

Template for Quality Review of an Interpretation of a NERC Reliability Standard

Basic Information:

Project number:

Standard Title:

Standard number:

Requirement number(s) for which interpretation is requested:

Requirement text:

Question or requested clarification :

Coordinator's name:

Draft date:

Draft number:

Date of review:

Reviewer's name:

Documents to be submitted by the Interpretation Drafting Team and provided to Quality Review Team:

- Approved Standard(s)
- Request for Interpretation
- Interpretation
- Report from IDT
- Supplemental Information from IDT

In circumstances where the drafting team has reported that it cannot develop an interpretation, the team should provide its reasons and recommend the appropriate corrective action to bridge the gap, including submitting a Standards Comments and Suggestions Form. The Drafting Team should provide the following documents for review so that the Standards Committee can ensure that the issue has been addressed:

- Approved Standard(s)
- Request for Interpretation
- Report from IDT
- Suggestions and Comments form prepared by IDT

1. Has the drafting team addressed all of the issue(s) for which clarification has been requested?

- If the request asked for clarity on the required performance, was this provided?
- If the request asked for clarity on the conditions under which the performance is required, was this provided?
- If the request asked for clarity on which functional entity from the Applicability section of the standard is required to perform an action in a requirement, was this provided?
- If the request asked for clarity on the reliability outcome, was this provided?

Comments:

2. Does the interpretation avoid modifying in any way the functional entity assigned responsibility for a requirement as identified in the standard?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

3. Does the proposed interpretation stay within the current scope and purpose of the approved Reliability Standard, without expanding the reach of the standard or attempting to address a perceived gap or deficiency in the approved standard?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

4. Is the interpretation stated in a clear and concise manner without the use of any ambiguous words or unnecessary explanatory information?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

5. Is the proposed interpretation consistent with other approved Reliability Standards?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Comments:

6. Is the language in the proposed interpretation consistent with the terminology used in the approved Reliability Standard, other approved Reliability Standards, and in the NERC Glossary of Terms?

- Yes
- No

Comments:

7. Identify any other issues in the proposed interpretation that you believe would adversely impact reliability: