

Minutes

Reliability Issues Steering Committee

December 13, 2017 | 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Eastern

Kristin Iwanechko took attendance and verified a quorum with the following Reliability Issues Steering Committee (RISC) members on the phone: Peter Brandien, Terry Bilke, Carol Chinn, Tim Eckel, Daniel Froetscher, Charles King, Lloyd Linke, Mark McCulla, Dave Osburn, John Pespisa, Woody Rickerson, Chris Root, Herb Schrayshuen, Chris Shepherd, and Brian Slocum. Additional stakeholder observers were in attendance as well. NERC staff attendees included Erika Chanzas, Kristin Iwanechko, Mark Lauby, James Merlo, and Mike Walker.

Introduction and Chair's Remarks

Mr. Brandien welcomed RISC members and observers and reviewed the agenda. Mr. Brandien then reminded members with terms expiring who wish to continue to serve on the RISC that they need to submit a nomination form to Ms. Iwanechko by the December 15 deadline.

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

Ms. Iwanechko called attention to the NERC antitrust guidelines in the agenda package.

Agenda Items

1. October 17, 2017, Meeting Minutes

The October 17, 2017, meeting minutes were approved on a motion by Mr. Slocum and seconded by Mr. Osburn.

2. ERO Reliability Risk Priorities Report

Mr. Brandien explained that the ERO Reliability Risk Priorities Report (RISC report) needs to be completed by mid-January for submission to the NERC Board of Trustees (Board) for acceptance during their February meeting. The committee then discussed the RISC report with respect to inputs and comments received; the proposed revisions to the levels of risk based on feedback from the Board during their November meetings; and the need to review the recommendations to see if any can be consolidated or eliminated.

a. Inputs and Comments

Mr. Brandien noted there was one set of comments from the first comment period that he believes are minor in nature, and he can work to address them with NERC staff. There were also inputs received from the Regional Entities as part of the pulse-point interview process, which he believes are consistent with other comments and can also be addressed offline. The committee agreed that Mr. Brandien will review the RISC report and make proposed edits, if needed, in response to these comments and inputs.

b. Proposed Revisions to Levels of Risk/Heat Map

Mr. Brandien explained that there was discussion during the November Board meetings regarding how the RISC report assesses the level of risk of the risk profiles with respect to the Higher, Moderate, and Lower level designations. The Board suggested to simplify the approach by instead using the heat map quadrants for categorizing the risk.

Discussion among the committee noted that it should be clear that the mapping is relative based on actions taken to mitigate the risks. The committee then agreed to move away from the High, Moderate, and Lower levels of risk and instead focus on categorizing the profiles by the quadrants in the heat map. Edits reflecting this change will be included in the next draft.

c. Review of RISC Recommendations

Mr. Brandien noted there are about 100 recommendations in the current draft of the RISC report and a number of RISC members believe some of the recommendations can be consolidated or eliminated. He explained that he put together a spreadsheet of all the recommendations and attempted to categorize each by outcome and whether the recommendation has a direct or indirect impact on reliability. The goal of this exercise is to provide a way to prioritize the recommendations to see if any can be removed and instead acknowledged in the body of the RISC report. These may include recommendations that say “consider” or “continue to.”

Discussion among the committee supported the direction of continuing to work on the spreadsheet to identify recommendations that could possibly be eliminated based on their maturity level and instead referenced in the beginning narrative of the RISC report. Mr. Brandien will work with a small group (Mr. Pespisa, Mr. Shepherd, and Mr. Schrayshuen) on reviewing the recommendations spreadsheet for proposed removal of recommendations. The spreadsheet will be shared with the full committee in advance of the next call.

3. Resilience Framework

Mr. Brandien provided an overview of discussions from the November Board meetings that led to the NERC Board asking the RISC to develop a framework on resiliency to be discussed at the February Member Representatives Committee (MRC) meeting. Mr. Brandien noted that much of the feedback he has received since has emphasized that the RISC should consider the work of other groups that have addressed resiliency, including the National Infrastructure Advisory Council (NIAC). The NIAC has a framework that breaks down resiliency into four aspects: robustness, resourcefulness, rapid recovery, and adaptability.

Discussion among RISC members confirmed that the goal of the deliverable for the February MRC meeting is to facilitate a discussion that will identify aspects of resiliency and how others look at resiliency through different lenses. RISC members should provide any information or references they think will be valuable to Mr. Brandien and NERC staff. The committee will discuss further on its next conference call.

4. Next Steps

A conference call will be scheduled for early January with the goals of agreeing on a final RISC report for presentation to the NERC Board in February, and continuing the resiliency discussion and plan for the February MRC meeting.

5. Future Meeting Dates

- a. January TBD – conference call