

The Standards Committee conducted an e-mail ballot the week of March 9–13, 2009 requesting approval of the Roles and Responsibilities document. Some suggestions were made to correct some typographical errors and these changes were made. The ballot results are shown below and the approved document, with its corrections, is posted at the following link:

<http://www.nerc.com/filez/sc.html>

<p>Chairman Segment 1-2008-9</p>	<p>R. Scott Henry</p>	<p>(Per Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised, chair does not vote unless vote is needed to affect the outcome)</p>
<p>Vice Chairman Segment 4-2008-9</p>	<p>Allen Mosher</p>	<p>I'd like us to keep the text pretty much as it is, including the discussion of rehearing request, etc. Putting the text in an appendix means that many SDT members aren't going to read it until after an SDT starts heading down a dead end. Having the text up front highlights the importance of developing a true consensus within the standard development process in support of a technically sound position that does not leave the legitimate concerns and objectives of regulators unanswered.</p> <p>Part of the problem we face is that the engineers, operators and other SMEs that make up the membership of most drafting teams don't have a background in FERC regulation or other administrative law. Nor should they be required to have that background – we solicit SAR and SDT nominations based on technical expertise and diverse industry balance considerations. Nonetheless they need to understand the administrative procedures, within which FERC, NERC and the industry must work, to develop, approve and then enforce mandatory standards. That includes developing a record during standard development that gives NERC staff the ammunition to support regulatory approval that anticipates the questions that FERC and Canadian regulators might have. The result, I really hope, will be shorter, less complicated FERC rulemakings, with fewer NOPR issues and fewer regulatory directives in the final rule. The text that Raj highlights (and the text below) highlight the fact the SDT role encompasses both driving the industry to consensus <i>and</i> creating a record for NERC to gain regulatory approval.</p> <p>I do agree with two of the editorial changes that Steve Rueckert suggested, to break the first paragraph into two and to take the SDT responsibilities point "m." on page 3 and break it into sub-bullets, as shown below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> m. provide technical input to NERC staff during preparation of regulatory documents, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. filing(s); submitting the proposed standard(s) for approval, ii. responding to questions raised in a notice

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. of proposed rulemaking, preparation of a request for clarification or rehearing following the issuance of the rule or order addressing a proposed standard filed for approval, and iv. preparing requests for extensions of time when a regulatory imposed deadline for standards development cannot be achieved.^[1] <p>With respect to FAC-008 R7, that's a case in point. I am not agnostic in my views on R7, but this list is not an appropriate place to debate content. Nonetheless, NERC staff needs a technical record of SDT deliberations and industry comments that address the FERC's directive. With respect to timing, the request for NERC staff to lay out the options to respond to regulatory directives preceded the R7 controversy.</p>
Segment 7-2009-10	John A. Anderson	Approve
Segment 9-2009-10	Diane J. Barney	Approve
Segment 6-2008-9	Stephen J. Beuning	Negative
Segment 2-2009-10	Terry Bilke	Approve
Segment 5-2008-9	Thomas J. Bradish	Approve
Segment 10-2008-9	Linda Campbell	Approve
Segment 5-2009-10	Michael F. Gildea	Approve
Canada	David Kiguel	Approve
Segment 8, 2009-10	Brendan Kirby	Approve
Segment 2-2008-9	P.S. (Ben) Li	Approve
Segment 4-2009-10	John D. Martinsen, P.E.	Approve
Segment 7-2008-9	Robert John Nelson	Approve
Segment 3-2009-10	Ronald G. Parsons	Approve
Segment 3-2008-9	Raj Rana	Approve

Segment 10-2009-10	Steve Rueckert	Approve The first part of the paragraph talks about the Standards development process. Starting here, the purpose of this document is addressed. Does it make sense to start a new paragraph here? Item G of this list has sub-items to list them all. This item puts all the separate items in one long sentence. Would putting them in sub-bullets make it easier to read?
Segment 1-2009-10	Jason Shaver	Approve
Segment 8-2008-9	Jim Stanton	Approve
Segment 6-2009-10	Robert S. Walker	Approve
Segment 9-2008-9	Lou Ann Westerfield	Approve