



**Comment Form for: Draft NERC Rules of Procedure section 500 & Appendix 5 (Solicitation of public comments per [NERC bylaws](#) Article XI section 2)**

Please use this form to submit comments on the proposed *NERC Rules of Procedure section 500, Appendix 5, and TOP, RC & BA questionnaires*. Comments must be submitted by **August 8, 2008**, you may submit the completed form by e-mail to [jim.hughes@nerc.net](mailto:jim.hughes@nerc.net) with the words "**Certification Process**" in the subject line. Additionally, if you wish to redline your comments, these documents are provided to you in Word. If you have any questions please contact Jim Hughes by telephone at 609-203-2288.

**Background Information:**

During the September 12, 2007 joint meeting of the Standards Committee (SC) and the Compliance and Certification Committee (CCC), the SC and CCC agreed to translate the work done on the following draft standards into a new certification process under the CCC:

- Transmission Operator Certification Standards (ORG-001 through ORG-008)
- Balancing Authority Certification Standards (ORG-009 through ORG-018)
- Reliability Coordinator Certification Standards (ORG-020 through ORG-027)

The CCC's Organization Registration & Certification Subcommittee (ORCS) has translated the essential elements of the above draft certification standards into new entity certification processes and want to post the new processes for comment (RoP 500, Appendix 5, and questionnaires).

Therefore, the ORCS is soliciting for public review and comments on the draft revisions to the NERC Rules of Procedure section 500, Appendix 5, and the TOP, BA, RC questionnaires relating to the certification process.

Commenter Information	
Name: Guy Zito	Completed by: <input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team
Position: Chairman	If team, names of team members: NPCC RSC
Region (e.g., RFC, SERC): NPCC	Date: 07/25/08
Phone #: 212-840-1070 email: gzito@npcc.org	Any additional data:
(Check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> RC <input type="checkbox"/> BA <input type="checkbox"/> TOP <input type="checkbox"/> TO <input type="checkbox"/> PA <input type="checkbox"/> TP <input type="checkbox"/> GO <input type="checkbox"/> GOP <input type="checkbox"/> LSE <input type="checkbox"/> RP <input type="checkbox"/> TSP <input type="checkbox"/> DP <input type="checkbox"/> PSE <input type="checkbox"/> IA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Region <input type="checkbox"/> NERC <input type="checkbox"/> NA	

Do you wish to have NERC contact you regarding your comments?  Yes  No

**Comment Form — Draft NERC Rules of Procedure section 500 & Appendix 5**

▷**Comment:** NERC needs to define who is a “new entity.” The purpose and scope of Appendix 5 is to “provide the process on completing certification of a new entity that will become NERC certified as an RC, TOP, or BA”. NERC, therefore, should define a “new entity” as an entity that desires to operate as an RC, TOP or BA and has not been subject to a NERC Compliance Audit in calendar years 2007, 2008 or 2009. This approach would avoid redundancy in the certification process by specifying that NERC should only apply the certification rules to those entities that were not operating as an RC, TOP or BA on the first day of ERO operations.

If a “new entity” wishes to operate as an RC, TOP or BA, NERC rules should specify that they may do so for a provisional period and under the ultimate authority of the existing RC, TOP or BA presently operating within the footprint. This approach has two advantages. First, the existing RC, TOP, or BA could override the decisions of the new entity if they believe that the new entity is not operating reliably. (This would also mean that the existing, RC, TOP or BA would bear compliance liability during the provisional period). Second, this provisional period would act as the basis for assessing the new entity’s competence to act as an RC, TOP or BA.

At this moment all areas are by definition adequately covered by RCs, TOPs and BAs. If a new entity fails to be certified, then there is no problem. But, when a traditional member fails, then there is a problem (a problem not addressed in this proposal). Can that entity be allowed to continue to operate? If not, then who fills the identified gap(s)?

Also missing is the process for changing over from one certified member to another. What happens if a new entity is certified but the old entity wants to remain?

What happens when a new entity is certified? How does that entity transition to the operational system?

What are the obligations of the entity being replaced?

Document that the comment applies to:      RoP 500       Appendix 5       Provisional Certification   
    TOP Questionnaire       BA Questionnaire       RC Questionnaire

Section that comment applies to:

Recommended solution:

**NPCC RSC team members providing comments**

	<b>Additional Member</b>	<b>Additional Organization</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Segment Selection</b>	
1.	Ed Thompson	Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.	NPCC	1	
2.	David Kiguel	Hydro One Networks Inc.	NPCC	1	
3.	Sylvain Clermont	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie	NPCC	1	
4.	Frederick White	Northeast Utilities	NPCC	1	
5.	Roger Champagne	Hydro-Quebec TransEnergie	NPCC	2	
6.	Ron Falsetti	Independent Electricity System Operator	NPCC	2	

**Comment Form — Draft NERC Rules of Procedure section 500 & Appendix 5**

8.	Randy MacDonald	New Brunswick System Operator	NPCC	2	
9.	Gregory Campoli	New York Independent System Operator	NPCC	2	
10.	Michael Ranalli	National Grid	NPCC	3	
11.	Ronald E. Hart	Dominion Resources, Inc.	NPCC	5	
12.	Ralph Rufrano	New York Power Authority	NPCC	5	
13.	Brian L. Gooder	Ontario Power Generation Incorporated	NPCC	5	
14.	Michael Gildea	Constellation Energy	NPCC	6	
15.	Brian D. Evans-Mongeon	Utility Services	NPCC	6	
16.	Donald E. Nelson	Massachusetts Dept. of Public Utilities	NPCC	9	
17.	Brian Hogue	NPCC	NPCC	10	
18.	Alan Adamson	New York State Reliability Council	NPCC	10	
19.	Guy Zito	NPCC	NPCC	10	
20.	Lee Pedowicz	NPCC	NPCC	10	

Called chairman on 7/28/08 and informed that while the footprints are established different entities are taking functional responsibilities similar to MISO with PJM and the consolidation out west of an RC. Lastly, informed Guy that this comment would be assessed by the ORCS for possible inclusion/clarification.