Power	R6 could have a reduced VSL.	R6 has 2 components - 1) emergency plan updating and 2) emergency plan distribution. The Requirement is not met if either component is not met. VSLs are a measure of the extent to which Requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. Unless the components are binary, multiple combinations of timely updating and distribution of emergency plans are possible. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting each component of the Requirement.
Southern Company	<p>R6.: (1) Is a Severe VSL warranted for this requirement?</p> <p>(2) The language "annually review" in the requirement could allow an entity to go as long as 23 months without addressing its plan. If "annually review", as specified in the requirement, is each calendar year; we could review our emergency plan on January 1 of the first year and December 31 of the subsequent year and still meet the obligations of the requirement. "Annually" is too nebulous — the requirement should say something like "review every 12 months".</p> <p>(3) The second part of the requirement does not stipulate "when" the emergency plan should be provided to others. At the conclusion of the "review and update" period how much time do the BA and TO have to provide a copy of its updated emergency plans to its RC and neighboring BAs and TOs? The requirement is too loosely worded to have a Severe VSL applied.</p>	<p>VSLs do not focus on reliability-related impact of noncompliance – VSLs focus on the “degree” to which the entity’s performance was noncompliant.</p> <p>The "annual review" language has been left unchanged as suggested by most comments received.</p> <p>The timing of emergency plan distribution is not part of the Requirement and may require interpretation which is outside the scope of this project.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 Requirement R7

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the VSLs, as proposed, subjected stakeholders to “double jeopardy” and the drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs so that each subrequirement is identified in a VSL, but no attempt was made to provide a distinct set of VSLs for each subrequirement. The drafting team believes this modification supports the intent of the Commission’s directives as there is a VSL for noncompliance associated with each of the subrequirements.

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R7.	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the but the coordination did not include two (2) of the appropriate sub-requirements identified for R7.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the but the coordination did not include three (3) or four (4) of the appropriate sub-requirements identified for R7.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate.
Original R7.1	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority did not establish and maintain reliable communications between interconnected systems as appropriate for the purpose of coordinating emergency plans.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R7.2	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority did not arrange for new interchange agreements as appropriate for the purpose of coordinating emergency plans.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R7.3	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority did not coordinate transmission and	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

EOP-001-0 – Emergency Operations Planning				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
	generator maintenance schedules as appropriate for the purpose of coordinating emergency plans.			
Original R7.4	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority did not arrange deliveries of electrical energy or fuel fro, remote systems as appropriate for the purpose of coordinating emergency plans.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R7	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the coordination specified in R7.4 was appropriate and was not included.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the coordination specified in R7.3 was appropriate and was not included.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the coordination specified in either R7.1 or R7.2 was appropriate and was not included.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the coordination specified in two (2) or more of the sub-requirements was appropriate and was not included.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R7: Same comment on R4 also applies here. The main requirement's VSLs can be made a function of the 4 sub-requirements hence eliminating the need to assign a VSL to each of the subrequirements. Also, there are two "but the but the" in the Moderate and High VSLs for R7	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R7 - The SRC would suggest that the VSLs for R7 and its sub-requirements be combined into R7.Thus if any one sub-requirement is missing then the VSL is LOWER. If two or three are missing then VSL is MODERATE; if all four are missing then HIGH; and if no plan at all then SEVERE. If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
	retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement	
Hydro One Networks	In the High VSL for R7, there is a clerical error. There is a repeat in the words "but the". In the Lower VSL for R7.4 there is a clerical error. Change "fro." to "from".	Thank you for your comments. Edits have been made.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R7 — The VSLs do not follow the VSL Guidelines Development Criteria (VSLGDC) as established by the VSL drafting team. The VSLGDC specifies quartiles as the preferred approach for establishing VSLs for multi-component requirements. Omission of a Lower VSL and integer selections of the number of missed sub-requirements do not follow the quartile approach. There should be four VSLs defined based on each VSL including successively 25% fewer or more violations of the sub-requirements. R7.4 — "fuel fro" should be "fuel from".	Thank you for your comment. The VSL drafting team believes that a percentage approach is not appropriate for this Requirement. The suggested edits have been made.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R7 — Again we have the double jeopardy situation here. As in R4 above we suggest eliminating all the VSLs for the sub-requirements and modify the VSLs for the main requirement to the following: Lower — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the coordination did not include one (1) of the sub-requirements identified for R7. Moderate — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the coordination did not include two (2) of the sub-requirements identified for R7. High — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated that it coordinated its emergency plans with other Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as appropriate but the coordination did not include three (3) of the sub-requirements identified for R7. Severe	Thank you for your comment. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-001 R7 should not have a VSL. Also, attempting to scale it based on the number of sub-requirements met creates the multiple penalty for the same violation scenario. The LOWER VSL for 7.1–7.4 is appropriate.	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Ontario IESO	R7: Same comment on R4 also applies here. The main requirement's VSLs can be made a function of the 4 sub-requirements hence eliminating the need to assign a VSL to each of the subrequirements. Also, there are two "but the but the" in the Moderate and High VSLs for R7	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Southern Company	R7. The worst case of non-compliance with this requirement is non-compliance with 4 of the 4 sub-requirements - the High VSL and Severe VSL appear to be equivalent. We recommend striking the reference to "four (4)" of the sub-requirements. The phrasing "..but the but..." in the High VSL should be corrected	The DT decided non-compliance with any 2 of the sub-requirements would result in a Severe VSL. The High VSL has been edited.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R7.1 - See comment to R7.If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement. There either were communications or there were no communications	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Bonneville Power	R7.1 change text to "for the purpose of coordinating during an emergency." (delete "plans").	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. As revised, there is no need to duplicate the text of the individual subrequirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R7.2 - SRC proposes to omit assigning any VSL.	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R7.3 - SRC proposes to omit assigning any VSL.	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Bonneville Power	R7.3 change coordinating emergency plans to coordinating during emergencies	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. As revised, there is no need to duplicate the text of the individual subrequirements.
Southern Company	R7.3.: Does the TO or BA have any access to fuel supply data - with or without an emergency?	Thank you for your comment. The language of the requirement states that Coordination is required for applicable steps. R7.3 may not be applicable to all entities. The revised VSLs reflect that some subrequirements may not be applicable in all situations.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-001 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R7.4 - See comment to R7.If there is to be only one VSL, the SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained as it is the only measurable part of the requirement	The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a specific VSL in R7. Violating multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach is consistent with the assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Southern Company	R7.4.: Can the BA or TO arrange deliveries of fuel, as stated in the requirement? This does not seem to be within the scope of a TOs or BAs responsibilities in any circumstance. Also, see typo "fro" in VSL.	Thank you for your comment. The language of the requirement states that Coordination is required for applicable steps. R7.4 may not be applicable to all entities. The revised VSLs reflect that some subrequirements may not be applicable.
We Energies	R7.4 typographical error (fro)	Thank you for your comments. Edits have been made.

4. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-002-2 — Capacity and Energy Emergencies. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.

EOP-002-2 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: Some commenters objected to having noncompliance with either component of the requirement as Severe – the DT believes that failure to meet either part of the requirement is a Severe violation. The DT modified the second Severe VSL to align with FERC’s Guideline 4 – VSL assignment should be based on a single violation, not on a cumulative number of violations.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority or Reliability Coordinator failed to provide evidence that it has responsibility and clear decision-making authority to take whatever actions are needed to ensure the reliability of its respective area. OR The Balancing Authority or Reliability Coordinator did not exercise its authority to alleviate capacity and energy emergencies.
Revised R1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority or Reliability Coordinator failed to provide evidence that it has responsibility and clear decision-making authority to take whatever actions are needed to ensure the reliability of its respective area.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
				OR The responsible entity failed to exercise its authority to alleviate a capacity or energy emergency.

Company	Comment	Response
BCTC	R1 can be separated into two parts. One is the responsibility and authority for clear decision-making and the other is to exercise the authority. A Severe VSL should be assessed if both parts are not met. Suggest a High VSL be assessed if one part is not met.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT believes that failure to meet either part of the requirement is a severe violation.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1 - Not having an Authority Agreement can be separated from not using the authority. SRC would propose MODERATE VSL for not having an Authority Agreement; and Severe for not using that Authority in an emergency.	The DT thanks you for your comments. VSLs are a measure of the extent to which Requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting the Requirement. The DT believes that failure to meet either part of the requirement is a severe violation
MRO	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The "parent" requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document. Currently the VSLs are set up so that if 1 or 2 elements are missed it is a Low VSL and if 3 or more are missed it is a Sever VSL. Recommend spreading the missing of elements more evenly across ALL of the VSLs as either a number value or a percentage.	The DT thanks you for your comments. R1 does not have any subrequirements or elements.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R1 "Severe" VSL, the first logic condition is not necessary. ("The Balancing Authority or Reliability Coordinator failed to provide evidence that it has responsibility and clear decision-making authority to take whatever actions are needed to ensure the reliability of its respective area.") Given an emergency this VSL logic condition appears to just complicate the matter when it appears to be not needed. This requirement has two components, and currently both are in the Severe VSL column. Recommend placing the first one under the moderate column and the second one under the sever column.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The language of the VSL must reflect the language of the requirement. The DT understands that there are two components within this requirement and the VSL must address both of them. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.
Dominion Virginia Power	For R1, the first part of the Severe VSL (not having clear authority) should actually be a High VSL. The Severe VSL should be limited to failure to take action (authorized or not) to alleviate emergencies.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT believes that failure to meet either part of the requirement is a severe violation.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R1 - The first VSL in the Severe column should be struck. BAs and RCs are given the authority by this requirement. The only way a BA or RC truly has authority is for those registered entities in their footprint to follow their direction. Failure of those registered entities to follow the RC or BA direction is an implicit violation of this requirement by those registered entities.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The language of the VSL must reflect the language of the requirement. The DT understands that there are two components within this requirement and the VSL must address both of them.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-002 R1 the second sentence is duplicative of the requirement set forth in R2, therefore absent modifying the standard, N/A the VSL for R2.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The language of the VSL must reflect the language of the requirement. The DT understands that there are two components within this requirement and the VSL must address both of them. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.
Bonneville Power	It is unclear in the Standards when to trigger capacity and energy plans - be specific if possible (reserves low, line overloads, possible stability problems). At least refer to other standards that apply. For example, R6 CPS1 & CPS2 are monthly and yearly averages and should not be used to trigger an emergency procedure, they are too slow.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Southern Company	General: Are there any overlaps or double jeopardy scenarios between these standards and the PRC standards, particularly where under-frequency and under-voltage load shedding schemes are concerned???	The DT thanks you for your comments. The double jeopardy issue is outside the scope of the VSL DT. This is a compliance issue and we refer you to section 3.10 of the NERC Sanctions Guidelines for information on this issue. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.
Southern Company	R1.: (1) Is the second part of the R1 Severe VSL more appropriate for R2? It's confusing to think that "not exercising its authority" is not the same as "implementing its capacity and emergency plan". (2) Is the BA in a double jeopardy situation, with a Severe VSL applied twice (R1 and R2), for what could be argued as being one violation?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The language of the VSL must reflect the language of the requirement. The DT understands that there are two components within this requirement and the VSL must address both of them. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Requirement R2

Summary Consideration: Most commenters agreed with the VSLs as proposed. One commenter proposed a minor wording change for clarity, and the wording change was adopted as shown below.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it implemented its capacity and energy emergency plan, when required and as appropriate, to reduce risks to the interconnected system.
Revised R2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority failed to implement its capacity and energy emergency plan, when required and as appropriate, to reduce risks to the interconnected system.

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R2 — SRC proposes to omit assigning any VSL	The DT thanks you for your comments The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R2 — "provide evidence that it" should be struck and "implemented" should be changed to implement. The requirement does not specify anything about evidence.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL has been modified as suggested.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-002 R1 the second sentence is duplicative of the requirement set forth in R2, therefore absent modifying the standard, N/A the VSL for R2.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to each Requirement and subrequirement that has a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until it is modified by future drafting teams.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Requirement R3

Summary Consideration: Stakeholders indicated that the emphasis on “evidence” in the High VSL was inappropriate. Requirement R3 has two parts; R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R3.	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority communicated its current and future system conditions to its Reliability Coordinator but failed to provide evidence that it communicated its current and future system conditions to all of its neighboring Balancing Authorities.	The Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it communicated its current and future system conditions to its Reliability Coordinator.
Revised R3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority experienced an operating capacity or energy emergency and failed to communicate its current and future system conditions to its Reliability Coordinator and its neighboring Balancing Authorities.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R3: VSL is a measure of the extent to which requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. As such, we do not agree with the way that the High and Severe levels are assigned. We suggest that failing to report to either the BA's RC, or all of the neighboring BAs should be a High (failing 1/2 of the requirement), whereas failing to report to both groups should be a Severe (failing the entire requirement).	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT agrees that a VSL is a measure of the extent to which a Requirement is not met, not the reliability impact. R3 has two parts. R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3 — LOWER — Conditions not reported to 25% or less of adjacent entities MODERATE — Conditions not reported to 25% - 50% of adjacent entities HIGH — Conditions not reported to 50–75% of adjacent entities SEVERE — Conditions not reported to more than 75% of the adjacent entities.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT agrees that a VSL is a measure of the extent to which a Requirement is not met, not the reliability impact. R3 has two parts. R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.
MHEB	R3: The requirement is to communicate its condition to its RC and neighboring BAs but the severity levels are on the providing evidence, providing evidence is after the fact, what's important is the communications take place. I would suggest that the words "provide evidence that it" be removed from both the high and severe VSLs and change "communicated" to "communicate".	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL has been modified.
Hydro One Networks	We agree with the VSLs for R3 however we suggest rewording the beginning of the High VSL statement: "The BA is able to provide evidence that it communicated its current ?". The use of the word evidence is consistent with the rest of the VSLs for this requirement.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs describe categories of noncompliant performance that has been measured – so VSLs are written in the “past tense.”
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R3, what if the Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it communicated its future or current conditions to the Reliability Coordinator or to neighboring Balancing Authorities?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL was revised to remove the reference to providing evidence.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R3 — What is the justification for these VSLs to be high and severe? They should be lower.	The VSL is a measure of the extent to which a Requirement is not met, not the reliability impact. R3 has two parts, R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R3 - As written, the VSLs place more emphasis on providing evidence that communications occurred rather than the act of actually communicating. We suggest the following: High — The Balancing Authority communicated its current and future system conditions to its Reliability Coordinator but failed to communicate its current and future system conditions to all of its neighboring Balancing Authorities. Severe — The Balancing Authority failed to communicate its current and future system conditions to its Reliability Coordinator.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL has been modified to eliminate the 'providing evidence' language. R3 has two parts; R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-002 R3 HIGH should be downgraded to LOWER or MODERATE and the "all of it's neighboring BAs" should be changed to "any?". The SEVERE should be downgraded to HIGH or MODERATE.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL is a measure of the extent to which a Requirement is not met, not the reliability impact. R3 has two parts; R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.
Ontario IESO	R3: VSL is a measure of the extent to which requirements are not met, not the reliability impact. As such, we do not agree with the way that the High and Severe levels are assigned. We suggest that failing to report to either the BA's RC, or all of the neighboring BAs should be a High (failing 1/2 of the requirement), whereas failing to report to both groups should be a Severe (failing the entire requirement).	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL is a measure of the extent to which a Requirement is not met, not the reliability impact. R3 has two parts; R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.
Southern Company	R3.: The requirement states "shall communicate" but is silent on "when". There should be a "when" stated, such as "contemporaneously", or "with no intentional delay", or "in a timely manner". More specificity is needed on the "when" of the requirement without being overly burdensome on a BA who is experiencing an emergency condition. Under the Severe VSL neighboring BA's seem to have been omitted. Does it matter in the formulation of the VSL that current and future conditions were communicated to neighboring BA's and but not to the RC?	The DT thanks you for your comments. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team. R3 has two parts; R3 is not met if either part is not met. The Severe VSL reflects the binary (pass or fail) nature of meeting both parts of the Requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Requirement R4

Summary Consideration: Several commenters disagreed with the VSLs as proposed. Although there are several actions identified in the requirement, if any one of the actions in the requirement has not been taken, then the impact in achieving the intent of the requirement has fallen so far from meeting the intent of the requirement that this qualifies as a "Severe" VSL. No changes were made to the VSLs.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R4.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority anticipating an operating capacity or energy emergency failed to perform all actions necessary including bringing on all available generation, postponing equipment maintenance, scheduling interchange purchases in advance, or preparing to reduce firm load.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R4: Having only a Severe violation level for a requirement that arguably is not binary can create difficulties in compliance audit. Furthermore, the term "all actions" is difficult to define, making assessment of failing to perform "all actions" debatable. We do not have a suggestion on how to revise the VSLs at this time, given the way the requirement is written, but suggest the VSL SDT keep this on file for consideration by the EOP SDT to revise this requirement to better support measurements and development of VSLs.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R4— SRC proposes to omit assigning any VSL.	The DT thanks you for your comments. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams.
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R4 "Severe" VSL, a "but" should be inserted between "The Balancing Authority anticipating an operating capacity or energy emergency" and " ? failed to perform all actions necessary including ?"	The DT thanks you for your comments – The drafting team did not make any modifications to the VSL.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R4 — Why is more than one VSL not selected? Shouldn't various VSLs be populated based on how many of the various listed actions were implemented? If all but one action was implemented perhaps the VSL should be Lower. The VSL as written appears to focus on importance which is a function of the VRF not VSL.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Although there are several actions identified in the requirement, if any one of the actions in the requirement has not been taken, then the impact in achieving the intent of the requirement has fallen so far from meeting the intent of the requirement that this qualifies as a “Severe” VSL.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-002 R4 needs scaling; additionally, "all" of the specified actions may not be needed to mitigate the emergency and thus should not be the criteria for the SEVERE VSL.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The requirement states that all actions "necessary" (including those stated in the requirement) are to be taken and it is beyond the scope of the Drafting Team to interpret the Requirement. The Drafting Team feels the severe VSL is appropriate.
Ontario IESO	R4: Having only a Severe violation level for a requirement that arguably is not binary can create difficulties in compliance audit. Furthermore, the term "all actions" is difficulty to define, making assessment of failing to perform "all actions" debatable. We do not have a suggestion on how to revise the VSLs at this time, given the way the requirement is written, but suggest the VSL SDT keep this on file for consideration by the EOP SDT to revise this requirement to better support measurements and development of VSLs.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Although there are several actions identified in the requirement, if any one of the actions in the requirement has not been taken, then the impact in achieving the intent of the requirement has fallen so far from meeting the intent of the requirement that this qualifies as a “Severe” VSL. The Drafting Team feels the severe VSL is appropriate.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Southern Company	<p>R4.: (1) This requirement lists four (4) actions. One recommendation is to associate the VSL severity with the number of actions taken (or not taken) as outlined below: Lower - the BA met 3, Moderate - the BA met 2, High - the BA met 1, Severe - the BA met none (2) The present language of the VSL does not indicate that "evidence" is required to demonstrate compliance. (3) Independent of prior recommendations, other language may be more appropriate than the present text in the Severe VSL which states that: the BA failed to perform "all actions" ... Consider "any" or "including, but not limited to" forms of phrasing as a replacement for the present text.</p>	<p>The DT thanks you for your comments. Although there are several actions identified in the requirement, if any one of the actions in the requirement has not been taken, then the impact in achieving the intent of the requirement has fallen so far from meeting the intent of the requirement that this qualifies as a "Severe" VSL. The Drafting Team feels the severe VSL is appropriate.</p>

EOP-002-2 Requirement R5

Summary Consideration: Based on stakeholder comments, the drafting team added a second option for the High VSL.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R5.	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority used the assistance provided by the Interconnection’s frequency bias for more time than needed to implement corrective actions.	<p>The Balancing Authority used the assistance provided by the Interconnection’s frequency bias for more time than needed to implement corrective actions.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The Balancing Authority unilaterally adjusted generation in an attempt to return Interconnection frequency to normal beyond that supplied through frequency bias action and Interchange Schedule changes.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R5.	N/A	N/A	<p>The Balancing Authority used the assistance provided by the Interconnection’s frequency bias for more time than needed to implement corrective actions.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Balancing Authority unilaterally adjusted generation in an attempt to return Interconnection frequency to normal beyond that supplied through frequency bias action and Interchange Schedule changes.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority used the assistance provided by the Interconnection’s frequency bias for more time than needed to implement corrective actions.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The Balancing Authority unilaterally adjusted generation in an attempt to return Interconnection frequency to normal beyond that supplied through frequency bias action and Interchange Schedule changes.</p>

Company	Comment	Response
BCTC	R5 — The High VSL should be for the extended use of the Interconnection's frequency bias OR unilateral action to return the Interconnection frequency to normal.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The changes were made as suggested.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R5 — SRC proposes to omit assigning any VSL.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF.
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R5, what if the Balancing Authority unilaterally adjusted generation in an attempt to return interconnection frequency to normal beyond that supplied through frequency bias action and interchange schedule changes but they also used the assistance provided by the interconnection's frequency bias for less time than needed to implement corrective actions?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The drafting team has revised the high VSL

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R5 — The High VSL and the first Severe VSL are duplicated. What is the justification for setting the VSLs so high? Why shouldn't they be lower?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The drafting team has revised the high VSL. The VSL is a measure of the severity of non compliance with the requirement after the fact (once the violation has occurred) and it is not a measure of impact on reliability.
We Energies	R5 Severe VSL: With an "and", if the only thing I do is unilaterally adjust generation to correct frequency this VSL does not apply.	The drafting team modified the High VSLs to ensure that it is clear that missing one of the pieces of the requirement is a "High" VSL and missing both is a "Severe" VSL.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-002 R5 is an example of another requirement that needs to be rewritten before an appropriate VSL can be assigned. Given the weakness in the current requirement the VSL should be no higher than MODERATE.	The DT thanks you for your comments. This is an approved and enforceable standard. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams.
Bonneville Power	R5 reduce VLS to low and moderate. In a disaster with loss of telecommunications, controlling generation using frequency may be the only option.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs describe the level (or how severely) the specific requirement has been violated, if it's not done at all or totally violated then it is severe. Extenuating circumstances will be considered by the auditor in its analysis and determination of penalties.
Southern Company	R5.: Is Interconnection frequency a defined term - if not, does it need to be?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The answer to your question is beyond the scope of this drafting team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Requirement R6

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the VSLs, as proposed, subjected stakeholders to “double jeopardy” and the drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs so that each subrequirement is identified in a VSL, but no attempt was made to provide a distinct set of VSLs for each subrequirement. The drafting team believes this modification supports the intent of the Commission’s directives as there is a VSL for noncompliance associated with each of the subrequirements.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R6.	N/A	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to implement two (2) of the sub-requirements identified for R6.	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to implement three (3) of the sub-requirements identified for R6.	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to implement four (4) or more of the sub-requirements identified for R6.
Original R6.1	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to load all available generating capacity.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R6.2	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to deploy all available operating reserve.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R6.3	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to interrupt interruptible load and exports.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R6.4	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
	Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to request emergency assistance from other Balancing Authorities.			
Original R6.5	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to declare an Energy Emergency through its Reliability Coordinator.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R6.6	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to reduce load, through procedures such as public appeals, voltage reductions or curtailing interruptible loads or firm loads.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R6.	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to immediately implement one (1) of the sub-requirements R6.1 R6.2, R6.3, R6.4, R6.5 or R6.6.	The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards and failed to immediately implement more than one (1) of the sub-requirements R6.1 R6.2, R6.3, R6.4, R6.5 or R6.6.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Southern Company	R6: The comments on R4 of EOP-001 (i.e. eliminate the Low's for subrequirements) also applies here.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a High VSL in R6. Low and Moderate VSLs were not assigned sub-requirements as non-compliance with any sub-requirement is a significant violation of R6. Non-compliance with multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach eliminates double jeopardy concerns for non-compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R6 - SRC proposes to omit assigning any VSL	The DT thanks you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF.
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R6, R6.1, R6.2, R6.3, R6.4, R6.5, or R6.6, the assigned VSL are not relevant to the requirements/sub requirements. Failure to comply with Control Performance and Disturbance Control standards should be addressed in those standards.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Revision of the standards or requirements is beyond the scope of the drafting team.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R6 — The VSLs do not follow the VSL Guidelines Development Criteria (VSLGDC) as established by the VSL drafting team. The VSLGDC specifies quartiles as the preferred approach for establishing VSLs for multi-component requirements. Omission of a Lower VSL and integer selections of the number of missed sub-requirements do not follow the quartile approach. There should be four VSLs defined based on each VSL including successively 25% fewer or more violations of the sub-requirements.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLDT believes that the quartile is not appropriate for this requirement. Low and Moderate VSLs were not assigned sub-requirements as non-compliance with any sub-requirement is a significant violation of R6.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
We Energies	<p>R6 and sub requirements (and somewhat carried over into R7): Consider this in writing the VSLs. R6 is poorly worded as a stand alone requirement and must be interpreted as part of EOP-002 as a whole. (R6 is a carry over from the old Policy 5 and probably the A1, A2, B1, B2 criteria). The intent is to take immediate action to bring ACE back to zero in an emergency. The actual wording in the requirement is CPS and DCS. The CPS standard says I have to maintain a yearly average for CPS1 and a monthly score for CPS2. What is immediately for these? I can have bad ACE for three days before I violate CPS2. The only thing mentioned in R6 that is immediate is DCS. If I do not restore ACE within 15 minutes I have not complied with DCS, so within 15 minutes I have to have done everything mentioned in R6.1 through 6.6, including public appeals - this is impossible. These VSLs cannot blindly parrot the requirement wording. They should be written in reference to capacity and energy emergencies.</p>	<p>The DT thanks you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have VRFs. FERC VSL guidelines state VSL assignments should be consistent with the corresponding requirement. Changing or revising the requirements is beyond the scope of this DT.</p>
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	<p>R6 — Again we have the double jeopardy situation here. As in EOP-001-0,R4 above we suggest eliminating all the VSLs for the sub-requirements and modify the VSLs for the main requirement to the following: Lower — The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards failing to implement one (1) of the sub-requirements for R6.Moderate - The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards failing to implement two (2) of the sub-requirements for R6. High — The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards failing to implement three (3) of the sub-requirements for R6.Severe - The Balancing Authority was not able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards failing to implement four (4) or more of the sub-requirements for R6.</p>	<p>The DT thanks you for your comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a High or Severe VSL in R6. Low and Moderate VSLs were not assigned sub-requirements as non-compliance with any sub-requirement is a significant violation of R6. Non-compliance with multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach eliminates double jeopardy for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-002 R6 is another requirement that needs to be rewritten. It implies that immediate actions need to be taken to comply with CPS 1 & 2, which are measure over a period of time. Would an entity do all of these sub-requirements to comply with CPS 1 or 2? Also, attempting to scale it based on the number of sub-requirements met creates the multiple penalty for the same violation scenario. Suggest removing VSL for R6.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. Revision to the standards is beyond the scope of the drafting team. Assigning sub-requirements to the VSLs of the requirement eliminates double jeopardy for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement.
FirstEnergy	<p>R6 - The VSLs for this requirement are not appropriate. The subrequirements of R6 are "include, but are not limited to" types of remedies the BA can use if he cannot comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards. Therefore, for example, if the BA has one instance where he cannot comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Control Standards, he may choose to Load all available generating capacity as permitted by R6.1. Does this mean that since he only used one of the suggested subrequirements that he is in violation? Furthermore, the VSLs for each subrequirement do not work as well for the same reason that each remedy may or may not be used. Suggest changing the VSLs for R6 as follows. Low: N/A Medium: N/A High: N/A Severe:</p> <p>The Balancing Authority had one or more instances of not being able to comply with the Control Performance and Disturbance Standard and did not use one or more of the remedies suggested in the subrequirements or other remedies as appropriate. Also, due to the way this requirement is written, each of the subrequirements may or may not be used, therefore VSLs cannot be applicable to the subrequirements. Each and every subrequirement VSL should state "N/A".</p>	<p>The DT thanks you for your comments. Revisions to and interpretation of the wording of the standards is beyond the scope of the VSL DT. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a High or Severe VSL in R6. Low and Moderate VSLs were not assigned sub-requirements as non-compliance with any sub-requirement is a significant violation of R6. Non-compliance with multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).</p> <p>In proposing modifications to the VSLs, the drafting team is trying to respect the guidelines for approving VSLs that FERC issued to NERC. FERC's Guideline 4 for VSLs is: VSL assignment should be based on a single violation, not non a cumulative number of violations – thus the recommendation to change the VSLs to reflect noncompliance for multiple instances was not adopted.</p>
Ontario IESO	R6: The comments on R4 of EOP-001 (i.e. eliminate the Low's for subrequirements) also applies here.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated each sub-requirement with a High and Severe VSL in R6.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Duke Energy Corporation	We do not agree that sub-requirements should always be assigned VSLs. Requirement R6 has sub-requirements. Violation of multiple sub-requirements would result in a "Lower" VSL for each sub-requirement violation, and also a "Moderate", "High" or "Severe" VSL for the main requirement. The "Lower" VSL for the main requirement should apply for missing any one of the sub-requirements. VSLs for each sub-requirement should be deleted.	Thank you for your comment. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated violation of any one sub-requirement with a High and Severe VSL in R6. Low and Moderate VSLs were not assigned as non-compliance with any one sub-requirement is a significant violation of R6 (High VSL). Non-compliance with multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach eliminates the potential double jeopardy issue for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the primary requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Entergy Services	It appears the double jeopardy exposure has not been removed from EOP-002-2 R6, R7 and R9. Providing specific comments in this comment form is very inconvenient due to the large number of comments. Therefore, we have marked up the SAR itself in the comment boxes contained in the attached file "SAR_EOP_VSLs_1st_Posting_18April Entergy Comments.pdf"	The DT thanks you for your comments. The EOP VSL drafting team has associated violation of each sub-requirement with a High or Severe VSL in R6. Low and Moderate VSLs were not assigned sub-requirements as non-compliance with any one sub-requirement is a significant violation of R6. Non-compliance with multiple sub-requirements results in a Severe VSL. This approach eliminates concern with the double jeopardy issue for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the primary requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R6, R6.1, R6.2, R6.3, R6.4, R6.5, or R6.6, the assigned VSL are not relevant to the requirements/sub requirements. Failure to comply with Control Performance and Disturbance Control standards should be addressed in those standards.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Revision of the standards or requirements is beyond the scope of the drafting team.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	The VSLs for R6.1 - 6.6 are appropriate but the wording should be changed to "the responsible entity failed to _____ to meet the requirement".	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL has been revised to reflect the language of the requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Requirement R7

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the VSLs, as proposed, subjected stakeholders to “double jeopardy” and the drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs so that each subrequirement is identified in a VSL, but no attempt was made to provide a distinct set of VSLs for each subrequirement. The drafting team believes this modification supports the intent of the Commission’s directives as there is a VSL for noncompliance associated with each of the subrequirements.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R7.	N/A	N/A	<p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or if the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it manually shed firm load without delay to return its ACE to zero.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or if the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it requested the Reliability Coordinator to declare an Energy Emergency Alert in accordance with Attachment 1-EOP-002-0 “Energy Emergency Alert Levels.”</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or if the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it manually shed firm load without delay to return its ACE to zero.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or if the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it requested the Reliability Coordinator to declare an Energy Emergency Alert in accordance with Attachment 1-EOP-002-0 “Energy Emergency Alert Levels.”</p>
Original	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or	N/A

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R7.1			if the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it manually shed firm load without delay to return its ACE to zero.	
Original R7.2	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or if the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to provide evidence that it requested the Reliability Coordinator to declare an Energy Emergency Alert in accordance with Attachment 1-EOP-002-0 "Energy Emergency Alert Levels."	N/A
Revised R7.	N/A	N/A	<p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to meet sub-requirement R7.1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to meet sub-requirement R7.1.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The Balancing Authority exhausted the steps listed in R6, or the steps listed in R6 could not be completed in sufficient time to</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
			resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to meet sub-requirement R7.2.	resolve the emergency condition, and the Balancing Authority failed to meet sub-requirement R7.2.

Company	Comment	Response
MHEB	R7: With the main requirement having VSLs that cover non-compliance with the 2 sub-requirements, the VSLs for R7.1 and R7.2 are not required.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been “rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement, and the separate sets of VSLs for the sub-requirements have been deleted.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R7 - SRC proposes to omit assigning any VSL.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive. The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been “rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement, and the separate sets of VSLs for the sub-requirements have been deleted.
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R7: Instead of restating the R7 sub requirements, just state in the VSLs that one sub requirement was not met for a Moderate VSL and both sub requirements were not met as a Severe VSL.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has modified the VSLs based on all industry comments received. The revised VSLs are very similar to your suggestion, except that missing one of the subrequirements is a “High” VSL.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R7 — The VSLs do not follow the VSL Guidelines Development Criteria (VSLGDC) as established by the VSL drafting team. The VSLGDC specifies quartiles as the preferred approach for establishing VSLs for multi-component requirements. Omission of a Lower and Moderate VSL and failure to even mention the sub-requirements do not follow the quartile approach. There should be four VSLs defined based on each VSL including successively 25% fewer or more violations of the sub-requirements.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT does not believe that the quartile approach is appropriate for this requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R7 — To eliminate the double jeopardy exposure between the R7 and its sub-requirements R7.1 and R7.2, we suggest deleting the VSLs for sub-requirements. We also recommend deleting the reference to providing evidence in the VSLs in R7. The revised VSLs would read as follows: High — “the Balancing Authority failed to manually shed firm load” OR “the Balancing Authority failed to request the Reliability Coordinator to declare” Severe — “the Balancing Authority failed to manually shed firm load” AND “the Balancing Authority failed to request the Reliability Coordinator to declare”	The DT thanks you for your comments. The EOP VSL drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs for the sub-requirements into the VSLs for the primary requirement R7, and the separate sets of VSLs for the sub-requirements have been deleted. This approach eliminates double jeopardy for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL). The language in the VSLs has been edited to reflect language used in the requirement and supports your suggested revisions.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-002 R7 is a statement and should not have a VSL assigned to it if there are VSLs associated with the sub-requirements.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirement that have a VRF. The EOP VSL drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs for the sub-requirements into the VSLs for the primary requirement R7, and the separate sets of VSLs for the sub-requirements have been deleted. This approach eliminates double jeopardy for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL).
Ontario IESO	R7: With the main requirement having VSLs that cover non-compliance with the 2 sub-requirements, the VSLs for R7.1 and R7.2 are not required.	The DT thanks you for your comments The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been “rolled up”: into the VSLs for the primary requirement, thus the sub-requirements no longer have separate sets of VSLs. This supports your suggestion.
MHEB	R7, R7.1, R7.2: The requirement is to shed load and /or request and EEA, the VSLs are to provide evidence. I suggest removing the words "provide evidence that it" from the High and Severe VSLs and change "requested" to "request".	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has modified the VSLs based on your comments and all other industry comments received. The language in the VSLs reflects the language used in the requirement and does not use the term, “provide evidence” or “requested”.
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R7 has two sub-requirements. Violation of either sub-requirement would result in a “High” VSL for the sub-requirement, and also a “High” VSL for the main Requirement. Violation of both sub-requirements would result in a “High” violation for each sub-requirement and also a “Severe” VSL for the main requirement. VSLs for each sub-requirement should be deleted.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the VSLs for the primary requirement, thus the sub-requirements no longer have separate sets of VSLs. This approach eliminates double jeopardy for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL)

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Bonneville Power	R7 R7.1 & R7.2 VSL cause double counting of penalties.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the VSLs for the primary requirement, thus the sub-requirements no longer have separate sets of VSLs. This approach eliminates double jeopardy for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement. The assignment of sub-requirements to specific VSLs in the requirement is also consistent with other NERC Standards (FAC and IROL)
Dominion	R7 has a HIGH severity level accompanied by a HIGH for R7.1 and R7.2. I suggest that SEVERE be retained as is and that the HIGH for R7 be changed to N/A since R7.1 and R7.2 adequately cover this.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the VSLs for the primary requirement, thus the sub-requirements no longer have separate sets of VSLs.
Entergy Services	It appears the double jeopardy exposure has not been removed from EOP-002-2 R6, R7 and R9. Providing specific comments in this comment form is very inconvenient due to the large number of comments. Therefore, we have marked up the SAR itself in the comment boxes contained in the attached file "SAR_EOP_VSLs_1st_Posting_18April Entergy Comments.pdf"	The DT thanks you for your comments. The sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the VSLs for the primary requirement, thus the sub-requirements no longer have separate sets of VSLs. This approach eliminates double jeopardy for non compliance with a sub-requirement and the requirement.
Southern Company	R7.: We find R7 is an over-arching requirement with sub-requirements that have their own VSLs. It seems to be overkill that sub-requirements R7.1 and R7.2 have High VSLs and R7 has both a High and Severe VSL. We recommend the deletion of the High VSL from R7 while maintaining the Severe VSL. The sub-requirements should stand alone with their own High VSLs.	The DT thanks you for your comments. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VRF and VSLs to all Requirements. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams. Rather than delete the VSLs for R7, the VSL DT “rolled up” the VSLs for the subrequirements into the VSLs for the primary requirement, and deleted the separate sets of VSLs for the subrequirements.
MHEB	R7, R7.1, R7.2: The requirement is to shed load and /or request and EEA, the VSLs are to provide evidence. I suggest removing the words "provide evidence that it" from the High and Severe VSLs and change "requested" to "request".	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLDT has modified the VSLs based on your comments and all other industry comments received. The language used in the VSLs reflects the language used in the requirement and does not use the phrase, “provide evidence”
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R7.1 and R7.2: Should be set to Low VSL as they are a component of the overall R7.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the VSLs for the primary requirement, thus the sub-requirements no longer have separate sets of VSLs.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R7.1 — What is the drafting team's justification for a high VSL? Importance?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT believes that if the responsible entity failed to shed load, then this is equivalent to performance that is missing a single vital component, and this meets the criteria for a "High" VSL.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	7.1 should be LOWER and state " the responsible entity failed to shed load to meet the requirement"	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT believes that if the responsible entity failed to shed load, then this is equivalent to performance that is missing a single vital component, and this meets the criteria for a "High" VSL.
Bonneville Power	R7.1 — Cutting export schedules in addition to load shed should be included.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Your suggestion would require a change in the language of the requirement and is outside of the scope of this drafting team.
Southern Company	R7.1.: There may be a correlation issue across two requirements and their respective VSLs. At issue is R7.1 and R6.6 where the requirement is, among other things, to shed firm load. Is there a difference between "curtailing" firm load and "shedding" firm load? The interpretation is that the BA could be hit with a "Lower VSL" at R6.6 for not "curtailing firm load" and hit with a "High VSL" at R7.1 for failing to "shed firm load."	The DT thanks you for your comments. Interpretation of standards is beyond the scope of this drafting team. The language used in the VSLs reflects the language used in the requirement.
MHEB	R7, R7.1, R7.2: The requirement is to shed load and /or request and EEA, the VSLs are to provide evidence. I suggest removing the words "provide evidence that it" from the High and Severe VSLs and change "requested" to "request".	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLDT has modified the VSLs based on your comments and all other industry comments received. The language used in the VSLs reflects the language used in the requirement and does not use the term, "provide evidence" or "requested".
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R7.1 and R7.2: Should be set to Low VSL as they are a component of the overall R7.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-requirements have been "rolled up" into the VSLs for the primary requirement, thus the sub-requirements no longer have separate sets of VSLs. The DT believes that if the responsible entity failed to shed load, then this is equivalent to performance that is missing a single vital component, and this meets the criteria for a "High" VSL.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R7.2 — What is the drafting team's justification for a high VSL? Importance?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT believes that if the responsible entity failed to make the request of its Reliability Coordinator, then this is equivalent to performance that is missing a single vital component, and this meets the criteria for a "High" VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	R7.2 should be LOWER and state "the responsible entity failed to declare the appropriate EEA" EOP-002	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT believes that if the responsible entity failed to make the request of its Reliability Coordinator, then this is equivalent to performance that is missing a single vital component, and this meets the criteria for a "High" VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Requirement R8

Summary Consideration: Several commenters suggested modifying the VSLs to eliminate the generic language in the “Lower” VSL and to reference specific Alert Levels from the associated Attachment. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels per FERC Guidelines, (3,2b) Guideline 3: Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement
 Guideline 2b: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R8.	The Reliability Coordinator’s implementation of an Energy Emergency Alert failed to meet one (1) or two (2) of the program/procedural elements detailed in Attachment 1-EOP-002-0 “Energy Emergency Alert Levels.”	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator’s implementation of an Energy Emergency Alert failed to meet three (3) or more of the program/procedural elements detailed in Attachment 1-EOP-002-0 “Energy Emergency Alert Levels.”

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R8.	N/A	N/A	A Reliability Coordinator had a Balancing Authority within its Reliability Coordinator area experiencing a potential or actual Energy Emergency and the Reliability Coordinator did not initiate an Energy Emergency Alert Level 1 as detailed in Attachment 1-EOP-002-0 “Energy Emergency Alert Levels.”	A Reliability Coordinator had a Balancing Authority within its Reliability Coordinator area experiencing a potential or actual Energy Emergency and the Reliability Coordinator did not initiate an Energy Emergency Alert Level 2 or 3 as detailed in Attachment 1-EOP-002-0 “Energy Emergency Alert Levels.” OR A Reliability Coordinator had a Balancing Authority within its Reliability Coordinator area experiencing an actual Energy Emergency and the Reliability Coordinator did not act to mitigate the emergency condition by requesting emergency assistance when this was required.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R8: Reiterating our view that VSLs are measures of the extent to which requirements are not complied with, we believe violating one of the 2 requirements within R8 would be High, not Low.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines, (3,2b)

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MHEB	R8: I suggest replacing the Lower VSL with "The Reliability Coordinator's implementation of an Energy Emergency Alert failed to initiate the proper/requested alert level." I also suggest replacing the Severe VSL with "The Reliability Coordinator's implementation of an Energy Emergency Alert failed to mitigate the emergency condition or failed to request emergency assistance."	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines, (3,2b)
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R8 - SRC agrees with the proposed VSLs	The DT thanks you for your comments. Based on other comments, the DT did make some modifications to the VSLs.
Hydro One Networks	We do not agree with the VSLs for R8. The two requirements for R8 are (1) RC shall initiate an Alert and (2) RC shall act to mitigate. The VSLs need to be based on these two requirements. We suggest removing both the proposed Lower and Severe VSLs and replacing them with a Severe VSL stating: "The RC failed to initiate an Energy Emergency Alert — OR The RC failed to act to mitigate the emergency condition."	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines, (3,2b)
MRO	For EOP-002-2 R8: Recommend determining how many actual procedural elements are in the attachment and assign the VSLs accordingly.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines. The ambiguous term "procedural elements" has been removed from the VSL and the revised VSLs do reflect consideration of the actual elements in the attachment in support of your comment
Dominion Virginia Power	For R8, failure to meet 2 of the program/procedural elements is a Lower VSL while failure to meet 3 is a Severe VSL. Why the giant leap over Moderate and High?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R8 — What is the drafting team's justification for setting a Lower and Severe VSL and no Moderate or High VSL? What category in the VSL Guidelines document does this follow? It seems this could follow the quartile approach with each quartile representing 25% of the total number of requirements.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines, The quartile approach is not appropriate for this Requirement. Using the requirements specified in the attachments to determine severity, only addresses the first part of R8 (Send out an alert) however it disregards the second part of the requirement (Shall act to mitigate the emergency condition, including a request for emergency assistance if required).

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R8 — In both the Lower and Severe VSLs change 'implementation' to 'initiation' to make the VSLs consistent with the requirement.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines.
Ontario IESO	R8: Reiterating our view that VSLs are measures of the extent to which requirements are not complied with, we believe violating one of the 2 requirements within R8 would be High, not Low.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines.
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R8 VSLs don't match the requirement. The RC has no "program/procedural elements" to implement in Attachment 1-EOP-002-0	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines. The ambiguous term "procedural elements" has been removed from the VSL.
Entergy Services	It appears the double jeopardy exposure has not been removed from EOP-002-2 R6, R7 and R9. Providing specific comments in this comment form is very inconvenient due to the large number of comments. Therefore, we have marked up the SAR itself in the comment boxes contained in the attached file "SAR_EOP_VSLs_1st_Posting_18April Entergy Comments.pdf"	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines,
Southern Company	R8: What criteria supports the leap in VSL (from Lower to Severe) if a third element is not met? The Severe VSL is triggered when the third element is not met.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Requirement R9

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that there is no performance in the main requirement and the drafting team agrees and removed all VSLs from the main requirement. As each of the subrequirements is really a “stand alone” statement of performance, the SDT retained the individual VSLs for each of the subrequirements.

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R9.	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to comply with two (2) of the three sub-requirements R9.2, R9.3, or R9.4 of R9.	The Reliability Coordinator failed to comply with the three (3) sub-requirements R9.2, R9.3, and R9.4 of R9.
Revised R9.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R9.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Load-Serving Entity failed to provide evidence that it requested it's Reliability Coordinator to initiate an Energy Emergency Alert in accordance with Attachment 1-EOP-002-0.
Revised R9.1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	For an expected elevation in transmission service priority from Priority 6 to Priority 7, the deficient Load-Serving Entity failed to request it's Reliability Coordinator to initiate an Energy Emergency Alert in accordance with Attachment 1-EOP-002-0.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R9.2	The Reliability Coordinator failed submit the report to NERC for posting on the NERC Website, noting the expected total MW that may have its transmission service priority changed.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R9.2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to submit the report to NERC for posting on the NERC Website, noting the expected total MW that may have its transmission service priority changed.
Original R9.3	The Reliability Coordinator failed to use EEA 1 to forecast the change of the priority of transmission service of an Interchange Transaction on the system from Priority 6 to Priority 7.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R9.3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to use EEA 1 to forecast the change of the priority of transmission service of an Interchange Transaction on the system from Priority 6 to Priority 7.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

EOP-002-2 Capacity and Energy Emergencies				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R9.4	The Reliability Coordinator failed to use EEA 2 to announce the change of the priority of transmission service of an Interchange Transaction on the system from Priority 6 to Priority 7.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R9.4.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to use EEA 2 to announce the change of the priority of transmission service of an Interchange Transaction on the system from Priority 6 to Priority 7.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R9: For the RC, there should be a Medium for missing 1 of the 3 subrequirements R9.2 to R9.4. With that, the Severe for each of the 3 subrequirements are not required. Note that in here, the SDT has assigned a Severe to each of the subrequirements - a proper approach for binary requirements unlike their EOP-001 R4 counterparts.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines, No VSLs have been assigned to requirement R9 as R9 simply states the pre-existing conditions for the actions to be performed under the sub-requirements. Severe VSLs are assigned to the binary sub-requirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R9 - R9 is a statement and not a requirement. There should not be any VSLs associated with this requirement. The VSLs should be applied to the sub-requirements. The proposed VSLs are focused only on RC when sub-requirement 9.1 is on the LSE.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT agrees with your comment and the VSLs have been edited accordingly.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MHEB	R9. 1: Remove "provide evidence that it" from the Severe VSL and change "requested" to "request". Providing evidence is part of a measure not part of a requirement.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT agrees with your comment and the VSLs have been edited to take into account your comments and other industry comments. The revised VSLs do not use the terms, "provide evidence" or "requested".
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R9 — The requirement does not apply to the RC. The VSLs are defined inappropriately.	The DT thanks you for your comments. Only part of R9 applies to the Reliability Coordinator. The VSLs have been edited to remove the VSLs from the primary requirement and assign a binary "Severe" VSL for noncompliance with each of the subrequirements.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R9 — The double jeopardy issue comes up again here but is complicated by the LSE being the responsible entity in R9.1 and the RC being the responsible entity in R9.2, R9.3 and R9.4. In this case, we suggest deleting the VSLs for sub-requirements 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4 and adding a Moderate VSL for R9 as follows: Moderate "The Reliability Coordinator failed to comply with one (1) of the three sub-requirements R9.2, R9.3 or R9.4 of R9. The High and Severe VSLs remain as proposed. Additionally, strike the reference to providing evidence in the Severe VSL for R9.1 such that it reads 'The Load Serving Entity failed to request its Reliability Coordinator?'. The DT thanks you for your comments. The DT modified the VSLs so that no VSLs have been assigned to requirement R9 as R9 simply states the pre-existing conditions for the actions to be performed under the sub-requirements. Severe VSLs are assigned to the binary sub-requirements. This eliminates the double jeopardy issue and problems due to the assignment of various functional model entities to R9 and its sub-requirements. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. The revised VSLs do not use the term, "provide evidence."	
Ontario IESO	R9: For the RC, there should be a Medium for missing 1 of the 3 subrequirements R9.2 to R9.4. With that, the Severe for each of the 3 subrequirements are not required. Note that in here, the SDT has assigned a Severe to each of the subrequirements - a proper approach for binary requirements unlike their EOP-001 R4 counterparts.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL DT has revised the VSL levels as per industry comments and FERC Guidelines. No VSLs have been assigned to requirement R9 as R9 simply states the pre-existing conditions for the actions to be performed under the sub-requirements. Severe VSLs are assigned to the binary sub-requirements.
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R9 has sub-requirements. Violations of multiple sub-requirements (R9.2, R9.3 and R9.4) would result in a "Lower" VSL for each sub-requirement violation, and also a "High" or "Severe" VSL for the main requirement. The "Lower" VSL for the main requirement should apply for missing any one of the sub-requirements. VSLs for each sub-requirement should be deleted.	The DT thanks you for your comments. No VSLs have been assigned to requirement R9 as R9 simply states the pre-existing conditions for the actions to be performed under the sub-requirements. Severe VSLs are assigned to the binary sub-requirements. This eliminates the double jeopardy issue. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-002 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	The VSL for R9.1 may also be removed if this is moved to R9 preceding that for the RC.	The DT thanks you for your comments. No VSLs have been assigned to requirement R9 as R9 simply states the pre-existing conditions for the actions to be performed under the sub-requirements. Severe VSLs are assigned to the binary sub-requirements. This eliminates the problems due to the assignment of various functional model entities to R9 and its sub-requirements. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R9.1 - SRC agrees with proposed VSL	The DT thanks you for your comments.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R9.1 — Evidence is misspelled. Why is only one VSL selected for this sub-requirement? Can't multiple VSLs be selected using the Procedure/Program or Implementation/Execution category since EEAs shall be initiated using the attachment?	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL has been edited to reflect the language used in the Requirement and the word, "evidence" is no longer used. The EOP DT felt that gradient approach to compliance with the sub-requirements was not appropriate. The binary approach was applied to the sub-requirements as this subrequirement has only one element – for the LSE to make a request of its RC.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	R9.1 is redundant (for entities that are a BA and LSE) to other requirements already specifying the need to request and EEA. This should be rated as a LOWER as this is administrative.	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL reflects the language used in the sub-requirement. The EOP DT felt the binary approach was appropriate for R9.1 which results in a Severe VSL as this subrequirement has only one element – for the LSE to make a request of its RC.
Ontario IESO	The VSL for R9.1 may also be removed if this is moved to R9 preceding that for the RC.	The DT thanks you for your comments. No VSLs have been assigned to requirement R9 as R9 simply states the pre-existing conditions for the actions to be performed under the sub-requirements. Severe VSLs are assigned to the binary sub-requirements. This eliminates the problems due to the assignment of various functional model entities to R9 and its sub-requirements. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only.
Southern Company	R9.1 Typo in VSL - "evidnce".	The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSL has been edited to reflect the language used in the Requirement and the word "evidence" is no longer used, so the typographical error is not an issue.

5. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-003-1 — Load Shedding Plans. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you?

EOP-003-1 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: Most commenters agreed with the VSLs as proposed, and no changes were made. Note that suggestions were made to modify the requirement, but the scope of this project is limited to modifying the VSLs.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
R#	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to shed customer load.

Company	Comment	Response
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The “parent” requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document	Thank you for your comments There aren't any subrequirements for EOP-003 R1. The recommendation to include VSL Guidelines in DT Guidelines has been submitted to the standards staff for their consideration. Developing new criteria for VSLs is outside the scope of the EOP DT.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1 — SRC recommends that the BA be deleted from reference. Agree with proposed VSL as it applies to the TOP.	Thank you for your comments. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	EOP-003 R1 is a requirement that needs to be removed or rewritten. It is a general concept that is specified by requirements in other standards (EOP-002). "Insufficient" needs to be better described. Does it mean insufficient to balance load or insufficient to carry full operating reserves? While the concept is important, due to the duplicative nature and weakness of this requirement the rating should be no higher than MODERATE.	Thank you for your comments. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.

EOP-003-1 Requirement R2

Summary Consideration: Several stakeholders indicated that the Lower VSL was inappropriate as it referenced more details than are contained in the requirement and suggested that the Severe VSL was inappropriate because it referenced, “underfrequency and undervoltage” rather than “underfrequency or undervoltage” conditions. In its June 19, 2008 Order, FERC directed the language shown in the third row of the table below, and the drafting team adopted this language (with the exception that the DT replaced the term, “applicable entity” with the term, “responsible entity”) for the Severe VSL. FERC indicated that the language in the VSLs that were submitted for approval did not meet FERC’s VSL Guideline 3 – VSLs should be consistent with the corresponding requirement. Note that the VSLs submitted to FERC were those that failed ballot. The VSLs shown as “original” in the table below are those that were posted for comment following the failed ballot.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R2 that failed ballot	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority’s automatic load shedding plans are missing minor details or minor program/procedural elements.	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has an automatic load shedding plan but it only addresses one of the two required conditions (underfrequency or undervoltage).	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has failed to demonstrate the existence of the automatic load shedding plan required.
Original R2.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority’s automatic load shedding plans exist for underfrequency and undervoltage conditions but combined are missing no more than two details or program/procedural elements.	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of automatic load shedding plans for underfrequency and undervoltage conditions.
Revised R2	N/A	N/A	N/A	The responsible entity did not establish plans for automatic load shedding as directed by the requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R2. (FERC language)	N/A	N/A	N/A	The applicable entity did not establish plans for automatic load-shedding as directed by the requirement.

Company	Comment	Response
(NPCC)	R2: With a low assigned to missing no more than two details or program/procedural elements, a question arises on missing 3 or more or other amount of details before being assessed a Severe. Suggest to fill out the Moderate and High columns, and add a condition to the Severe column for missing a large amount of details.	Thank you for your comments. R2 of this standard only addresses the existence of automatic load shedding plans for underfrequency or undervoltage conditions. The DT has modified the VSL such that it reflects only the existence of plans, not the elements as described in R4.
(Manitoba)	R2: remove the Lower VSL or define what the "program/procedural elements" are. It's too vague. If the elements aren't defined you can't tell if they are missing. Replace "and" with "or" in the Severe VSL, not all areas require both under frequency and under voltage load shedding schemes.	Thank you for your comments. R2 of this standard only addresses the existence of automatic load shedding plans for underfrequency or undervoltage conditions. The DT has modified the VSL such that it reflects only the existence of plans, not the elements as described in R4.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R2 — The proposed VSL is based on plan elements, but there is no definition of such elements. The SRC would proposed a single SEVERE VSL	Thank you for your comments. R2 of this standard only addresses the existence of automatic load shedding plans for underfrequency or undervoltage conditions. The DT has modified the VSL such that it reflects only the existence of plans, not the elements as described in R4
Hydro One Networks	R2: The requirement states that the TOP and BA must have plans for automatic load shedding for under frequency OR under voltage conditions. The VSLs imply that the entities are non-compliance if they don't have plans for both under frequency AND under voltage conditions. This is a misinterpretation of the requirement. We suggest in both the Lower and Severe VSLs to simply remove the wording "for under frequency and under voltage conditions".	Thank for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL to reflect the language of the requirement and has removed the lower VSL based on other comments from stakeholders indicating that the lower VSL was inappropriate.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	For EOP-003-1 R2, what if the Transmission Operator or the Balancing Authority are missing one or more than three of the details or program procedural elements?	Thank you for your comments. R2 of this standard only addresses the existence of automatic load shedding plans for underfrequency or undervoltage conditions. The DT has modified the VSL such that it reflects only the existence of plans, not the elements as described in R4
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R2 - The program/procedure category of the VSL Guidelines document is not implemented completely or accurately	Thank for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL to reflect the language of the requirement. The requirement is a binary type requirement and now has only a severe VSL if the requirement is not met.
We Energies	R2 Lower and Severe VSL: The requirement says "underfrequency or undervoltage". If I do not have UVLS these VSL's can never apply. R7 Severe VSL: I know what the logic intends. I'm not sure that it really says that the TOP or BA did not coordinate with more than 50%... Typographical error (extra "the").	Thank for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL to reflect the language of the requirement. Note that the requirement is not limited to entities with UVLS – the requirement is aimed at having load shedding plans for underfrequency or undervoltage conditions. The lower VSL was deleted based on stakeholder comments and a FERC directive.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R2 — Use of the undefined phrase 'program/procedural elements' leaves the Lower VSL too vague. We suggest deleting it entirely and modifying the Severe VSL to the following: Severe — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority does not have a plan for automatic load shedding for underfrequency or undervoltage conditions	Thank you for your comments. The DT has eliminated the lower VSL, and has modified the Severe VSL to reflect the language of the requirement so that it no longer references the specific types of automatic load shedding conditions. This supports a FERC directive as well as other stakeholder comments.
FirstEnergy	R2 — The Lower VSL should be changed to "N/A". The phrase "but combined are missing no more than two details or program/procedural elements" is neither a requirement in R2 nor a measure in M1 and therefore cannot be part of the VSL	Thank you for your comments. The DT has eliminated the lower VSL, and has modified the Severe VSL to reflect the language of the requirement. This supports a FERC directive as well as other stakeholder comments.
Ontario IESO	(1) R2: With a low assigned to missing no more than two details or program/procedural elements, a question arises on missing 3 or more or other amount of details before being assessed a Severe. Suggest to fill out the Moderate and High columns, and add a condition to the Severe column for missing a large amount of details	Thank you for your comments. The DT has eliminated the lower VSL, and has modified the Severe VSL to reflect the language of the requirement. The requirement is a binary type requirement and now has only a severe VSL if the requirement is not met. This supports a FERC directive as well as other stakeholder comments.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
City of Tallahassee	R2 — VSLs change requirement. The insertion of the word AND instead of OR between underfrequency and undervoltage changes the requirement to require BOTH load shed programs. This is beyond the requirement	Thank you for your comments. The DT has eliminated the lower VSL, and has modified the Severe VSL to reflect the language of the requirement so that it no longer references the specific types of automatic load shedding conditions.
Dominion	R2 requires plans for automatic load shedding for either underfrequency or undervoltage conditions. It doesn't require plans for both conditions. We suggest it be re-written to read "The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority's automatic load shedding plans exist for underfrequency and/or undervoltage conditions but combined are missing no more than two details or program/procedural elements.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has eliminated the lower VSL, and has modified the Severe VSL to reflect the language of the requirement so that it no longer references the specific types of automatic load shedding conditions. The requirement is a binary type requirement and now has only a severe VSL if the requirement is not met. This supports a FERC directive as well as other stakeholder comments.
Southern Company	R2.: The term "details" is used in the VSL. What are the details? Does the standard indicate what the details are? There seems to be a significant leap from Lower to Severe VSL with not much change in the compliance criteria.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has eliminated the lower VSL, and has modified the Severe VSL to reflect the language of the requirement so that it no longer references the specific types of automatic load shedding conditions. The requirement is a binary type requirement and now has only a severe VSL if the requirement is not met. This supports a FERC directive as well as other stakeholder comments.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 Requirement R3

Summary Consideration: The drafting team modified the VSLs to comply with the FERC directive and stakeholder comments. FERC indicated that the language in the VSLs that were submitted for approval did not meet FERC's VSL Guideline 2b – VSLs should not use ambiguous terms. Note that the VSLs submitted to FERC were those that failed ballot. The VSLs shown as "original" in the table below are those that were posted for comment following the failed ballot.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R3 that failed ballot	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has demonstrated coordination / communication with required entities with minor exception.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has demonstrated coordination / communication with all but one of it's TOPs or Bas.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has demonstrated coordination / communication with some of it's TOPs and BAs but was deficient in meeting the directives of the requirement because multiple interconnected TOPs and BAs were not included.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has failed to coordinate load shedding plans among any of it's interconnected Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities.
Original R3.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated coordination/communication with all but one of its interconnected Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities.	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate coordination/communication with more than one of its interconnected Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to coordinate/communicate load shedding plans among any of its interconnected Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities.
Revised R3.	The responsible entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting 5% or less of its required entities.	The responsible entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting between 5-10% of its required entities.	The responsible entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting 10-15%, inclusive, of its required entities.	The responsible entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting more than 15% of its required entities.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R3. (FERC)	The applicable entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting 5% or less of its required entities.	The applicable entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting between 5-10% of its required entities.	The applicable entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting 10-15%, inclusive, of its required entities.	The applicable entity did not coordinate load shedding plans, as directed by the requirement, affecting greater than 15% of its required entities.

Company	Comment	Response
(NPCC)	R3: While it is OK to assign a High to missing coordination with more than one of the interconnected entity, not having an entry under the Moderate column seems to be inconsistent with the "progressive" VSL approach. An alternative is to have missing 2 for a Moderate, missing 3 for a High and 4 or more or simply not communicating with any for a Severe.	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language and % increments as directed by FERC. The 5% increments on the VSLs are intended to encourage the continuation of high levels of coordination of load shedding plans between interconnected entities.
(Manitoba)	R3: remove the "/communication" from all levels of VSL, its not part of the requirement.	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees with your comment and has revised the VSL language accordingly.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3 — LOWER — Plans not coordinated with 25% or less of adjacent entities MODERATE —Plans not coordinated with 25% -50% of adjacent entities HIGH — Plans not coordinated with 50–5% of adjacent entities SEVERE — Plans not reported to more than 75% of adjacent entities.	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language and % increments as directed by FERC. The DT does not feel the quartile approach is appropriate for this Requirement. The 5% increments on the VSLs are intended to encourage the continuation of high levels of coordination of load shedding plans between interconnected entities.
Hydro One Networks	R3: The VSLs should be graded by % of interconnected TOPs and BAs as the number of these interconnected neighbours varies.	Thank you for your comments. As you suggest, the VSLs have been revised using % increments as directed by the FERC VSL Order of 6/19/08.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	R3.The VSLs should be based on a percentage of how many BAs and TOs the entity in interconnected with compared to how many entities the noncompliant entity did not share their plan with. Low = 1%-25%, Moderate =26%-50%, High = 51%-75% and Severe = 76%-100%.	Thank you for your comments. The DT does not feel the quartile approach is appropriate for this Requirement. The 5% increments on the VSLs are intended to encourage the continuation of high levels of coordination of load shedding plans between interconnected entities.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R3 — We propose adding a Moderate VSL and modifying the High VSL: Moderate — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated coordination/communication with all but two (2) of its interconnected Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities. High — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated coordination/communication with all but three (3) of its interconnected Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language and % increments as directed by FERC. The 5% increments on the VSLs are intended to encourage the continuation of high levels of coordination of load shedding plans between interconnected entities.
Ontario IESO	R3: While it is OK to assign a High to missing coordination with more than one of the interconnected entity, not having an entry under the Moderate column seems to be inconsistent with the "progressive" VSL approach. An alternative is to have missing 2 for a Moderate, missing 3 for a High and 4 or more or simply not communicating with any for a Severe.	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language and % increments as directed by FERC. The 5% increments on the VSLs are intended to encourage the continuation of high levels of coordination of load shedding plans between interconnected entities.
Bonneville Power	R3 — Add "automatic" load shedding	Thank you for your comments. Revisions and interpretations to the Requirement/Standard is beyond the scope of the Drafting Team

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 Requirement R4

Summary Consideration: The drafting team modified the VSLs to comply with the FERC directive and stakeholder comments. FERC indicated that the language in the VSLs that were submitted for approval did meet FERC's VSL Guideline 2b – VSLs should not use ambiguous terms. Note that the VSLs submitted to FERC were those that failed ballot. The VSLs shown as "original" in the table below are those that were posted for comment following the failed ballot.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R4 that failed ballot	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has demonstrated the existence of a load shedding scheme, but is missing minor details or minor program/procedural elements.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has demonstrated the existence of the load shedding scheme but failed to show it considered one of the factors in designing an automatic load shedding scheme.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has demonstrated the existence of the load shedding scheme but failed to show it considered more than one of the factors in designing an automatic load shedding scheme.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has failed to demonstrate the existence of load shedding scheme.
Original R4.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority demonstrated the existence of a load shedding scheme but failed to show it considered one of these factors in designing the automatic load shedding scheme: frequency, rate of frequency decay, voltage level, rate of voltage decay, or power flow levels.	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to demonstrate the existence of an automatic load shedding scheme.
Revised R4.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The responsible entity failed to consider at least one of the five required elements.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R4 FERC	N/A	N/A	N/A	The applicable entity did not consider one of the five required elements, as directed by the requirement.

Company	Comment	Response
(NPCC)	R4: Suggest to revise the wording in the Low column to "...show it considered at least one of these factors in designing the.." since the way it is written leaves a gap for an entity failed to consider two or more or any of the factors.	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language as directed by FERC. The single Severe VSL reflects the binary nature of this Requirement.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R4 — SRC would agree with the proposed VSLs if the VSL for LOWER were rewritten to indicate that the elements do not necessarily have to be identified in one plan.	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language as directed by FERC. The single Severe VSL reflects the binary nature of this Requirement.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	R4, what if you fail to include more than one factor of the listed factors?	Thank you for your comment. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language as directed by FERC. The single Severe VSL reflects the binary nature of this Requirement.
FirstEnergy	R4 - The Lower VSL only addresses missing one of the factors shown in requirement R4. The Lower VSL phrase "one of these factors" should be revised to state "one or more of these factors".	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language as directed by FERC. The single Severe VSL reflects the binary nature of this Requirement.
Ontario IESO	R4: Suggest to revise the wording in the Low column to "...show it considered at least one of these factors in designing the.." since the way it is written leaves a gap for an entity failed to consider two or more or any of the factors	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language as directed by FERC. The single Severe VSL reflects the binary nature of this Requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Bonneville Power	R4 Lower VSL, change ?failed to consider "at least " one of these factors, frequency, voltage, etc.. R4 says "or" not all factors. In some cases UVLS is not effective or too slow	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT is using the language as directed by FERC. The single Severe VSL reflects the binary nature of this Requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 Requirement R5

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed, and no changes were made.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to implement load shedding in steps established to minimize the risk of further uncontrolled separation, loss of generation, or system shutdown.

Company	Comment	Response
Bonneville Power	. R5 — Change VSL ? failed to implement "automatic" load shedding ?	Thank you for your comments. The VSL reflects the language of the Requirement. Revisions to the Requirement are outside the scope of the EOP VSL DT.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 Requirement R6

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed, and no changes were made.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R6.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to shed additional load after it had separated from the Interconnection when there was insufficient generating capacity to restore system frequency following automatic underfrequency load shedding.

Company	Comment	Response
BCTC	R6 The VSL for this requirement is set at Severe. The VLS should be lower because after the Control Area has separated from the Interconnection, it is no longer a threat to the rest of the Interconnection	Thank you for your comments. The VSL does not measure reliability risk, but rather how well the Requirement is met.
Southern Company	R6.: In the scenario described in Requirement 6, a TO or BA's area is separated from the Interconnection. Once separated, what threat are they to the Interconnection at this stage? Should this warrant a Severe VSL? We recommend applying a High VSL instead of a Severe VSL.	Thank you for your comments. The VSL does not measure reliability risk, but rather how well the Requirement is met.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 Requirement R7

Summary Consideration: The drafting team modified the VSLs to comply with the FERC directive and stakeholder comments. FERC indicated that the language in the VSLs that were submitted for approval did meet FERC's VSL Guideline 2b – VSLs should not use ambiguous terms. Note that the VSLs submitted to FERC were those that failed ballot. The VSLs shown as "original" in the table below are those that were posted for comment following the failed ballot.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R7. that failed ballot	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has demonstrated coordination of automatic load shedding with required entities but is missing minor program/procedural elements.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has coordinated it's automatic load shedding, but did not include details on one of the elements of the requirement.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has not coordinated with 50% of their areas or was missing 50% of the required elements detail.	The Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority has failed to coordinate it's automatic load shedding with the required entities as directed by the requirement.
Original R7.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority coordinated automatic load shedding with all the applicable entities, but did not include details on one of the elements identified in R7.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority coordinated automatic load shedding with all the applicable entities, but did not include details on two of the elements identified in R7.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to coordinate load shedding with 100% of the applicable entities but did coordinate load shedding with more then 50% of the applicable entities.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to coordinate automatic load shedding with the 50% or less of the applicable entities.
Revised R7.	The responsible entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding with 5% or less of the types of automatic actions described in the Requirement.	The responsible entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding with more than 5% but less than 10% of the types of automatic actions described in the Requirement.	The responsible entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding with 10% or more but less than 15% of the types of automatic actions described in the Requirement.	The responsible entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding with 15% or more of the types of automatic actions described in the Requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R7. FERC	The applicable entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding, as directed by the requirement, affecting 5% or less of its automatic actions.	The applicable entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding, as directed by the requirement, affecting between 5 - 10% of its automatic actions.	The applicable entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding, as directed by the requirement, affecting 10-15%, inclusive, of its automatic actions.	The applicable entity did not coordinate automatic load shedding, as directed by the requirement, affecting greater than 15% of its automatic actions.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R7: This requirement places emphasis on the need to coordinate with other entities, while the rest is the "actions" to be coordinated. It's a mixed requirement that needs to be revised to avoid having mixed bag in the VSL, for future consideration.	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT has revised the VSLs. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs. The VSLs address coordination of automatic load shedding with the types of automatic actions used by the entity, not the discrete number of automatic actions that are in service. The FERC order directed the use of 5% increments for these VSLs.
(Manitoba)	R7: In the requirement the TOP and BA are required to coordinate throughout their areas with "under frequency isolation of generating units, tripping of shunt capacitors, and other automatic action that will occur..", All VSLs mention coordinate with "applicable entities" where no entities are listed in the requirement. Other than that, the Lower and Moderate VSLs are fine, but the High and Severe VSLs should be removed until the requirement can be re written. If the High and Severe VSLs must remain they will have to be edited for clarity. We do not have a suggestion for rewording the High and Severe VSLs because the requirement makes no mention of "applicable entities". Also the current wording in the High VSL and Severe VSL mean the same. Both mean more than 50% were coordinated	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT has revised the VSLs. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs. The VSLs address coordination of automatic load shedding with the types of automatic actions used by the entity, not the discrete number of automatic actions that are in service. The FERC order directed the use of 5% increments for these VSLs.
Hydro One Networks	R7: The SDT needs to be consistent in when deciding what kind of VSL gradient they want to use.	Thank you for your comments. The FERC order of 6/19/08 directed the use of 5% increments for these VSLs.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion Virginia Power	For R7, the wording of the Severe VSL should be revised to say, "The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to coordinate automatic load shedding with more than 50% of the applicable entities".	Thank you for your comments. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R7 mixes two categories in the VSL Guidelines document. It takes two VSLs based on one category and two VSLs based on another category. If more than two categories apply, then both categories should be applied to the full spectrum of VSL levels. For example, based on the quartile approach, a lower and medium VSL should be assigned for coordination with 0-25% and 25-50% of applicable entities, respectively. Then the High and Severe VSLs should be set to the 50-75% and 75-100% ranges, respectively. It would still be appropriate to include additional VSLs for each severity level based on another applicable category from the VSL Guidelines document	Thank you for your comments. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs. This removes one of the two categories previously used in the VSLs. The FERC order of 6/19/08 directed the use of 5% increments for these VSLs.
We Energies	R7 Severe VSL: I know what the logic intends. I'm not sure that it really says that the TOP or BA did not coordinate with more than 50%... Typographical error (extra "the").	Thank you for your comments. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	. R7 — Coordination is misinterpreted in proposed VSLs. The coordination in the requirement is relay and control coordination. The coordination referred to in the VSLs is communications among entities. We propose deleting all the VSLs except the Severe VSL and make modify it as follows: Severe — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to coordinate load shedding with underfrequency isolation of generating units, tripping of shunt capacitors or other automatic actions throughout their areas	Thank you for your comments. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs. The VSLs address coordination of automatic load shedding with the types of automatic actions used by the entity, not the discrete number of automatic actions that are in service. The FERC order directed the use of 5% increments for these VSLs.
Ontario IESO	R7: This requirement places emphasis on the need to coordinate with other entities, while the rest is the "actions" to be coordinated. It's a mixed requirement that needs to be revised to avoid having mixed bag in the VSL, for future consideration	Thank you for your comments. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R7 VSLs refer to "applicable entities". We think the VSLs should clarify that "applicable entities" refers to entities within the TO or BA footprint.	Thank you for your comments. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Bonneville Power	R7 Low and Moderate VSL — move to low and change to "elements that are needed to prevent reliability problems (frequency, voltage or power flow". Voltage is not always a good predictor for problems	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT has revised the VSLs. The VSLs address coordination of automatic load shedding with the types of automatic actions used by the entity.
Dominion	R7 ? We suggest changing Severe to read "The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority coordinated automatic load shedding with less than 50% of the applicable entities."	Thank you for your comments. The Requirement does not address coordination with other entities so that language has been removed from the VSLs
Southern Company	R7.: We recommend making the R7 VSLs (Lower to Severe) consistent with the VSLs in EOP-005-1	Thank you for your comments. The DT does not understand your reference to consistency with EOP-005 .

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 Requirement R8

Summary Consideration: The drafting team modified the VSLs to comply with the FERC directive and stakeholder comments. FERC indicated that the language in the VSLs that were submitted for approval did meet FERC's VSL Guideline 2b – VSLs should not use ambiguous terms. Note that the VSLs submitted to FERC were those that failed ballot. The VSLs shown as "original" in the table below are those that were posted for comment following the failed ballot.

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R8 that failed ballot	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has plans for manual load shedding but is missing minor program/procedural elements.	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority does not have plans for manual load shedding or is not capable of implanting in an adequate time frame.
Original R8.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has plans for manual load shedding but is missing no more than two program/procedural elements.	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority does not have plans for manual load shedding or is not capable of implanting the load shedding in a time frame adequate for responding to the emergency.
Revised R8.	N/A	The responsible entity did not have plans for operator controlled manual load shedding, as directed by the requirement.	The responsible entity has plans for manual load shedding but did not have the capability to implement the load shedding, as directed by the requirement.	The responsible entity did not have plans for operator controlled manual load shedding, as directed by the requirement nor had the capability to implement the load shedding, as directed by the requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

EOP-003-1 – Load Shedding Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Revised R8. FERC	N/A	The applicable entity did not have plans for operator controlled manual load shedding, as directed by the requirement.	The applicable entity did not have the capability to implement the load shedding, as directed by the requirement.	The applicable entity did not have plans for operator controlled manual load shedding, as directed by the requirement nor had the capability to implement the load shedding, as directed by the requirement.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	(NPCC) R8: By having a VSL associated with "is missing no more than two program/procedural elements", there is potential for disputes on what are these elements when they are not stipulated in the standard. Further, how about missing 3 or more of these elements, would the violation be assessed Severe?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and removed reference to procedural elements.
BTCC	.R8 - typo. Should be "implementing" instead of "implanting"	Thank you for your comment. Edits have been made to the VSLs and the typographical error is gone.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	1 R8, what if the entity is missing one or more than 2 program/procedural elements in its manual load shedding plan? In the EOP-003-1 R8 "Severe" VSL, the description uses the wrong word. It should use "implementing" opposed to "implanting".	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and removed reference to procedural elements. Edits have been made to the VSLs and the typographical error is gone.
(Manitoba)	.R8: Remove the Lower VSL as there are no elements listed in the requirement. I suggest splitting up Severe VSL and placing the second portion in High VSL and leave the first part in Severe VSL: High VSL: "The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority has plans for manual load shedding but is not capable of implementing the plan in a time frame adequate for responding to the emergency. And the Severe VSL would read: "The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority does not have plans for manual load shedding."	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT has modified the VSLs. References to the "elements" have been deleted.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-003 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R8 - In Severe, "implanting" should be "implementing". Based on the Implementation/Execution category of the VSL Guidelines document, the Severe VSL should be split. If the TOP or BA has plans for manual load shedding but can't implement them in a time frame adequate for responding to an emergency, the Moderate VSL would apply. Failure to respond in the appropriate timeframe is one significant element but does not represent missing all elements or even most elements.	Thank you for your comments. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT has modified the VSLs. The proposed VSLs split the categories as you suggest.
We Energies	R8 Lower VSL. Where is the list of "program/procedural elements" that might be used to judge what is missing?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and removed reference to procedural elements.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R8 — Again, because the phrase ' program/procedural elements' is too vague, we propose deleting the Lower VSL entirely and suggest modifying the Severe VSL to the following: Severe — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority does not have plans for manual load shedding or is not capable of implementing the load shedding in a time frame adequate for responding to the emergency.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and removed reference to procedural elements. The proposed VSLs split the categories similar to your suggestion.
FirstEnergy	R8 - The second part of the Lower VSL, "but is missing no more than two program/procedural elements" is neither a requirement in R8 nor a measure in M2. The Lower VSL should be changed to: "The TOP or BA has plans for manual load shedding but is not capable of implementing the load shedding in a timeframe adequate for responding to the emergency."	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and removed reference to procedural elements. In response to industry comments and the FERC VSL order of 6/19/08, the DT has modified the VSLs.
Ontario IESO	R8: By having a VSL associated with "is missing no more than two program/procedural elements", there is potential for disputes on what are these elements when they are not stipulated in the standard. Further, how about missing 3 or more of these elements, would the violation be assessed Severe?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and removed reference to procedural elements.
City of Tallahassee	. R8. — What are the "program/procedural elements" that are referred to in the VSL? They are not identified in the requirement.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and removed reference to procedural elements.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

6. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-004-1 — Disturbance Reporting. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.

EOP-004-1 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: The drafting team eliminated the Lower VSL based on stakeholder comments.

EOP-004-1 – Disturbance Reporting				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.	The Regional Reliability Organization has demonstrated the existence of a regional reporting procedure, but the procedure is missing no more than two details or program/procedural elements.	N/A	N/A	The Regional Reliability Organization does not have a regional reporting procedure.
Revised R1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Regional Reliability Organization does not have a Regional reporting procedure.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	(1) R1: The comments on R8 of EOP-003 also applies here. From EOP-003 R8: By having a VSL associated with "is missing no more than two program/procedural elements", there is potential for disputes on what are these elements when they are not stipulated in the standard. Further, how about missing 3 or more of these elements, would the violation be assessed Severe?	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees that the VSL may create ambiguity and therefore has removed the Lower VSL. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Manitoba Hydro	R1: remove the Lower VSL or define what the "program/procedural elements" are. It's too vague.	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees that the VSL may create ambiguity and therefore has removed the Lower VSL. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1 - SRC agrees with VSLs	Thank you for your comments. Note that based on other comments indicating that the language in the Lower VSL was too vague, the DT removed the Lower VSL that had been proposed.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The "parent" requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document. For EOP-004-1 R1, R4 and R5, are these VSL assignments relevant since the Regional Reliability Organizations are not suppose to be assigned a task?	Thank you for your comments. Revisions to the VSL Guideline document and whether the RRO can be assigned a task are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	In general we feel that reporting is an administrative function and as such is not deserving of a VSL higher than Moderate. We do recognize that there is value from a lessons learned perspective in the reporting process. We suggest the following changes. R1 — Delete the proposed Lower VSL and replace it with the proposed Severe VSL.	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees that the VSL may create ambiguity and therefore has removed the Lower VSL. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	In general, this standard is administrative and no requirement should be rated in the HIGH, SEVERE, or MODERATE category. EOP-004 R1 is yet another requirement that needs evaluation. Why doe the RRO need to have a reporting procedure in addition to the already existing reporting requirements in the industry? (OE-417, ESISAC). Nonetheless, this is entirely administrative and should be rated as LOWER.	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Ontario IESO	R1: The comments on R8 of EOP-003 also apply here. From EOP-003 R8: By having a VSL associated with "is missing no more than two program/procedural elements", there is potential for disputes on what are these elements when they are not stipulated in the standard. Further, how about missing 3 or more of these elements, would the violation be assessed Severe?	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees that the VSL may create ambiguity and therefore has removed the Lower VSL. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.
Southern Company	R1.: (1) The term "details" is used in the Lower VSL. What are the details? Does the standard indicate what the details are? (2) Under Severe VSL, how does the RRO not having a regional reporting procedure have a Severe impact on the reliability of the Eastern Interconnection?	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees that the VSL may create ambiguity and therefore has removed the Lower VSL. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

EOP-004-1 Requirement R2

Summary Consideration: The drafting team added a Lower VSL and modified the wording of the Moderate, High and Severe VSLs based on stakeholder comments.

EOP-004-1 – Disturbance Reporting				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R2.	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to analyze 1% to 25% of its disturbances on the BES or was negligent in the timeliness of analyzing the disturbances 1% to 25% of the time.	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to analyze 26% to 50% of its disturbances on the BES or was negligent in the timeliness of analyzing the disturbances 26% to 50% of the time.	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to analyze more than 50% of its disturbances on the BES or was negligent in the timeliness of analyzing the disturbances more than 50% of the time
Revised R2.	The responsible entity failed to promptly analyze 5% or less of its disturbances on the BES.	The responsible entity failed to promptly analyze more than 5%, up to 10% of its disturbances on the BES.	The responsible entity failed to promptly analyze 10% up to 15% of its disturbances on the BES.	The responsible entity failed to promptly analyze 15% or more of its disturbances on the BES.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R2: We feel that the first part of the sentence is sufficient. The second part on "negligent.." is not required to be an explicit condition as it is hard to prove, and "failure" to analyze would already cover this.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL and has removed the references to "negligent".
We Energies	R2 requires prompt analysis. Disturbances should not be common. The three VSLs are written with percentages of total disturbances that must be over a period of time such as a year. This is not prompt.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R2 — Because 'promptly' in the requirement is too vague, we suggest removing any reference to timeliness in the VSLs. Moderate — The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to analyze 1% to 25% of its disturbances on the BES. High — The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to analyze 26% to 50% of its disturbances on the BES. Severe — The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to analyze more than 50% of its disturbances on the BES.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL to expand to the quartile approach. The VSL uses the term "promptly" which is consistent with the Requirement. Changes to the Requirement are beyond the scope of the DT.
Oncor Electric Delivery	Req R2 ? As there will be lower priority events that have minimal impact on the bulk electric system, priorities must be established to reflect that reality. Suggested language "The responsible entities have failed to analyze (Recommended % Range) of its disturbances on the BES or was negligent in the timeliness of analyzing the disturbances (Recommended % Range) of the time. (1 to 15 % - Lower) ? (16% to 30 % - Moderate) ? (31% to 50% - Higher) .. (Greater than 50% - Severe)?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.
Ontario IESO	R2: We feel that the first part of the sentence is sufficient. The second part on "negligent.." is not required to be an explicit condition as it is hard to prove, and "failure" to analyze would already cover this.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.
Bonneville Power	R2: Timeliness is subjective.R3.3 Remove Lower VSL (it was reported verbally - good. The "all information" is subjective.)	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.
Dominion	R2 — I suggest changing so that low applies to 1% to 25%, medium to 26% to 50%, High to 51%–75% and SEVERE to greater than 75%.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.
Southern Company	R2.: The use of the term "timeliness" in the VSLs adds a nebulous aspect to compliance. What is timely?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	For EOP-004-1 R2, the assigned VSLs are poorly worded because sometimes it's not known who owns a disturbance until it's analyzed. However they should all be shifted down one VSL and the Severe VSL should be 76%-100%. The VSLs are to measure how bad the requirement was missed, not the importance of the requirement (taken care of by the VRF).	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R2 — The quartile approach of the VSL Guidelines document is not applied correctly. Four VSLs need to be defined with each successively more severe VSL representing 25% more non-compliance.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

EOP-004-1 Requirement R3

Summary Consideration: The drafting team added a High VSL and modified the wording of the Severe VSL for R3 based on stakeholder comments. Because the subrequirements are written as though they are, “stand alone” requirements, the drafting team retained separate sets of VSLs for the subrequirements and made conforming modifications to the language in the VSLs for the subrequirements based on stakeholder comments.

EOP-004-1 – Disturbance Reporting				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to provide a preliminary written report as directed by the requirement.
Revised R3.	N/A	N/A	The responsible entity experienced a reportable incident and failed to provide a preliminary written report to one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RRO • NERC 	The responsible entity experienced a reportable incident and failed to provide a preliminary written report as directed by the requirement to both of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RRO • NERC
Original R3.1	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity submitted the report within 25 to 36 hours of the disturbance or discovery of the disturbance.	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity submitted the report within 36 to 48 hours of the disturbance or discovery of the disturbance.	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity submitted the report more than 48 hours after the disturbance or discovery of the disturbance.
Revised	The responsible entity submitted	The responsible entity submitted	The responsible entity submitted	The responsible entity submitted

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

EOP-004-1 – Disturbance Reporting				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R3.1.	the report as required in R3.1 more than 24 but less than or equal to 36 hours of the disturbance or unusual occurrence, or discovery of the disturbance or unusual occurrence.	the report as required in R3.1 more than 36 but less than or equal to 48 hours of the disturbance or unusual occurrence, or discovery of the disturbance or unusual occurrence.	the report as required in R3.1 more than 48 but less than 72 hours after the disturbance or unusual occurrence, or discovery of the disturbance or unusual occurrence.	the report as required in R3.1. 72-hours or more after the disturbance or unusual occurrence, or discovery of the disturbance or unusual occurrence.
Original R3.2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R3.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R3.3	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity provided its Regional Reliability Organization(s) and NERC with periodic, verbal updates about a disturbance, but the updates did not include all information that was available at the time.	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity did not provide its Regional Reliability Organization(s) and NERC with verbal updates about a disturbance as specified in R3.3.
Revised R3.3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The responsible entity did not provide its Regional Reliability Organization(s) and NERC with verbal notification or updates about a disturbance as specified in R3.3.
Original R3.4	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity submitted the final report 30 or less days late or was missing one of the elements	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity submitted the final report more than 30 days late or was missing two of the elements	The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity final report was not submitted or was missing more than two of the elements

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

EOP-004-1 – Disturbance Reporting				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
		specified in the requirement.	specified in the requirement.	specified in the requirement.
Revised R3.4.	The responsible entity submitted the final report no more than 30 days past the 60 day due date; or the final report was missing one of the three elements specified in R3.4.	The responsible entity submitted the final report between 31 days and 60 days inclusive past the 60 day due date. OR The final report was missing two of the three elements specified in R3.4.	The responsible entity submitted the final report between 61 days and 90 days inclusive past the 60 day due date.	The responsible entity failed to submit the final report. OR The responsible entity submitted the final report 91 days or more past the 60 day due date OR The responsible entity submitted a final report that was missing all three of the elements specified in R3.4.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R3: Having multiple sets of VSLs - one for the main requirement and one for each of the subrequirements other than R3.2, is problematic. This requirement should be revised to better support development of VSLs in the future.	Thank you for your comments. Revisions to the Requirement are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Detroit Edison/DTE Energy Fossil Generation NERC Compliance Manager	Reports to other entities as required other than immediate verbal notification should never be higher than Moderate VSL. It should be the responsibility of the receiving entity or the entity requiring the written report, to generate the written report by requesting interviews with the various entities and then write their own report. This will insure the receiving entity gets the information in the format they require and of the quality they expect. Report writing by an entity who does not use the report for value added will not spend the necessary resource to generate those reports in the quality that the receiving entity believes is required. Therefore I propose that the entity requiring reports interview the other entities and request logged information or notes and generate their own reports. This will insure the receiving entity gets the report timely, in the desired format and of the required quality. Again written reports or the cooperation with the should never exceed Moderate VSL.	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. Revisions to the Requirement are beyond the scope of the VSL Drafting Team.
Pepco Holdings, Inc. - Affiliates	R3 and R3.1 need to be coordinated. How can not filing a report at all have the same VSL as filing a report more than 48 hours after discovery of the disturbance?	Thank you for your comments.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R3 — Change the Severe VSL to Lower.	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature of R3 is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.
FirstEnergy	R3 — The quartile approach should be used instead of placing a Severe VSL on missing merely one reportable incident.	Thank you for your comments. This Requirement is written based on a per event basis and the VSL must reflect the provisions of the Requirement. The VSL DT did not feel the quartile approach was appropriate for this requirement.
Ontario IESO	R3: Having multiple sets of VSLs - one for the main requirement and one for each of the subrequirements other than R3.2, is problematic. This requirement should be revised to better support development of VSLs in the future.	Thank you for your comments, however revisions to the Requirement are beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services	It appears the double jeopardy exposure has been removed from EOP-004-1 R3.	Thank you for your comments.
Southern Company	R3.: Does the failure of the entities named to provide a preliminary written report severely impact the reliability of the Eastern Interconnection?	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The impact to reliability of non-compliance with the requirement is taken into consideration by the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	EOP-004-1R3: Requires a report to be sent to NERC and the RRO. Recommend a VSL of Moderate for not reporting to one of the two entities and a Severe VSL for not reporting to both of the entities.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has modified the VSL similar to your suggestion.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R3 — The Reporting category of the VSL Guidelines document is not applied correctly. The preliminary reports have a specific required template that is used. The VSLs should be written considering what goes into this template. How does the drafting team justify a Severe only VSL? Additionally, R3 has sub-requirements so the Multi-Component category should be used. R3.1 — Why does the drafting team jump directly to a Moderate VSL for a late report? Shouldn't the first late reporting category be lower? The way the VSLs are written, a report that is less than one hour late does not fit any VSL. Why do the VSLs jump to a Severe VSL for being only one day late? Can the drafting team really justify subjecting an entity to sanctions up to \$1 million/day for a late report? This is really a disservice to NERC and the industry.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs reflect language used in the requirement which does not reference a report template. The sub-requirements, are independent of the requirement and thus have been assigned separate VSLs. Potential financial penalties are a function of both the VRF and VSLs assigned. This requirement has a Low VRF.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.1 - SRC proposes VSLs be defined as :LOWER for 25-36 hours late (1hr to ? day late)MODERATE for 36-48 (1/2 to 1 day late)HIGH for 48 -60 (1 to 1? days late)SEVERE for more then 60 (more then 1? days late)	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSLs for R3.1 in support of your suggestion.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	EOP-004-1R3.1: Spread the time frame over all 4 VSLs.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL VSLs for R3.1 in support of your suggestion.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion	R3.1 — I suggest changing so that low applies to reports submitted within 25 to 36 hours of the disturbance, medium if submitted 36 to 48 and high if submitted more than 48 hours.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL VSLs for R3.1 in support of your suggestion.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R3.1 — We propose the following: Lower — The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity submitted the report more than 24 hours after the disturbance or following the discovery of the disturbance. Moderate - The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to submit a report after a disturbance or following the discovery of a disturbance.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL to represent an approach to R3.1 as suggested by several commenters with VSLs for timeliness distributed across four VSLs. The failure to provide the report needs to be a Severe VSL in accordance with the VSL Guidelines.
We Energies	R3.1 VSLs should include that R3.3 did not apply	Each requirement and sub-requirement is evaluated on its own merits for the purpose of assigning VSLs.
Southern Company	R3.1 (1) R3.3 seems to offer an exception to R3.1 because of the entity's ability to assess damage. If an entity meets R3.3 by providing a verbal notification, it may be more acceptable to take more than 48 hours to comply with R3.1. R3.1 should be modified to reflect that exception.	Each requirement and sub-requirement is evaluated on its own merits for the purpose of assigning VSLs. Audit teams will address the merits of exceptions such as the ones that have been identified in R3.3.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R3.1 — Why does the drafting team jump directly to a Moderate VSL for a late report? Shouldn't the first late reporting category be lower? The way the VSLs are written, a report that is less than one hour late does not fit any VSL. Why do the VSLs jump to a Severe VSL for being only one day late? Can the drafting team really justify subjecting an entity to sanctions up to \$1 million/day for a late report? This is really a disservice to NERC and the industry because it will create a due process nightmare. No entity will accept a significant penalty for a late report and you can be sure that they will fight a significant penalty for a late report each step of the way. If the VSL is set only to Lower for late reporting of any duration, this due process nightmare will be avoided entirely.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL to represent an approach to the standard as suggested by commenters with VSLs for timeliness distributed across four VSLs. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature of this requirement is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low as it has minimal impact on reliability

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.2 - SRC agrees with no VSL	Thank you for your comments
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.3 - SRC proposes a single SEVERE VSL.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has deleted the Lower VSL in support of your suggestion.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R3.3 — Delete the proposed Lower VSL and replace it with the proposed Severe VSL.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has deleted the Lower VSL in support of your suggestion.
Bonneville Power	R3.3 Remove Lower VSL (it was reported verbally - good. The "all information" is subjective.)	Thank you for your comments. The DT has deleted the Lower VSL in support of your suggestion.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R3.3 — Can the drafting team really justify subjecting an entity to sanctions up to \$1 million/day for failing to provide verbal updates to the RRO and NERC? Shouldn't they focus on restoring the system? This is really a disservice to NERC and the industry because it will create a due process nightmare. No entity will accept a significant penalty for failing to provide verbal updates and you can be sure that they will fight a significant penalty for a late report each step of the way. If the VSL is set only to Lower for late reporting of any duration, this due process nightmare will be avoided entirely.	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature of this requirement is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low as it has minimal impact on reliability.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3.4 - SRC agrees with the proposed VSLs	Thank you for your comments. Other commenters have recommended changes to the VSLs to address timeliness as well as completeness and changes have been made to add VSLs for timeliness.
Hydro One Networks	For R3.4 we suggest changing the grading slightly for the High and Severe VSLs. We suggest the following for the High VSL: "The RC, BA, TOP, GOP or LSE submitted the final report more than 30 days late but less than 60 days late OR the report was missing two of the elements specified in the requirement." For the Severe VSL, we suggest: "The RC, BA, TOP, GOP or LSE final report was not submitted within 120 days from the date of request OR was missing more than two of the elements specified in the requirement."	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSLs taking into consideration your comments to address timeliness as well as completeness.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	EOP-004-1R3.4: Spread the time frame over all 4 VSLs, Suggest the High VSL state "more that 30, but less than 60 days". The Severe VSL should be 60 days or more.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments to address timeliness as well as completeness.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R3.4 — We propose the following: Lower — The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity submitted the final report more than 60 days following the disturbance or was missing one of the elements specified in R3.4. Moderate — The Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator, Generator Operator or Load-Serving Entity failed to submit a report following a disturbance.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments to address timeliness as well as completeness..
FirstEnergy	R3.4 — As written, the VSL assess penalties for being "late" in submitting a report, but it is not clear from the sub-requirement when the timer starts. Since R3.4 is a sub-requirement of R3 it must be assumed that the time starts with the occurrence of the event, therefore the VSL should state that the report is submitted more than 60 but less than or equal to 90 days after the occurrence of the event for a Moderate severity level and more than 90 days after the occurrence of the event for a High severity level.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking in consideration your comments to address timeliness as well as completeness. The VSLs reflect the language used in the requirement or sub-requirement which references only "within 60 days". Interpretation of the sub-requirement is outside the scope of the EOP VSL DT.
Dominion	R3.4 — I do not believe that a final report should warrant a severe classification. I suggest reducing current levels by one (Severe to High, High to moderate and moderate to low).	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs were changed based on other comments as well as taking in your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low as it has minimal impact on reliability.
Southern Company	R3.4: The requirement stipulated a 60 day reporting time frame. The Severe VSL seems open-ended because it does not hold the entity to the same stipulation.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking in consideration your comments. The revised VSLs provide greater specificity with respect to timeliness in providing the report.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R3.4 — Can the drafting team really justify subjecting an entity to sanctions up to \$1 million/day for failing to provide a timely report to the RRO and NERC? This is really a disservice to NERC and the industry because it will create a due process nightmare. No entity will accept a significant penalty for a late report and you can be sure that they will fight a significant penalty for a late report each step of the way. If the VSL is set only to Lower for late reporting of any duration, this due process nightmare will be avoided entirely.	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature of this requirement is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low as it has minimal impact on reliability.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

EOP-004-1 Requirement R4

Summary Consideration: The drafting team removed the Moderate VSL and added a Severe VSL in support of stakeholder comments indicating that a violation of a binary requirement must be a "Severe" VSL.

EOP-004-1 – Disturbance Reporting				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R4.	N/A	The RRO did not make its representatives on the NERC Operating Committee and Disturbance Analysis Working Group available for the purpose of providing any needed assistance in the investigation and to assist in the preparation of a final report.	N/A	N/A
Revised R4.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The RRO did not make its representatives on the NERC Operating Committee and Disturbance Analysis Working Group available for the purpose of providing any needed assistance in the investigation and to assist in the preparation of a final report.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	(4) R4: It is a binary requirement; the VSL should be either none or Severe.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has moved the Moderate VSL to Severe in consideration your comments.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R4 - SRC proposes LOWER if one of two reps made available SEVERE if neither made available	Thank you for your comment. The Requirement states that both representatives need to be supplied.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R4 — Change the Moderate VSL to Lower.	Thank you for your comments. Other commenters have recommended changes to the VSL to move it to Severe. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature of this requirement is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. For this requirement, the VRF is Low.
Ontario IESO	R4: It is a binary requirement; the VSL should be either none or Severe.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the Moderate VSL to Severe taking into consideration your comments.
Southern Company	R4.: Under Severe VSL, what is the RROs response time frame? It is not stipulated in the text.	Thank you for your comments. Interpretation of the Requirement is beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R4 — Hasn't the DAWG disbanded?	Thank you for your comment. If this is so, then this would require a Standard change and this is beyond the scope of the DT

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

EOP-004-1 Requirement R5

Summary Consideration: The DT modified the Moderate VSL to provide clearer boundaries on the % of recommendations and added more words to the Severe VSL to align more closely with the language in the requirement.

EOP-004-1 – Disturbance Reporting				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R5.	The Regional Reliability Organization reviewed all final report recommendations less than twice a year.	The Regional Reliability Organization reviewed 75% or more final report recommendations twice a year.	The Regional Reliability Organization has not reported on any recommendation that has not been acted on within two years to the NERC Planning and Operating Committees.	The Regional Reliability Organization has not reviewed the final report recommendations or did not notify the NERC Planning and Operating Committees.
Revised R5.	The Regional Reliability Organization reviewed all final report recommendations less than twice a year.	The Regional Reliability Organization reviewed twice per year 75% or more but less than 100% of the final report recommendations.	The Regional Reliability Organization has not reported on any recommendation that has not been acted on within two years to the NERC Planning and Operating Committees.	The Regional Reliability Organization has not reviewed the final report recommendations or did not notify the NERC Planning and Operating Committees that the recommendations were not being acted upon.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R5: Should the Moderate VSL be revised to: "The Regional Reliability Organization reviewed 75% or more but less than 100% of the final report recommendations twice a year"?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments.
Ontario IESO	R5: Should the Moderate VSL be revised to: "The Regional Reliability Organization reviewed 75% or more but less than 100% of the final report recommendations twice a year"?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R5 - SRC would propose the following: LOWER VSL — reviewed twice and reported once MODERATE VSL — reviewed twice did not report HIGH ? reviewed and reported once SEVERE — did not review or report	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL to provide more clarification of this requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-004 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Hydro One Networks	For R5, the Severe VSL description needs to be completed. We suggest the following: "The RRO has not reviewed the final report recommendations OR did not notify the NERC Planning and Operating Committees that the recommendations were not being acted upon."	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments.
We Energies	R5 Severe VSL: Should say ?reviewed the status of the final report recommendations?	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R5 — We suggest deleting the proposed Moderate and High VSLs and changing the Severe VSL to Moderate.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL based on comments provided by other commenters. Note that a complete failure to meet the performance must be a Severe VSL.

7. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-005-1 — System Restoration Plans. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.

EOP-005-1 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed and the only change made was to revise the VSLs to state the % of the performance that was “noncompliant” rather than stating the % of performance that was compliant. The percentages were modified based on FERC’s thresholds of up to 5% noncompliant for Lower, 5-10% noncompliant for Moderate, 10-15% noncompliant for High – and anything 15% or higher noncompliant as Severe.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that includes 75 % or more but less than 100% of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that includes 50% to 75% of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that includes 25% - 50% of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that includes less than 25% of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005. OR The Transmission Operator has no restoration plan.
Revised R1.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that is missing less than 5% of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that is missing 5% or more but less than 10% of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that is missing 10% or more but less than 15% of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005.	The Transmission Operator has a restoration plan that is missing 15% or more of the applicable elements listed in Attachment 1-EOP-005.

Company	Comment	Response
---------	---------	----------

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Manitoba Hydro	Should be left until new standard is approved.	Thank you for your comments. The scope of this project is to revise the assignment of VSLs to the EOP standards. This is the only group of VSLs that failed to get the required 2/3 approval vote. NERC has no choice but to meet the FERC order. Other revisions to the standards and requirements will be done (or are being done) by drafting teams addressing those standards. When standards are revised the VSLs will be revised along with the requirements, measures etc. As standards are revised VSLs will only be assigned to the primary requirements and not to the sub-requirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1 - SRC agrees with proposed VSLs	Thank you for your comment. Please see the modifications made.
We Energies	R1. The VSLs ignore the necessary items in the requirement itself.	Thank you for your comment.
Duke Energy Corporation	We do not agree that sub-requirements should always be assigned VSLs. Requirement R1 ?Moderate? VSL identifies a range of ?50% to 75%. The range should say ?more than 50% but less than 75%?.	Thank you for your comment we have made changes to the percentages based on FERC directives
Bonneville Power	R1: Many Attachment A items is included in other Requirements of EOP-005-1. So there is duplication. Just have Severe VSL for "no restoration plan" (there is a SAR for EOP-005 revision in comment).	Thank you for your comment we have made changes to the percentages based on FERC directives

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R2

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed and no changes were made.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R2.	The Transmission Operator failed to review or update its restoration plan when it made changes in the power system network.	The Transmission Operator failed to review and update its restoration plan at least annually.	The Transmission Operator failed to review and update its restoration plan at least annually or whenever it made changes in the power system network, and failed to correct deficiencies found during the simulated restoration exercises.	The Transmission Operator failed to review and update its restoration plan at least annually and whenever it made changes in the power system network, and failed to correct deficiencies found during the simulated restoration exercises.

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R2 - SRC agrees with proposed VSLs	Thank you for your comment
Southern Company	General: What constitutes "changes in the power system network" that would trigger the need for review of the plan? Are these "changes" temporary changes or permanent changes or other? R2.: What is the time-frame for reviewing? Are updates to the plan to be made contemporaneously, or by some other specified period?	Thank you for your comments. Interpretation of the Requirement is beyond the scope of the Drafting Team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R3

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed and the only change made was to remove the word, "top" from the Severe VSL as this word is not included in the associated requirement.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator's restoration plans failed to make restoration of the integrity of the Interconnection a top priority.
Revised R3.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator's restoration plans failed to make restoration of the integrity of the Interconnection a priority.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	(1) R3: The impact on an interconnection really depends upon the location of the TOP. The reliability impact of non-compliance of this requirement would not be consistent and is difficult to measure. for the VSL suggest replacing "top priority" with "priority". There should be no pressure on a TOP to de-prioritize the supply to nuclear stations.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments and removed the word, "top" as suggested.
City of Tallahassee	R3 Severe VSL changes the requirement. The requirement states it should be a "priority", the VSL states it should be a "top priority". This makes it subjective.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments and removed the word, "top" as suggested.
BCTC	R3. The Requirement does not say restoring the integrity of the Interconnection has to be a TOP priority as stated in the VSL. Suggest deleting the word top from the VSL description.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has changed the VSL taking into consideration your comments and removed the word, "top" as suggested.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R3 - SRC proposes no VSLs	Thank you for your comments. The scope of this project is to revise the assignment of VSLs to the EOP standards. This is the only group of VSLs that failed to get the required 2/3 approval vote. NERC has no choice but to meet the FERC order. Other revisions to the standards and requirements will be done (or are being done) by drafting teams addressing those standards. When standards are revised the VSLs will be revised along with the requirements, measures etc. As standards are revised VSLs will only be assigned to the primary requirements and not to the sub-requirements.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R3 — Integrity is not a measurable quantity? For this requirement, it is impossible to write a meaningful VSL without good measurements.	The VSL reflects the language of the Requirement and interpretation of the Requirement is beyond the scope of this drafting team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R4

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed and the only change made was to revise the VSLs to state the “% of entities” rather than stating the “number of entities”.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R4.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with one of the entities listed in the requirement.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with two of the entities listed in the requirement.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with three of the entities listed in the requirement.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with four or more of the entities listed in the requirement.
Revised R4.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with 5% or less of the entities identified in the Requirement.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with more than 5% but less than 10% of the entities identified in the Requirement.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with 10% or more, but less than 15% of the entities identified in the Requirement.	The Transmission Operator failed to coordinate its restoration plans with 15% or more of the entities identified in the Requirement.

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R4 — What category is being applied from the VSL Guidelines document? These VSLs do not appear to fit any category. We suggest that a quartile approach be taken based on the percent of applicable registered entities that the TOP coordinated with.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has revised the VSLs to use a FERC recommended percentage approach.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	R4: The MRO agrees with the idea here, but recommend using a percentage instead of a set number.EOP-005-1	Thank you for your comments. The DT has revised the VSLs to use a percentage approach.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R5

Summary Consideration: Several stakeholders suggested modifications to the VSLs. The drafting team adopted the recommendation that the requirement be treated as “binary” with just a single “Severe” VSL.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R5.	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to periodically test its telecommunication facilities needed to implement the restoration plan.	N/A
Revised R5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to periodically test its telecommunication facilities needed to implement its restoration plan.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R5: It is a binary requirement; the VSL should be either none or Severe.	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees and has revised the VSL so it is Severe.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R5 - SRC proposes: LOWER VSL is test is missing for one entity MODERATE VSL if test is missing for 2 entities SEVERE if tests not done for all entities.	Thank you for your comments. The DT, in agreement with industry suggestions, views this requirement as binary and has assigned a single Severe VSL. Note that testing is associated with the responsible entity’s “facilities” not with entities.
Hydro One Networks	Ideally Requirement R5 should have a timeline associated with it. In any case we suggest moving the High VSL to a Severe VSL as the telecommunication facilities for a restoration plan are extremely critical.	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees and has revised the VSL to Severe. The timeline needs to be addressed through a revision to the requirement. Revision is beyond the scope of this DT.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	R5: Recommend basing the VSLs on a percentage of telecommunication facilities not tested compared to the number of facilities owned that are needed for restoration, Low = 1%-25%, Moderate =26%-50%, High = 51%-75% and Severe = 76%-100%.EOP-005-1	Thank you for your comments. The DT did not feel the percentage (or quartile) approach would be appropriate for this VSL. The DT, in agreement with industry suggestions, views this requirement as binary and has assigned a single Severe VSL.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R5 — What category is being applied from the VSL Guidelines document? What is the justification of a only a High VSL? The VSL as defined doesn't appear to fit any category.	Thank you for your comments. The DT, in agreement with industry suggestions, views this requirement as binary and has assigned a single Severe VSL.
Ontario IESO	(1) R5: It is a binary requirement; the VSL should be either none or Severe.	Thank you for your comments. The DT agrees and has revised the VSL to Severe.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R6

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the use of percentages, but some commenters suggested adopting the “quartile” approach and this suggestion was adopted. In addition, the VSLs were revised to state the % of the performance that was “noncompliant” rather than stating the % of performance that was compliant. The percentages were modified based on FERC’s thresholds of up to 5% noncompliant for Lower, 5-10% noncompliant for Moderate, 10-15% noncompliant for High – and anything 15% or higher noncompliant as Severe.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R6.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority trained less than 100% but greater than or equal to 67 % of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority trained less than 67 % but greater than or equal to 33 % of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority trained less than 33 % of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority did not train any of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.
Revised R6.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to train less than 5% of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to train 5% or more, but less than 10 % of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to train 10 % or more but less than 15% of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to train 15% or more of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R6: Suggest to change the percentage to >75% but <100% for low, >50% but <75% as Moderate, >25% but <50% as High, and <25% as Severe.	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using a percentage approach as per FERC.
Hydro One Networks	The VSLs for R6 should be graded in quarters like R7. Example: Lower VSL "trained 75% to 99%", Moderate VSL "trained 50% to 74%", High VSL "trained 25% to 49%" and Severe VSL "trained less than 25%. Currently both the High and Severe VSL include the zero%. We question the logic behind the VSLs for	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using a percentage approach as per FERC directives and suggestions..

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R6 — The quartile approach from the VSL Guidelines document has been misapplied. The VSL categories are not quarters but rather thirds.	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using a percentage approach per FERC.
FirstEnergy	<p>R6 — The quartile approach from the VSL Guidelines document is misapplied. The VSL categories divided into thirds across the four levels instead of the required quarters. Also, the requirement suggests the possibility that you may have trained all your personnel but may not have included simulations when practicable. However, the VSL do not address this situation. Based on the two comments above, we therefore suggest revising the VSL for requirement R6 as follows:</p> <p>Lower: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority trained all their personnel but did not include simulated exercises when practicable.</p> <p>Moderate: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority trained less than 100% but greater than or equal to 67% of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.</p> <p>High: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority trained less than 67% but greater than or equal to 33% of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.</p> <p>Severe: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority trained less than 33% of its operating personnel in the implementation of the restoration plan.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using a percentage approach per FERC. The Requirement references the inclusion of simulation exercises "if practicable". The determination of "practicable" simulations requires interpretation of the Requirement which is outside the scope of the EOP VSL DT.
Ontario IESO	R6: Suggest to change the percentage to >75% but <100% for low, >50% but <75% as Moderate, >25% but <50% as High, and <25% as Severe.	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using a percentage approach per FERC. Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using the quartile approach.
Bonneville Power	R6: Remove Lower, Moderate, High.	Thank you for your comments. The DT did not view this Requirement to be binary. The VSLs have been revised using a percentage approach as per FERC.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R7

Summary Consideration: Several stakeholders suggested modifications to the VSLs. The drafting team adopted the recommendation that the requirement be treated as “binary” with just a single “Severe” VSL.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R7.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified 76% to 99% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified 51% to 75% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified 26% to 50% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified less than 26% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation.
Revised R7.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority did not verify the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation.

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R7 - SRC proposes no VSLs	Thank you for your comments. The scope of this project is to revise the assignment of VSLs to the EOP standards. This is the only group of VSLs that failed to get the required 2/3 approval vote. FERC requires that all requirements have assigned at least one VSL. Other revisions to the standards and requirements will be done (or are being done) by drafting teams addressing those standards. When standards are revised the VSLs will be revised along with the requirements, measures etc.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R7 — There are gaps left in the percentages defined in the VSLs. For instance, 99-100%, 75-76%, etc. are not included.	Thank you for your comments. The DT, in agreement with other industry suggestions, views this requirement as binary and has assigned a single Severe VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
FirstEnergy	R7 — Should be revised as follows: Lower: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified greater than 75% but less than or equal to 100% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation. Moderate: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified greater than 50% but less than or equal to 75% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation. High: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified greater than 25% but less than or equal to 50% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation. Severe: The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority verified less than 25% of the restoration procedure by actual testing or by simulation.	Thank you for your comments. The DT, in agreement with industry suggestions, views this requirement as binary and has assigned a single Severe VSL.
Bonneville Power	R7: Make it similar to R6, i.e. High Severity if TO/BA has not verified procedure.	Thank you for your comments. The DT, in agreement with your suggestion, views this requirement as binary and has assigned a single Severe VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R8

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed and no changes were made.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
Lower VSL		Moderate VSL		Severe VSL
Original R8.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator failed to verify that the number, size, availability, and location of system blackstart generating units are sufficient to meet Regional Reliability Organization restoration plan requirements for the Transmission Operator's area.

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R8 - SRC proposes no VSLs	Thank you for your comments. The scope of this project is to revise the assignment of VSLs to the EOP standards. This is the only group of VSLs that failed to get the required 2/3 approval vote. FERC requires that all requirements have assigned at least one VSL. Other revisions to the standards and requirements will be done (or are being done) by drafting teams addressing those standards. When standards are revised the VSLs will be revised along with the requirements, measures etc.
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R8 ? ?Severe? VSL is too high since RRO restoration plan requirements are not yet published. We have no avenue to comment on or challenge them.	Thank you for your comments. The DT feels the binary approach is appropriate for this Requirement. Issues with the RRO restoration plan are beyond the scope of this DT.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R9

Summary Consideration: Several stakeholders suggested that the VSLs for High and Severe be revised to reflect consideration of the fact that if the document did not exist, it could not be provided to the Regional Reliability Organization and the drafting team modified the High and Severe VSLs in support of these comments.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R9.	N/A	N/A	<p>The Transmission Operator failed to document the Cranking Paths, including initial switching requirements, between each blackstart generating unit and the unit(s) to be started.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Transmission Operator failed to provide the Cranking Paths documentation to an Regional Reliability Organization upon request.</p>	<p>The Transmission Operator failed to document the Cranking Paths, including initial switching requirements, between each blackstart generating unit and the unit(s) to be started.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The Transmission Operator failed to provide the Cranking Paths documentation to an Regional Reliability Organization upon request.</p>
Revised R9.	N/A	N/A	<p>The Transmission Operator documented the Cranking Paths, including initial switching requirements, between each blackstart generating unit and the unit(s) to be started, but did not provide the documentation as requested by the Regional Reliability Organization.</p>	<p>The Transmission Operator failed to document the Cranking Paths, including initial switching requirements, between each blackstart generating unit and the unit(s) to be started.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R9 - SRC proposes LOWER VSL if document was created but not sent to RROMODERATE VSL if document was missing path for one (1) BS unit HIGH VSL if missing more then one (1) BS unit SEVERE VSL if no document done	Thank you for your comments. The VSL reflects the language used in the requirement which is applicable to all black start plans.
Hydro One Networks	R9. If the TOP does not have a Cranking Path document, it of course cannot meet the RRO request for it. Hence we suggest the following: High VSL "The TOP failed to provide the Cranking Paths documentation to an RRO upon request" and Severe VSL "The TOP failed to document the Cranking Paths, including ?."	Thank you for your comment. The VSL have been revised per your suggestion and that of other industry comments.
Dominion Virginia Power	For R9, the High VSL should be for having the required documentation of the cranking paths but not providing it to the RRO. The Severe VSL should be for not having the required documentation. As written, the Severe VSL is redundant -- you cannot provide what you do not have.	Thank you for your comment. The VSL have been revised per your suggestion and that of other industry comments.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R9 — Failure to provide cranking path documentation to the RRO does not justify moving VSLs to the high and severe categories of the sanctions matrix. Can the drafting team really justify subjecting an entity to sanctions up to \$1 million/day for failing to provide a timely report to the RRO and NERC? This is really a disservice to NERC and the industry because it will create a due process nightmare. No entity will accept a significant penalty for failing to report documentation and you can be sure that they will fight a significant penalty for it each step of the way. If the VSL is set only to Lower for late reporting of any duration, this due process nightmare will be avoided entirely.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs must categorize the various degrees of noncompliant performance without regard to "importance" to reliability.
Dominion	For R9, the High VSL should be for having the required documentation of the cranking paths but not providing it to the RRO. The Severe VSL should be for not having the required documentation. As written, the Severe VSL is redundant -- you cannot provide what you do not have.	Thank you for your comment. The VSL have been revised per your suggestion and that of other industry comments.
Southern Company	R9.: (1) We recommend moving the second component of the High VSL to the position of Moderate VSL. (2) Typo in the second component of both the High and Severe VSL - "an Regional Reliability Organization" should be "a Regional Reliability Organization".	Thank you for your comment. The VSL have been revised per industry comments.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R10

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the use of percentages, but some commenters suggested adopting the “quartile” approach and this suggestion was adopted. In addition, the VSLs were revised to state the % of the performance that was “noncompliant” rather than stating the % of performance that was compliant. No changes were made to the VSLs for Requirement R10.1 as this subrequirement is really looking for a different performance than is required for R10.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R10.	The Transmission Operator only demonstrated, through simulation or testing, that between 67 and 99% of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator only demonstrated, through simulation or testing, that between 33 and 66% of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator only demonstrated, through simulation or testing, that less than 33% of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan.	The Transmission Operator did not demonstrate, through simulation or testing, that any of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan.
Revised R10.	For less than 25% of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan, the Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate, through simulation or testing, that these blackstart generating units can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan,	For 25% or more, but less than 50% of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan, the Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate, through simulation or testing, that these blackstart generating units can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan.	For 50% or more, but less than 75% of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan, the Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate, through simulation or testing, that these blackstart generating units can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan.	For 75% or more of the blackstart generating units in its restoration plan, the Transmission Operator failed to demonstrate, through simulation or testing, that these blackstart generating units can perform their intended functions as required in the regional restoration plan.
Original R10.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator failed to perform the required simulation or testing at least once every five years.

Company	Comment	Response
---------	---------	----------

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R10: The Severe VSL for R10.1 can be combined with the VSL for the main requirement by adding it as an "OR" condition in the Severe column.	Thank you for your comments. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. Since the primary requirement and the subrequirement are looking at two different performances, the drafting team believes it is acceptable to keep the VSLs for R10.1 separate from the VSLs for R10.
Hydro One Networks	The VSLs for R10 should be graded in quarters similar to what we have suggested for R6.	Thank you for your comment. The VSL have been revised to use a quartile approach as per yours and other industry comments.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The "parent" requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document.	Thank you for your comments. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. Modifications to the VSL guideline are outside the scope of the EOPVSL drafting team. In accordance with the VSL guidelines, total noncompliance is a Severe VSL.
Ontario IESO	R10: The Severe VSL for R10.1 can be combined with the VSL for the main requirement by adding it as an "OR" condition in the Severe column.subrequirements.	Thank you for your comments. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. Since the primary requirement and the subrequirement are looking at two different performances, the drafting team believes it is acceptable to keep the VSLs for R10.1 separate from the VSLs for R10.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R10 — The quartile approach from the VSL Guidelines document has been misapplied. The VSL categories are not quarters but rather thirds. There are gaps left in the percentages defined in the VSLs. For instance, 99–100%, 75-76%, etc. are not included.	Thank you for your comment. The VSL have been revised to use a quartile approach as per yours and other industry comments.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R10.1 - SRC agrees with the proposed VSL	Thank you for your comment. The DT did not change the VSL for R10.1

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 Requirement R11

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the VSLs, as proposed, subjected stakeholders to “double jeopardy” and the drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 to the main requirement so that each subrequirement is identified in a VSL, but no attempt was made to provide a distinct set of VSLs for each subrequirement with the exception of subrequirement R11.5. This subrequirement (R11.5) addresses a subject that is different and distinct from the subject addressed by R11 and the first 4 sub-requirements. The drafting team rolled up the sub-subrequirements of R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 into the VSLs for the primary subrequirement R11.5 and eliminated the separate sets of VSLs for each of the sub-subrequirements.

The drafting team believes this modification supports the intent of the Commission’s directives as there is a VSL for noncompliance associated with each of the subrequirements.

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R11.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with less than 25% of the sub-requirements of R11.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with 25% or more and less than 50% of the sub-requirements of R11.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with 50% or more and less than 75% of the sub-requirements of R11.	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with more than 75% of the sub-requirements of R11.
Original R11.1	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to work in conjunction with their Reliability Coordinator to determine the extent and condition of the isolated area(s)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R11.2	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to take the necessary actions to restore Bulk Electric System frequency to normal.	N/A
Original R11.3	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority failed to make all attempts to maintain adjusted Interchange Schedules as required in R11.3	The Balancing Authority failed to immediately review the Interchange Schedules between those Balancing Authority Areas

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
				or fragments of those Balancing Authority Areas within the separated area and make adjustments to facilitate the restoration as required in R11.3.
Original R11.4	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator failed to give high priority to restoration of off-site power to nuclear stations.	N/A
Revised R11.	The responsible entity immediately began to restore the Bulk Electric System to normal and complied with 75% or more, but less than 100% of subrequirements R11.1, R11.2, R11.3, and R11.4.	The responsible entity immediately began to restore the Bulk Electric System to normal and complied with 50% or more, but less than 75% of subrequirements R11.1, R11.2, R11.3, and R11.4.	The responsible entity immediately began to restore the Bulk Electric System to normal and complied with 25% or more but less than 50% of subrequirements R11.1, R11.2, R11.3, and R11.4.	The responsible entity immediately began to restore the Bulk Electric System to normal and complied with less than 25% of subrequirements R11.1, R11.2, R11.3, and R11.4.
Original R11.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator attempted to resynchronize an isolated area(s) with a surrounding area(s) when one (1) or more of the sub-requirements of R11.5 were not met.
Original R11.5.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator attempted to resynchronize an isolated area(s) with a surrounding area(s) when sub-requirement R11.5.1 was not met.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

EOP-005-1 – System Restoration Plans				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R11.5.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator attempted to resynchronize an isolated area(s) with a surrounding area(s) when sub-requirement R11.5.2 was not met.
Original R11.5.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator attempted to resynchronize an isolated area(s) with a surrounding area(s) when sub-requirement R11.5.3 was not met.
Original R11.5.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator attempted to resynchronize an isolated area(s) with a surrounding area(s) when sub-requirement R11.5.4 was not met.
Revised R11.5.	N/A	N/A	The Transmission Operator attempted to resynchronize an isolated area(s) with a surrounding area(s) when one (1) of the conditions identified in the sub-requirements R11.5.1, R11.5.2, R11.5.3, or R11.5.4 was not met.	The Transmission Operator attempted to resynchronize an isolated area(s) with a surrounding area(s) when more than one (1) of the conditions identified in the subrequirements R11.5.1, R11.5.2, R11.5.3, and R11.5.4 were not met.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	<p>R11: This is a requirement with multiple conditions and requirements, hence the VSLs are difficult to develop. Nonetheless, we agree with the attempt to assign VSLs to the main requirement as a function of non-compliance with the subrequirements except R11.5. As such, we suggest revising the condition in each of the VSLs to: "?of the sub-requirements R11.1 to R11.4". If we adopt this approach, we should eliminate the VSLs for subrequirements R11.1 to R11.4, or at least change the VSLs for R11.1, R11.2 and R11.4 to Severe since they are binary requirements. For R11.3, since the main requirement's VSL is dependent on this subrequirement, we suggest to move the condition under High to Severe with an "OR" preceding it. For R11.5, we suggest to keep the VSLs for the main subrequirement (i.e. R11.5) as written but remove the VSLs for the R11.5.x subrequirements.</p>	<p>The DT thanks you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using many of the changes you suggest. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.</p>
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	<p>R11 - SRC agrees with the proposed VSLR11.1 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement</p>	<p>The DT thanks you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VRF and VSLs to all Requirements. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.</p>
Hydro One Networks	<p>R11: We believe having VSLs for requirement R11 and its sub-requirements will induce a double penalty. We suggest either removing the VSLs for the main R11 requirement OR have a single severe VSL stating: "The TOP and BA did not begin immediately to return the BES to normal. "</p>	<p>The DT thanks you for your comments. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams. Revisions made to the VSLs assigned to R11 and the sub-requirements should eliminate the potential for double jeopardy. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	R11: The binary sub requirements should be set to Low as they are a component of requirement 11.	Thank you for your comments. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R11 - The double jeopardy issue comes up again here but is complicated by one of the sub-requirements having sub-requirements itself. We suggest deleting the VSLs for all the sub-requirements and sub-sub-requirements and changing the VSLs for the main requirement as listed below. Lower — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with less than 25% of the sub-requirements and sub-sub-requirements collectively. Moderate — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with 25% or more and less than 50% of the sub-requirements and sub-sub-requirements collectively. High — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with 50% or more and less than 75% of the sub-requirements and sub-sub-requirements collectively. Severe — The Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to comply with more than 75% of the sub-requirements and sub-sub-requirements collectively.	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using many of the changes you suggest and should eliminate the double jeopardy issue. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
FirstEnergy	R11 — This VSL and its sub-requirements have the same problem in that they require implementation of the load restoration plan. This requires a very specific definition of implementation. A restoration plan may exist for years and never be used (implemented). However, if implementation is defined as the plan has been developed, documented, approved, distributed, and implemented when needed, then the VSL is appropriate. However, if the latter definition is the intent of the VSL, then a footnote should be added to this VSL and the definition provided.	Thank you for your comments. Interpretation and or modification of the standard or requirements is beyond the scope of this drafting team.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Ontario IESO	<p>R11: This is a requirement with multiple conditions and requirements, hence the VSLs are difficult to develop. Nonetheless, we agree with the attempt to assign VSLs to the main requirement as a function of non-compliance with the subrequirements except R11.5. As such, we suggest revising the condition in each of the VSLs to: "of the sub-requirements R11.1 to R11.4". If we adopt this approach, we should eliminate the VSLs for subrequirements R11.1 to R11.4, or at least change the VSLs for R11.1, R11.2 and R11.4 to Severe since they are binary requirements. For R11.3, since the main requirement's VSL is dependent on this subrequirement, we suggest to move the condition under High to Severe with an "OR" preceding it. For R11.5, we suggest to keep the VSLs for the main subrequirement (i.e. R11.5) as written but remove the VSLs for the R11.5.x subrequirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been revised using many of the changes you suggest. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.</p>
Duke Energy Corporation	<p>Requirement R11 has multiple sub-requirements. Violation of multiple sub-requirements would result in a violation for each sub-requirement and also a violation of the main requirement. Suggest deleting the VSLs for the main requirement.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements with a VRF. The EOP group of standards falls under the current directive until they are modified by future drafting teams. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.</p>
Bonneville Power	<p>R11: The Lower VSL wording is confusion, it appears for 0% failures to comply a Lower VSL occurs. I don't think that is the intent (one subrequirement failure)? Clarify if sub requirements includes 5.1,.2,.3,.4 in the count. I think the Severe VSL should be more than one element, and one element is High. This would shift sub items down one level. (see EOP-006 R2/R5 VSL) R11.2: Shift the VSL item down one level. Small island frequency is sensitive to load changes. R11.3: Shift the VSL items down one level. R11.5: Sub-sub .3</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been modified to eliminate the confusion on the wording and be more specific as to the sub-requirements associated with a VSL level. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5. The net result is that missing one of the subrequirements (R5.1 through R5.4) is a "Lower" VSL.</p>

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy Services	It appears the double jeopardy exposure has been removed from EOP-005-1 R10. That exposure has not been removed from EOP-005-1 R11	Thank you for your comments. Revisions to the VSLs assigned to R11 and the sub-requirements should eliminate the potential for double jeopardy. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
Hydro One Networks	For R11.1, a violation for this sub-requirement should be assigned a High VSL, not a Lower VSL.	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs for R11.1 through R11.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the primary requirement R11 – and the VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.2 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5. By rolling up the sub-requirements into the primary requirement the FERC directive is met since violation of a sub-requirement has at least one VSL assigned.
Bonneville Power	R11.2: Shift the VSL item down one level. Small island frequency is sensitive to load changes.	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and sub-requirements that have a VRF. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5. By rolling up the sub-requirements into the primary requirement the FERC directive is met since violation of a sub-requirement has at least one VSL assigned. The suggestion to “shift the VSL down one level” was not adopted but the concept of missing just R11.2 would now result in a Lower VSL if the responsible entity met the other performance in the requirement.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.3 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and sub-requirements that have a VRF. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5. By rolling up the sub-requirements into the primary requirement the FERC directive is met since violation of a sub-requirement has at least one VSL assigned.
Bonneville Power	R11.3: Shift the VSL items down one level. R11.5: Sub-sub .3	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
		Requirements and sub-requirements that have a VRF. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5. By rolling up the sub-requirements into the primary requirement the FERC directive is met since violation of a sub-requirement has at least one VSL assigned. The suggestion to “shift the VSL down one level” was not adopted but the concept of missing just R11.3 would now result in a Lower VSL if the responsible entity met the other performance in the requirement.
Dominion	R11.3 — I suggest reducing VSLs. I don't think that verification of interchange schedules warrants a severe during restoration events. I suggest reduce high to low and severe to moderate. Other BAs should be able to maintain frequency that results from an incorrect interchange schedule.	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and sub-requirements that have a VRF. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5. By rolling up the sub-requirements into the primary requirement the FERC directive is met since violation of a sub-requirement has at least one VSL assigned. The suggestion to “reduce the VSLs” was not adopted as proposed, but the concept of missing just R11.3 would now result in a Lower VSL if the responsible entity met the other performance in the requirement.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.4 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and sub-requirements that have a VRF. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5. By rolling up the sub-requirements into the primary requirement the FERC directive is met since violation of a sub-requirement has at least one VSL assigned.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.5 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements that have a VRF. The VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R11.5 — This is a multi-component requirement and the quartile approach based on the number of sub-requirements met should be applied.	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs have been modified to reflect High and Severe levels. The VSL DT did not feel the quartile approach to be appropriate for this requirement. The VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-005 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion	R11.5 and sub-requirements. Severe should be applied to R11.5. Sub requirements warrant low.	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VSLs to all Requirements and sub-requirements that have a VRF. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements except R11.5.. R11.5 addresses a subject that is different and distinct from the subject addressed by R11 and the first 4 sub-requirements. The VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.5.1 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement	Thank you for your comments. VSLs have been removed from the sub-requirements to R.11.5.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.5.2 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.5.3 - SRC agrees with the proposed VSL	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R11.5.4 - SRC proposes no VSLs for this requirement	Thank you for your comments. The VSLs for the sub-subrequirements R11.5.1 through R11.5.4 were rolled up into the VSLs for the subrequirement R11.5.

8. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-006-1 — Reliability Coordination – System Restoration. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.

EOP-006-1 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: The VSLs were revised to state the % of the performance that was “noncompliant” rather than stating the % of performance that was compliant, percentages used were as per FERC directives.

EOP-006-1 – Reliability Coordination – System Restoration				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.	The Reliability Coordinator is aware of more than 75% but less than 100% of its Transmission Operators restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator is aware of more than 50% but less than 75% of its Transmission Operators restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator is aware of more than 25% but less than 50% of its Transmission Operators restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator is not aware of any of its Transmission Operators restoration plans.
Revised R1.	The Reliability Coordinator is not aware less than 5% of its Transmission Operators’ restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator is not aware of 5% or more, but less than 10% of its Transmission Operators’ restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator is not aware of 10% or more, but less than 15% of its Transmission Operators’ restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator is not aware of 15% or more of its Transmission Operators’ restoration plans.

Company	Comment	Response
Hydro One Networks	The Severe VSL for R1 should be modified as follows to include the range 0%-25%: "The RC is aware of less than 25% of its TOPs restoration plans. >= 75%.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSLs to reflect the idea that not being aware of 30% or more of the restoration plans substantially misses the intent of the requirement
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R1 - The severe VSL should be: "The RC is aware of less than 25% of its TOPs restoration plans." An "equal to" is not included in the Lower, Moderate and High VSLs. Thus, 75%, 50% and 25% are not included in the VSLs.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSLs to reflect the idea that not being aware of 30% or more of the restoration plans substantially misses the intent of the requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Entergy	The gradation of the VSLs into percentages for penalty purposes is arbitrary. This Requirement is to ensure the RC is aware of restoration plans. The RC is the highest level entity responsible for reliability of the interconnected system. It is very important that the RC be aware of the restoration plan of EVERY TOP in its area. There should be only one VSL for this standard: Severe.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has received several comments and after considerable discussion, the VSLs were revised based on the collective comments and now the VSLs use smaller % for each of the categories of noncompliant performance to reflect that not being aware of 30% or more of the restoration plans substantially misses the intent of the requirement. The "importance" of this requirement with respect to reliability is reflected in the VRF, not the VSLs.
NPCC	High VSL should be imposed if the Reliability Coordinator is not aware of the restoration plan of each TWP in its RC area.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has adjusted the VSLs based on comments received to reflect the Requirement of the Standards as written and now the VSLs use smaller % for each of the categories of noncompliant performance to reflect that not being aware of 30% or more of the restoration plans substantially misses the intent of the requirement. The "importance" of this requirement with respect to reliability is reflected in the VRF, not the VSLs.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

EOP-006-1 Requirement R2

Summary Consideration: All commenters agreed with the VSLs as proposed and no changes were made.

EOP-006-1 – Reliability Coordination – System Restoration				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R2.	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to monitor restoration progress or failed to coordinate assistance.	The Reliability Coordinator failed to monitor restoration progress and failed to coordinate assistance.

Company	Comment	Response
ISO/RTO	SRC agrees with the proposed VSLs	Thank you for your comments

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

EOP-006-1 Requirement R3

Summary Consideration: Commenters favored using a percentage approach to measure the number of RC and TO restoration plans that were not coordinated and recognition of the requirement that an RC restoration plan must maintain reliability. The drafting team agreed with these comments and revised the VSLs accordingly.

EOP-006-1 – Reliability Coordination – System Restoration				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R3.	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator's Reliability Coordinator Area restoration plan did not coordinate with one individual Transmission Operator restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator's Reliability Coordinator Area restoration plan did not coordinate with more than one individual Transmission Operator restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator does not have a Reliability Coordinator Area restoration plan.
Revised R3.	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator's Reliability Coordinator Area restoration plan did not provide coordination between less than 10% of its individual Transmission Operator restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator's Reliability Coordinator Area restoration plan did not provide coordination between 10% or more of the Transmission Operator restoration plans.	The Reliability Coordinator does not have a Reliability Coordinator Area restoration plan. OR The Reliability Coordinator's Reliability Coordinator Area restoration plan does not ensure reliability is maintained during system restoration events.

Company	Comment	Response
Hydro One Networks	The VSLs should be graded by % of TOPs as the number of TOPS varies. We suggest: Moderate VSL <33%, High VSL >=33% and <66% and Severe VSL >= 66% OR does not have a RC Area restoration plan.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSLs to take into account percentages while still following the FERC guidelines using percentages that are small and maintain reliability.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	The drafting team should consider applying a quartile approach based on the percentage of TOPs that the RC restoration plan doesn't coordinate with. Currently, the VSLs favor RCs with many TOPs and penalize RCs with fewer TOPs.	Thank you for your comments. The DT has modified the VSL to take into account percentages while still following the FERC guidelines using percentages that are small and maintain reliability.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	For EOP-006-1 R3, what if the RC has a restoration plan but it does not provide sufficient detail or policies to clearly ensure reliability?	Thank you for your comments. Another Severe VSL has been developed to reflect language in the Requirement in support of your suggestion.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

EOP-006-1 Requirement R4

Summary Consideration: Several stakeholders indicated the VSLs should be revised – some stakeholders suggested using a quartile approach – but one stakeholder pointed out that the intent of the requirement is for the RC to serve as the primary contact for disseminating information – the requirement does not include actual dissemination of information. The VSLs were revised to reflect the binary nature of the requirement.

EOP-006-1 – Reliability Coordination – System Restoration				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R4.	The Reliability Coordinator failed to disseminate information regarding restoration to one neighboring Reliability Coordinator or Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority not immediately involved in restoration.	The Reliability Coordinator failed to disseminate information regarding restoration to two neighboring Reliability Coordinators or Transmission Operators or Balancing Authorities not immediately involved in restoration.	The Reliability Coordinator failed to disseminate information regarding restoration to three neighboring Reliability Coordinators or Transmission Operators or Balancing Authorities not immediately involved in restoration.	The Reliability Coordinator failed to disseminate information regarding restoration to four or more neighboring Reliability Coordinators or Transmission Operators or Balancing Authorities not immediately involved in restoration.
Revised R4.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to serve as primary contact for disseminating information regarding restoration in accordance with Requirement R4.

Company	Comment	Response
Hydro One Networks	R4: The VSLs should be graded by % of neighbouring entities as the number of these neighbours varies. We suggest: Lower <25%, Moderate VSL 25% to <50%, High VSL 50% to <75% and Severe VSL >= 75%.	Thank you for your comment. The DT believes that the requirement for the RC to serve as primary contact to disseminate information is binary in nature. The requirement, as written, does not include actual dissemination of information. The VSLs have been revised to reflect the language and binary nature of this requirement.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Ontario IESO	R4: Suggest to change the graded VSLs to a function of the % of the entities to whom the RC failed to disseminate information since some RCs may be connected to one other RC, TOP or BA only. Failure to disseminate to the only neighboring RC or TOP or BA should be assessed a Severe, not Low.	Thank you for your comment. The DT believes that the requirement for the RC to serve as primary contact to disseminate information is binary in nature. The requirement, as written, does not include actual dissemination of information. The VSLs have been revised to reflect the language and binary nature of this requirement.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R4 - The drafting team should consider applying a quartile approach based on the percentage of RCs, TOPs and BAs that the RC doesn't inform. Currently, the VSLs favor RCs with many neighboring RCs and TOPs and penalize RCs with fewer neighboring RCs and TOPs. Additionally, the bigger the area involved in restoration the easier it is to comply because fewer BAs that are not involved will have to be informed. This seems counterintuitive.	Thank you for your comment. The DT believes that the requirement for the RC to serve as primary contact to disseminate information is binary in nature. The requirement, as written, does not include actual dissemination of information. The VSLs have been revised to reflect the language and binary nature of this requirement.
Dominion Virginia Power	For R4, the VSLs expand the scope of the requirement. The requirement is for the RC to be the point of contact for the dissemination of information to neighboring RCs, TOPs, and BAs not involved in the restoration process. The VSLs are written as if actual dissemination of information to all of these entities is required. It isn't. Some RCs are surrounded by numerous other entities that could have no involvement in (or add value to) the restoration process. It is up to the RC to decide which of these entities it should proactively disseminate information to. The RCs only obligation to the rest of the neighbors is to be the point of contact if they wish to inquire about the restoration.	Thank you for your comment. The DT believes that the requirement for the RC to serve as primary contact to disseminate information is binary in nature – this supports your comments. The VSLs have been revised to reflect the language and binary nature of this requirement.
WE Energies	R4: Should the VSLs also reflect that the RC is the "primary contact" - the primary information source?	Thank you for your comment. The DT has modified the VSL to reflect the binary nature of this requirement and to reflect the Requirement of the Standards as written – this supports your suggestion. The requirement, as written, does not include actual dissemination of information.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

EOP-006-1 Requirement R5

Summary Consideration: While most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed, some commenters suggested that the Severe VSL could be improved, and the drafting team modified the Severe VSL to improve its clarity.

EOP-006-1 – Reliability Coordination – System Restoration				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to approve, communicate, and coordinate the re-synchronizing of major system islands or synchronizing points and caused a Burden on adjacent Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority, or Reliability Coordinator Areas.
Revised R5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to approve, communicate, and coordinate the re-synchronizing of major system islands or synchronizing points as stated in Requirement 5.

Company	Comment	Response
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	For EOP-006-1 R5, should there be a VSL for an RC who fails to approve, communicate, and coordinate the re-synchronizing of major system islands or synchronizing points without causing a burden on adjacent TOP, BA, or RC areas assuming the "Severe" VSL level description stays the same? (Should this circumstance be assigned a lower, moderate, or high VSL level?)	As stated in the requirement, not causing a burden is the intended result of the Reliability Coordinator's actions. Missing the conditions of the requirement still warrants a Severe VSL since the failure to perform those actions can potentially cause a burden.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion Virginia Power	For R5, there should be a HIGH VSL for when the RC failed to approve, communicate, and coordinate re-synchronization but did NOT cause a Burden on neighboring entities.	As stated in the requirement, not causing a burden is the intended result of the Reliability Coordinator's actions. Missing the conditions of the requirement still warrants a Severe VSL since the failure to perform those actions can potentially cause a burden.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R5 - The Severe VSL does not consider all practical outcomes. The RC could fail to approve, communicate and coordinate resynhornization and still not cause a burden with the right system conditions. Right now, no VSL fits this outcome.	As stated in the requirement, not causing a burden is the intended result of the Reliability Coordinator's actions. Missing the conditions of the requirement still warrants a Severe VSL since the failure to perform those actions can potentially cause a burden.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-006 VSLs

EOP-006-1 Requirement R6

Summary Consideration: Most stakeholders agreed with the VSLs as proposed, and no modifications were made.

EOP-006-1 – Reliability Coordination – System Restoration				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R6.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Reliability Coordinator failed to take actions to restore normal operations once an operating emergency was mitigated in accordance with its restoration plan.

Company	Comment	Response
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R6 - SRC agrees with the proposed VSLs	Thank you for your comment.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R6 - We suggest that failure to restore to normal operations does not warrant a severe VSL. This should be lower. If the RC remains in emergency operations, they aren't going to cause problems on the system. This hardly justifies subjecting the RC to potential penalties of \$1,000,000/day and the associated due process nightmare that will occur as the RC fights the penalty.	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the requirement in question. The VRF for this requirement is Medium, which limits the penalty potential

9. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-008-0 — Plans for Loss of Control Center Functionality. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.

EOP-008-1 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the VSLs, as proposed, subjected stakeholders to “double jeopardy” and the drafting team “rolled up” the VSLs so that each subrequirement is identified in a VSL, but no attempt was made to provide a distinct set of VSLs for each subrequirement. The drafting team believes this modification supports the intent of the Commission’s directives as there is a VSL for noncompliance associated with each of the subrequirements.

EOP-008-1 – Plans for Loss of Control Center Functionality				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with one (1) of the sub-requirements of R1.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with two (2) of the sub-requirements of R1.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with three (3) or four (4) of the sub-requirements of R1.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with more than four (4) of the sub-requirements of R1.
Original R1.1	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan relies on data or voice communication from the primary control facility for up to 25% of the functions identified in R1.2 and R1.3.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan relies on data or voice communication from the primary control facility for 25% to 50% of the functions identified in R1.2 and R1.3.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan relies on data or voice communication from the primary control facility for 50% to 75% of the functions identified in R1.2 and R1.3.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan relies on data and voice communication from the primary control facility for more than 75% of the functions identified in R1.2 and R1.3.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

EOP-008-1 – Plans for Loss of Control Center Functionality				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.2	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan failed to include procedures and responsibilities for providing basic tie line control and procedures and for maintaining the status of all inter-area schedules, such that there is an hourly accounting of all schedules.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R1.3	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan failed to address one of the elements listed in the requirement.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan failed to address two of the elements listed in the requirement.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan failed to address three of the elements listed in the requirement.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority contingency plan failed to address four or more of the elements listed in the requirement.
Original R1.4	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan failed to include procedures and responsibilities for maintaining basic voice communication capabilities with other areas.	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

EOP-008-1 – Plans for Loss of Control Center Functionality				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.5	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan failed to include procedures and responsibilities for conducting periodic tests, at least annually, to ensure viability of the plan.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R1.6	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan failed to include procedures and responsibilities for providing annual training to ensure that operating personnel are able to implement the contingency plans.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Original R1.7	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan was reviewed within three months of passing its annual review date.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan was reviewed within six months of passing its annual review date.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan was reviewed within nine months of passing its annual review date.	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority plan was reviewed more than nine months of passing its annual review date.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

EOP-008-1 – Plans for Loss of Control Center Functionality				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.8	The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to make interim provisions when it is took more than one hour to implement the contingency plan for loss of primary control facility.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revised R1.	The responsible entity’s plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with one (1) of the subrequirements (R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R1.5, R1.6, R1.7, or R1.8).	The responsible entity’s plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with two (2) of the subrequirements (R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R1.5, R1.6, R1.7, or R1.8).	The responsible entity’s plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with three (3) or four (4) of the subrequirements (R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R1.5, R1.6, R1.7, or R1.8).	The responsible entity’s plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with more then four (4) of the subrequirements (R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R1.5, R1.6, R1.7, or R1.8).

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	We support the approach to make VSLs for R1 dependent on non-compliance with the subrequirements R1.1 to R1.8. As such, we suggest the following approach to simplify the VSLs: a. Keep the VSLs for the main requirement, but change it to Low for failure to comply with 1-2 subrequirements, Moderate for 3-4, High for 5-6 and Severe for 7 or more. b. Eliminate the VSLs for all of the subrequirements.	Thank-you for your comment. The EOP VSL DT accepts your comment on R1. The sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Manitoba Hydro	It becomes confusing when a sub-requirement has a higher severity than the main requirement. R1: Lower VSL, Moderate VSL, High VSL and Severe VSL need to exempt R1.1, R1.3 and R1.7 because if R1.1 is the only sub-requirement violated it can rate higher than R1 Lower VSL which is the failure to comply with one sub-requirement.	Thank you for your comment. The drafting team is required to follow the guidelines that all requirements & sub-requirements that have been assigned VRFs also be assigned VSLs. The sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Hydro One Networks	R1: We believe having VSLs for requirement R1 and its sub-requirements will induce a double penalty. We suggest either removing the VSLs for the main R1 requirement OR have a single severe VSL stating: "The RC, TOP and BA does not have a plan to ?."	Thank-you for your comment. The drafting team is required to follow the guidelines that all requirements & sub-requirements that have been assigned VRFs also be assigned VSLs. The sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The ?parent? requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document.EOP-008-0 R1: There are 8 sub requirements for R1, but the current VSL only covers 4. Recommend changing VSLs so all Requirements are covered.	Thank you for your comments. In the future as Standards are revised and new ones added, VSLs (as well as Violation Risk Factors) will be assigned to the primary Requirements only. The FERC directive for the existing and approved group of standards is to assign VRF and VSLs to all Requirements and subrequirements. Modifications to the VSL guideline are outside the scope of the EOPVSL drafting team. The drafting team is required to follow the guidelines that all requirements & sub-requirements that have been assigned VRFs also be assigned VSLs. The sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements. In this manner violation of a subrequirement has one or more severity levels associated with it – and all subrequirements are covered in support of your suggestion.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R1 — The drafting team should apply the preferred approach (quartile) specified for multi-component requirements in the VSLs Guideline document.	Thank you for your comment. The drafting team believes that failing to meet more than 4 of the subrequirements is a severe violation level.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R1 - The double jeopardy issue comes up again here. We suggest deleting the VSLs for all the sub-requirements and changing the VSLs for the main requirement as listed below. High — The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, or Balancing Authority plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with three (3) of the sub-requirements of R1. Severe - The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, or Balancing Authority plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable failed to comply with four (4) or more of the sub-requirements of R1. OR The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, or Balancing Authority did not have a plan to continue reliability operations in the event its control center becomes inoperable.	Thank you for your comment. The drafting team is required to follow the guidelines that all requirements & sub-requirements that have been assigned VRFs also be assigned VSLs. The double jeopardy issue has been addressed by the “roll up” of the subrequirements into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	In general, the VSLs should be developed in conjunction with the standards as they are currently being revised. Spending time here to justify VSLs for requirements that most likely will change or be deleted is not efficient.	Thank you for your comments. The FERC directive requires us to assign the VSLs to the current version of the standards.
Ontario IESO	We support the approach to make VSLs for R1 dependent on non-compliance with the subrequirements R1.1 to R1.8. As such, we suggest the following approach to simplify the VSLs: a. Keep the VSLs for the main requirement, but change it to Low for failure to comply with 1-2 subrequirements, Moderate for 3-4, High for 5-6 and Severe for 7 or more. b. Eliminate the VSLs for all of the subrequirements.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised similar to your suggestion. The sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements. The drafting team believes that failing to meet more than 4 of the subrequirements is a severe violation level.
Duke Energy Corporation	We do not agree that sub-requirements should always be assigned VSLs. Requirement R1 has multiple sub-requirements. Violation of one or more sub-requirements also results in a violation of the main requirement. The “Lower” VSL for the main requirement should apply for missing any one of the sub-requirements. VSLs for each sub-requirement should be deleted.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised similar to your suggestion. The sub-requirements have been “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Bonneville Power	The VSL for EOP-008 R1 will cause double counting of penalties in addition to R1.1 through R1.8.	Thank you for your comment. The double jeopardy issue has been addressed by the “roll up” of the subrequirements into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Entergy Services	This EOP-008-1 R1 continues to contain elements of double jeopardy. If an entity violates two or more of the sub-requirements then the sanction will contain at least two parts from the sub-requirements, PLUS, another part based on R1 itself.	Thank you for your comment. The double jeopardy issue has been addressed by the “roll up” of the subrequirements into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Hydro One Networks	R1.1 is really a binary requirement as either the control facility has or does not have data or voice communication hence all functions in the plan must not rely on having communication from the primary control facility hence we suggest having a single Severe VSL for this sub-requirement: " The RC, TOP or BA contingency plan relies on data and voice communication from the primary control facility"	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
NPCC	R1.1: Making it dependent on the non-compliance with R1.2 and R1.3 appears ungrounded since they are not sub-requirements of R1.1.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
FirstEnergy	The suggested way to overcome this issue is to change all the VSLs of all R1 sub-requirements to "N/A".	Thank you for your comment , The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R1.1 — The VSLs should not rely on requirements R1.2 and R1.3. This is really a binary requirement. Either the plan relies on communication independent of the main control center or it doesn't. A lower VSL should be selected.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Ontario IESO	R1.1: Making it dependent on the non-compliance with R1.2 and R1.3 appears ungrounded since they are not sub-requirements of R1.1.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R1.1 percentages overlap.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
		assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Entergy Services	The gradation of the VSLs into percentages for penalty purposes is arbitrary. This Requirement is to ensure the contingency plan does not rely on data or voice communication from the primary control facility. Either the plan is dependent or it is not. If not, the risk to the Interconnection is not significantly different if 22% or 51% of the required functions are relied on. There should be only one VSL, High.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1.2 - SRC would propose: MODERATE VSL if missing either procedures or missing responsibilities. SEVERE VSL if missing both.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Hydro One Networks	R1.2 We suggest moving part of the Lower VSL to a High VSL: "The RC, TOP or BA plan failed to include procedures and responsibilities for providing basic tie line control."	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1.3 - SRC agrees with the proposed VSLs	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	Lower VSL, Moderate VSL and Severe VSL be changed to N/A.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Hydro One Networks	R1.4 We suggest moving this Lower VSL to a High VSL as communication is critical.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	High VSL should be imposed if the contingency plan relies upon data or voice communication from the primary control facility to be viable.	Thank you for your comment, The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1.6 - SRC would propose: LOWER VSL if missing responsibilities. SEVERE VSL if missing both.	Thank you for your comment, The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements “rolled up” into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion Virginia Power	For R1.7, the Severe VSL should be reworded to explicitly cover the situation of not having reviewed the plan at all.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R1.7 — Webster's dictionary defines annual as occurring or happening every year or once a year. Thus, if an annual review occurred on January 1, 2007, the TOP and BA would still be compliant if they completed their next review on December 31, 2008. Thus, how can there be an annual review date? There isn't. We suggest that a lower VSL apply for failure to review and update the plan annually.	Thank you for your comment,. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Dominion	For R1.7, the Severe VSL should be reworded to explicitly cover the situation of not having reviewed the plan at all.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Entergy Services	The gradation of the VSLs into months for penalty purposes is arbitrary. This Requirement is to ensure the contingency plan is reviewed and updated annually. The entity either did or did not review the plan. Regardless of how late they were the risk to the Interconnection is the same. There should be only one VSL: Moderate.	Thank you for your comment. The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements. VSLs have been removed from R1.7.
Manitoba Hydro	R1.8 should be edited to read 'The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority failed to make interim provisions when it was expected to take more than one hour to implement the emergency plan for loss of primary control facility.	Thank you for your comment The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements. VSLs have been removed from R1.8.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1.8 - Assuming that the requirement is mandating that the entity create interim provisions for the special case when the facility outages continues for more then 1 hour, the SRC would suggest that only a SEVERE VSL be used.	Thank you for your comment, The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.
Hydro One Networks	R1.8 We suggest making this Lower VSL to a High VSL as timing during the loss of a control center is critical.	Thank you for your comment, The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-008 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	Lower VSL, High VSL and Severe VSL be changed to N/A.	Thank you for your comment, The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements. VSLs have been removed from R1.8.
We Energies	R1.8: Typographical error "when it is took".	Thank you for your comment, The VSLs have been revised with the sub-requirements "rolled up" into the primary requirement and VSLs assigned based on violating one or more of the subrequirements. VSLs have been removed from R1.8.

10. Please review the VSLs proposed for the requirements and subrequirements in EOP-009-0 — Documentation of Blackstart Generating Unit Test Results. If you believe that one or more of the VSLs should be modified, please identify the requirement, each VSL you disagree with, and if possible provide alternate language that would make that VSL acceptable to you.

EOP-009-1 Requirement R1

Summary Consideration: Several commenters objected to the use of “program/procedural elements” in the Lower VSL. This language has been deleted. The revised VSLs also reflect the two requirements of R1 to both test and document the test data of blackstart units.

EOP-009-1 – Documentation of Blackstart Generating Unit Test Results				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R1.	The Generator Operator blackstart unit testing and recording is missing no more than two program/procedural elements.	Startup and testing of each blackstart unit was performed, but the testing records are incomplete. The testing records are missing 25% or less of data requested in the requirement.	The Generator Operator failed to test 25% or less of the blackstart units or testing records are incomplete. The testing records are missing between 25% and 50% of data requested in the requirement.	The Generator Operator failed to test more than 25% of its blackstart units or does not have blackstart testing records or is missing more than 50% of the required data.
Revised R1.	The Generator Operator’s testing records for Requirement 1 are missing up to 5% of the required information.	The Generator Operator failed to test 5% or more but less than 10% of the required blackstart units. OR The Generator Operator’s testing records for Requirement 1 are missing 5% or more, but less than 10% of the required information.	The Generator Operator failed to test 10% or more but less than 15% of the required blackstart units OR The Generator Operator’s testing records for Requirement 1 are missing 10% or more, but less than 15% of the required information.	The Generator Operator failed to test more than 15% or more of the required blackstart units. OR The Generator Operator’s testing records for Requirement 1 are missing 15% or more of the required information.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-009 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R1: The Low VSL appears to be unrelated to the requirement which deals with testing and keeping record but not procedures or program. Given there are two requirements within R1 (test and keeping record), we suggest that a Low be assigned for having done the test but the record is missing some but <25% of the data; a Moderate for the same condition but for missing >25% but <50% of data; a High for having done the test but missing >50% but 75% of the data; a Severe for not having done the test or missing >75% of the data.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages.
Detroit Edison/DTE Energy Fossil Generation NERC Compliance Manager	Again I suggest that written reports not exceed Moderate VSL under any situation. Where possible the RRO or RC should develop the necessary templates for submitting reports or standardize such reports with in there region.	Thank you for your comments. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The VRF for this requirement is Medium.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R1 - SRC would propose: LOWER if missing 1 element MODERATE if missing 2 elements SEVERE is no document	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages.
Hydro One Networks	R1: The SDT should be consistent in the wording of the VSLs. We are unsure at this time how to improve these VSLs	Thank you for your comment. Please see the proposed revisions.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The ?parent? requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document. If a GOP is using EOP-009-1 R1 and GOP misses 2 program/procedural elements in their BCP out of 8 total possible elements, which of the VSLs would be assigned to this circumstance - lower or moderate?	Thank you for your comment. Future revisions of Standards will only assign VRFs to the Parent Requirement. Changes to the VSL Guideline document and Standard Drafting Team guideline document are beyond the scope of the DT. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received. Note that R1 does not have any subrequirements. The DT has removed the language of "program/procedural requirements".
Dominion Virginia Power	For R1, the Lower VSL refers to program/procedural requirements, but none are identified in the requirement. The Moderate VSL is invalid in that it is for when the testing records are missing 25% or less of data requested in the requirement, but the requirement only lists three types of data -- the lowest increment of missing data would be 33%.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has removed the language of "program/procedural requirements". The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-009 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R1 - The quartile approach was misapplied. Quartile percentages must be spread across all four VSLs. The VSL Guidelines document has no provisions for modifying the quartile approach in the manner applied to this requirement.	Thank you for your comment. The VSL was revised based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages.
We Energies	R1 Moderate, High, and Severe VSL: The requirement requires three pieces of data: Date, duration, and indication that Regional requirements are met. The Lower VSL allows me to miss two of these (67%). If I miss 67% of the data the Severe VSL also applies. The High and Severe VSLs are written as if 100% of the blackstart units are tested each year. That is not necessarily true. EOP-007 allows the Regional BCP to require only 1/3 of the blackstart units to be tested each year (33%).	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages. The requirement is focused on two separate performance objectives – test the units and document the results of the test.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R1 - Use of the undefined phrase 'program/procedural elements' leaves the Lower VSL too vague. We suggest deleting the Lower VSL.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages. The DT has removed the language of "program/procedural requirements".
FirstEnergy	R1 - The Lower VSL is neither required in the requirement or measured in the measure. It should be deleted. Also, the remaining VSL do not properly use the quartile approach. We suggest changing the VSL to the following: Lower: The Generator Operator tested each of its blackstart units but is missing one or more elements of the required information in the test records. Moderate: The Generator Operator failed to test 33% or less of its blackstart units. High: The Generator Operator failed to test greater than 33% but less than 67% of its blackstart units. Severe: The Generator Operator failed to test 67% or more of its blackstart units.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages. The DT has removed the language of "program/procedural requirements". Please see the revised VSLs – they focus on both the testing and the test data.
Ontario IESO	R1: The Low VSL appears to be unrelated to the requirement which deals with testing and keeping record but not procedures or program. Given there are two requirements within R1 (test and keeping record), we suggest that a Low be assigned for having done the test but the record is missing some but <25% of the data; a Moderate for the same condition but for missing >25% but <50% of data; a High for having done the test but missing >50% but 75% of the data; a Severe for not having done the test or missing >75% of the data.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages. The DT has removed the language of "program/procedural requirements".

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-009 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Duke Energy Corporation	Requirement R1 references EOP-007-1, but should reference EOP-005.Requirement R1 VSLs percentages overlap.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages. The DT cannot modify the requirements.
Bonneville Power	Should be evenly balanced between GOs with one unit or GOs with multiple units.R1. Severe VSL "? failed to test", High "?does not have testing records." Moderate "? testing records are incomplete".	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages.
Dominion	For R1, the Lower VSL refers to program/procedural requirements, but none are identified in the requirement. The Moderate VSL is invalid in that it is for when the testing records are missing 25% or less of data requested in the requirement, but the requirement only lists three types of data -- the lowest increment of missing data would be 33%.	<p>Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received and the FERC directed percentages. The DT has removed the language of "program/procedural requirements".</p> <p>The test data is required for each test of each unit.</p>
Entergy Services	<p>The gradation of the VSLs into months for penalty purposes is arbitrary. This Requirement is for the GOP of each blackstart resource to test the resources, and generate certain records. The risk to the Interconnection of not performing the test is significantly greater than the percentage of data that is provided. Therefore, we recommend this requirement have two VSLs: Moderate VSL should be imposed if the Generator Operator does not have blackstart testing records containing the required data.</p> <p>High VSL should be imposed if the Generator Operator failed to test the startup and operation of each system blackstart generating unit as required in the Regional BCP.</p> <p>Lower VSL, and Severe VSL be changed to N/A.</p>	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSL based on all comments received. VRFs assess the risk to reliability – VSLs describe different levels of noncompliant performance.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-009 VSLs

EOP-009-1 Requirement R2

Summary Consideration: Several commenters indicated that the Lower VSL was inappropriate as it assessed elements outside the requirement and one commenter correctly noted that the Severe VSL did not include the Generator Owner – and the Generator Owner is one of the responsible entities. The drafting team removed the Lower VSL in response to these comments and added the Generator Owner as a responsible entity in the Severe VSL.

EOP-009-1 – Documentation of Blackstart Generating Unit Test Results				
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
Original R2.	The Generator Operator has provided the blackstart testing documentation to its Regional Reliability Organization. However the documentation provided had no more than two missing program/procedural elements or failed to provide the documentation requested to NERC within 30 days.	N/A	N/A	The Generator Operator did not provide the required blackstart documentation to its Regional Reliability Organization.
Revised R2.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Generator Owner or Generator Operator did not provide the required blackstart documentation to its Regional Reliability Organization.

Company	Comment	Response
---------	---------	----------

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-009 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
NPCC	R2: Again, the procedure/program component is unrelated; this condition should be removed. If the VSL is to be made a function of delay in submitting testing document, we suggest to change the Low to: "The Generator Operator has provided the blackstart testing documentation to its Regional Reliability Organization or NERC but the document was not submitted within 30 days of the completion of the test or upon NERC's request." Along this line, a Moderate would be submission between 31 to 45 days, a High for between 46 to 60 days and a Severe would be > 60 days or none at all.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed. Note that since the requirement does not specify that the documentation must be submitted to the RRO within 30 days of the completion of the test, we cannot add this to the VSLs.
Manitoba Hydro	Should be left until new standard is approved. If this SAR must forge ahead than:R2 - Edit the Lower VSL as follows: "The Generator Operator or Generator Owner has provided the blackstart testing documentation to its Regional Reliability Organization but failed to provide NERC with the documentation requested." Requirement R2 only dictates that the GO or GOP provide documentation of the test results of the start up and operation of each blackstart generating unit to the RRO and upon request to NERC. The program/procedural elements are in Requirement R1 and its VSLs have them covered.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed.
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	R2 - SRC would propose that only the SEVERE VSL be retained, as the documentation is either sent or not sent. The contents of the document are determined by tester not the reporter.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed.
Hydro One Networks	R2 consider grading non-compliance with the requirement based on days from receipt of request.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed.
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The EOP-009-1 R2 VSLs should be rewritten. The generator owner is not listed in the VSLs for EOP-009-1 R2; the generator owner is a responsible entity, too. Finally, the current assigned VSLs are more prescriptive than EOP-009-1 R2; the VSLs actually state a 30 day deadline not provided in the requirement EOP-009-1 R2.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed and the Generator Owner was added to the Severe VSL.

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-009 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion Virginia Power	For R2, the Lower VSL refers to program/procedural elements, but none are identified in the requirement. Also the second part of the second sentence of the Lower VSL should be split out as a separate sentence reading, "The Generator Operator failed to provide the documentation to NERC within 30 days of NERC's request".	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed.
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	R2 - No category for the VSLs in the VSL guideline document specifies missing no more than two procedural/program elements as a Lower VSL. It appears the Program/Procedure category has been misapplied.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed.
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	R2 - Use of the undefined phrase 'program/procedural elements' leaves the Lower VSL too vague. We suggest deleting the Lower VSL. We further suggest modifying the proposed Severe VSL as shown below and make it the new Lower VSL. Lower — The Generator Operator did not provide the required blackstart documentation to its Regional Reliability Organization or upon request to NERC.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. The Lower VSL has been removed.
Ontario IESO	R2: Again, the procedure/program component is unrelated; this condition should be removed. If the VSL is to be made a function of delay in submitting testing document, we suggest to change the Low to: "The Generator Operator has provided the blackstart testing documentation to its Regional Reliability Organization or NERC but the document was not submitted within 30 days of the completion of the test or upon NERC's request." Along this line, a Moderate would be submission between 31 to 45 days, a High for between 46 to 60 days and a Severe would be > 60 days or none at all.	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. Per the NERC Sanction Guidelines, the VSL is assessed post-violation and is an indicator of how severely the violator actually violated the standard(s) requirement(s) in question. The administrative nature is taken into consideration through the VRF assignment. The Lower VSL has been removed.
Bonneville Power	R2. The blackstart site data should be kept not for public viewing. It is Operationally Sensitive data. The data should be submitted through the TO/BA channels to the RRO.	Thank you for your comment. This is beyond the scope of the DT

Comments, Responses and Associated Modifications to EOP-009 VSLs

Company	Comment	Response
Dominion	R2. The Lower VSL refers to program/procedural elements, but none are identified in the requirement. Also the second part of the second sentence of the Lower VSL should be split out as a separate sentence reading, "The Generator Operator failed to provide the documentation to NERC within 30 days of NERC's request".	Thank you for your comment. The DT has revised the VSLs based on all comments received to a Pass/Fail which is reflected in the Severe VSL. The Lower VSL has been removed.

11. If you have any other comments on the SAR or the proposed set of EOP VSLs, please provide them here.

Organization	Question 11 Comments:
NPCC	Most of our comments are intended to address consistency among the various sets of VSLs and with the guideline provided in the VSL criteria document. We commend the SDT for having done a very good job in developing the VSLs for these standards, particular for those requirements that contain multiple level and/or mixed requirements.
Response: Thank you for your comments.	
Detroit Edison/DTE Energy Fossil Generation NERC Compliance Manager	In General: lack of specific in Standards cause extreme difficulties in developing business process and supporting documentation for compliance. Such as terms "six wall protect", left up to the regulated entities we will see infinite number of compliance schemes. Failure to provide more specifics will create wasted effort to compliance and extreme frustration on the regulated entities.
Response: Thank you for your comment. The standards development process is the defined process to develop standards that contain specific language. NERC has a published work plan to review each standard over the next few years. Participating in this process offers an opportunity for industry to provide its views and input into the development of the VSLs, failure to participate will result in a missed opportunity to influence the outcome.	
ISO / RTO Council (IRC)	The SRC would recommend that this SAR be recalled by the requestor and in its place the requestor (or someone else) be requested to submit SARs for each of the EOP standards with the stated objective of eliminating ambiguities and redundancies and administrative requirements.
Response: The VSL for this group of standards are being developed to satisfy the FERC directive in its Order on Compliance Filing dated June 7, 2007, to replace Levels on non compliance with VSL for the 83 approved standards in a timely manner. There are currently existing projects that are revising the majority of the EOP standards. When the standards currently under revision are approved by industry and the FERC they will become effective and replace the existing standards.	
MRO NERC Standards Review Subcommittee	The MRO believes that the VSLs for binary sub-requirements should be 'Low'. The "parent" requirement contains the VSLs for evaluating the severity of non-compliance for the requirement. The MRO would like the EOP VSL SDT to formulate criteria for VSLs for a binary requirement and incorporate the criteria into the VSL guideline

Other Comments on SAR or EOP VSLs

Organization	Question 11 Comments:
	document. The MRO would like to see the standard drafting team guideline modified to include a reference to the VSL guideline document.
<p>Response: The EOP VSL DT agrees that the VSL guideline document is useful and should continue to be used by future drafting teams and updated as required. In the future as standards are drafted or revised, VSLs will only be assigned to primary requirements. This change will greatly reduce the volume of the guidelines needed.</p>	
Midwest ISO Stakeholders Standards Collaborators	There are many typos in the proposed set of VSLs which suggests they have not been reviewed carefully. There are many misapplications of the categories defined in the VSLs Guidelines document. The drafting team needs to review this document carefully and consult the VSL drafting team if necessary for clearer understanding.
<p>Response: The typographical errors have been corrected.</p> <p>The VSL Guidelines are just that – guidelines. Each drafting team must try to apply the guidelines, but as written, they do not cover all aspects of every possible type of requirement.</p>	
Entergy Services, Inc. (System Planning & Operation - Generation)	As stated earlier, it is unclear as to whether this SAR proposes an effort to revise the EOP VSLs or if it is offering up VSLs for review and comment. Review of proposed VSLs should not occur in a SAR. The format provided to provide comments on the proposed VSLs is burdensome. Additionally, it is difficult to support VSLs for requirements that need revision to begin with. Many of the standards are being revised, and thus the effort spent on identifying VSLs for the existing standard is not efficient. Effort should be focused on getting the revised standards (including VRFs and VSLs) completed. Suggest revising the standards prior to development of the VSLs. Requirements with sub-requirements still pose the "multiple penalty" for the same deficiency scenario. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
<p>Response: The SAR is proposing to revise the EOP VSLs that were balloted and failed to achieve a high enough affirmative vote for approval.</p> <p>The Reliability Standards Development Procedure allows a requester to submit both a SAR and the associated document(s) to the Standards Committee for posting. That occurred in this situation and the Standards Committee authorized simultaneous posting of the SAR and the associated VSLs referenced in the SAR.</p>	
Ontario IESO	Most of our comments are intended to address consistency among the various sets of VSLs and with the guideline

Other Comments on SAR or EOP VSLs

Organization	Question 11 Comments:
	provided in the VSL criteria document. We commend the SDT for having done a very good job in developing the VSLs for these standards, particular for those requirements that contain multiple level and/or mixed requirements.
Response: The drafting team thanks you for your support.	
City of Tallahassee	Some VSLs made reference to "evidence", others did not. This inconsistency makes it more difficult for entities to know what the "audit team" is going to be looking for. I realize the VSL only comes into play after a violation has been identified. But the VSLs are part of the standard and should be consistent across the board. They are also used by entities to see where they may have a compliance issue. The whole premise of "risk" takes into account the VSLs and other elements. There are too many instances of trying to make a change to the requirement by changing verbiage in the VSL.
Response: You are correct that there is an opportunity to improve consistence as we refine VSLs and other aspects of the standards. Because the standards are developed in parallel with multiple different drafting teams, there will continue to be some inconsistencies. In the case of using or not using the word, "evidence" in VSLs, there should be no impact to stakeholders. Every requirement includes a measure that has associated "evidence" – and the "evidence" is used to demonstrate compliance. It should not matter whether the VSL says "the responsible entity failed to provide evidence to show that it acted. . ." or says "the responsible entity failed to act . . ." as the two are describing the same noncompliant performance. The requirement says the responsible entity must act – the measure says the responsible entity must have evidence that it did act – and the VSL either says the responsible entity did not act or did not have evidence that it did act.	
Oncor Electric Delivery	No Additional Comments
Operating Reliability Working Group (ORWG)	No other comments
Entergy Services	N/A
Southern Company	No other comments.