Agenda
Standards Committee Process Subcommittee
April 23, 2014 | 1:00–4:00 p.m. ET

Conference Call with ReadyTalk Web Access

Conference Dial-in Information:

Register for ReadyTalk access here: April 23, 2014

Administrative
1. Introductions and Chair’s Remarks
2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement*
3. Approval of Meeting Notes from March 12–13, 2014 Meeting*
4. Review of Agenda and Objectives

Agenda Items
1. Update on Solicitation for New Members – L. Lee
2. SCPS Activities* (Update Only)
   a. Cost Effectiveness Analysis Process (CEAP) – G. Zito
   b. Consolidate SC Resource Documents – G. Zito and M. Benson
   c. Process to Improve the Effectiveness of Managing Ballot Pools – L. Lee
   d. Management of FERC Remands of Interpretations* – L. Lee
3. SCPS Activities (For Discussion)
   a. Consensus Building and SAR Development / RISC Triage Diagram* – P. Heidrich and B. Murphy
   b. Charter Revisions* – L. Lee and S. Miller
   c. Modifications to Quality Review Process* – K. Porterfield
   d. Review of Standards Processes and Procedures (Task #2 from 2013 Strategic Work Plan)* – J. Tarantino and P. Heidrich
4. SCPS Work Plan* – L. Lee and P. Heidrich
5. Communication with Industry – L. Lee
6. Items Slated for Presentation at Next Standards Committee Meeting – L. Lee and E. Chanzes
7. Review of Actions/Assignments – E. Chanzes
8. Future Meetings
   a. Meetings in coordination with Standards Committee:
      
      June 10–11, 2014 (8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m./1:00–5:00 p.m.) Denver
      September 30–October 1, 2014 (8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m./1:00–5:00 p.m.) Portland
      December 9–10, 2014 (8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m./1:00–5:00 p.m.) Atlanta
   b. Interim Meetings
      TBD
9. Adjourn

*Background materials are included.
Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

I. General
It is NERC’s policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition.

It is the responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC’s compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

Antitrust laws are complex and subject to court interpretation that can vary over time and from one court to another. The purpose of these guidelines is to alert NERC participants and employees to potential antitrust problems and to set forth policies to be followed with respect to activities that may involve antitrust considerations. In some instances, the NERC policy contained in these guidelines is stricter than the applicable antitrust laws. Any NERC participant or employee who is uncertain about the legal ramifications of a particular course of conduct or who has doubts or concerns about whether NERC’s antitrust compliance policy is implicated in any situation should consult NERC’s General Counsel immediately.

II. Prohibited Activities
Participants in NERC activities (including those of its committees and subgroups) should refrain from the following when acting in their capacity as participants in NERC activities (e.g., at NERC meetings, conference calls and in informal discussions):

- Discussions involving pricing information, especially margin (profit) and internal cost information and participants’ expectations as to their future prices or internal costs.
- Discussions of a participant’s marketing strategies.
- Discussions regarding how customers and geographical areas are to be divided among competitors.
- Discussions concerning the exclusion of competitors from markets.
- Discussions concerning boycotting or group refusals to deal with competitors, vendors or suppliers.
• Any other matters that do not clearly fall within these guidelines should be reviewed with NERC’s General Counsel before being discussed.

III. Activities That Are Permitted
From time to time decisions or actions of NERC (including those of its committees and subgroups) may have a negative impact on particular entities and thus in that sense adversely impact competition. Decisions and actions by NERC (including its committees and subgroups) should only be undertaken for the purpose of promoting and maintaining the reliability and adequacy of the bulk power system. If you do not have a legitimate purpose consistent with this objective for discussing a matter, please refrain from discussing the matter during NERC meetings and in other NERC-related communications.

You should also ensure that NERC procedures, including those set forth in NERC’s Certificate of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Rules of Procedure are followed in conducting NERC business.

In addition, all discussions in NERC meetings and other NERC-related communications should be within the scope of the mandate for or assignment to the particular NERC committee or subgroup, as well as within the scope of the published agenda for the meeting.

No decisions should be made nor any actions taken in NERC activities for the purpose of giving an industry participant or group of participants a competitive advantage over other participants. In particular, decisions with respect to setting, revising, or assessing compliance with NERC reliability standards should not be influenced by anti-competitive motivations.

Subject to the foregoing restrictions, participants in NERC activities may discuss:

• Reliability matters relating to the bulk power system, including operation and planning matters such as establishing or revising reliability standards, special operating procedures, operating transfer capabilities, and plans for new facilities.

• Matters relating to the impact of reliability standards for the bulk power system on electricity markets, and the impact of electricity market operations on the reliability of the bulk power system.

• Proposed filings or other communications with state or federal regulatory authorities or other governmental entities.

Matters relating to the internal governance, management and operation of NERC, such as nominations for vacant committee positions, budgeting and assessments, and employment matters; and procedural matters such as planning and scheduling meetings.
Public Announcements

REMINDER FOR USE AT BEGINNING OF MEETINGS AND CONFERENCE CALLS THAT HAVE BEEN PUBLICLY NOTICED AND ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

For face-to-face meeting, with dial-in capability:
Participants are reminded that this meeting is public. Notice of the meeting was posted on the NERC website and widely distributed. The notice included the number for dial-in participation. Participants should keep in mind that the audience may include members of the press and representatives of various governmental authorities, in addition to the expected participation by industry stakeholders.
Introductions and Chair’s Remarks
L. Lee brought the meeting to order on Wednesday, March 12, 2014 at 8:00 a.m. ET. She welcomed the attendees and thanked them for their participation. Those in attendance introduced themselves. Safety procedures for exiting in an emergency were discussed.

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement
E. Chanzes reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and announced that the meeting was public.

1. Approval of February 6–7, 2014 Meeting Notes
   Meeting notes from the February 6–7, 2014 meeting were approved without modification or comment.

2. Review Team Roster
   a. Update on Solicitation for New Members – L. Lee
L. Lee led the discussion on next steps for solicitation for new members. At the last Standards Committee Process Subcommittee (SCPS) meeting, it was decided that three to five additional members would be appropriate. S. Miller provided information on how the Project Management and Oversight Subcommittee (PMOS) solicited members in the past.

_E. Chanzes will work with S. Kim on the logistics for preparing the documentation for posting and announcement._

3. **SCPS Activities**

   a. **Charter Revisions – B. Li**

   B. Li informed the group of his progress on the Charter revisions. A redlined version was distributed to the SCPS for review and comments were received. There are continued efforts of striving for consistency with the PMOS Charter. B. Li will work to coordinate with the PMOS prior to the final version.

   _B. Li will send S. Miller the redlined Charter for further input and provide a revised draft to the SCPS for their April 23 meeting._

   b. **Cost Effectiveness Analysis Process (CEAP) – G. Zito**

   G. Zito led the discussion on CEAP and provided an update. A draft report of CEAP’s application to the Disturbance Monitoring standard development project will be sent to the SCPS for review. Upon concurrence, it will be sent to the Standards Committee (SC), targeting the SC’s April 9 meeting. G. Zito noted that a meeting with NERC staff regarding potential projects for 2014 took place, and that the CEAP team would need to explore an alternate approach to allow CEAP to be applied on a broader basis. Discussion continued on how to apply cost effectiveness analysis to Reliability Standards without impacting regulatory deadlines. It was noted that it might helpful to reach out to those impacted by this type of program roll out for additional approaches.

   _G. Zito will send the CEAP report to the SCPS for feedback and then submit the report to the SC for their April 9 meeting to endorse for posting._
c. Consolidate SC Resource Documents – G. Zito and M. Benson

G. Zito reported on the status of the consolidation of SC resource documents. Resource documents have been identified for clean-up and efforts are underway to combine documents useful for the drafting team members as a companion packet to the Drafting Team Reference Manual. A list of resource documents for retirement will be compiled and provided to the SCPS for review and then submitted to the SC for their April 9 meeting. Upon approval, documents designated as ‘retired’ will be removed from the resource page and archived.

*M. Benson will continue working on finalizing the list of documents for retirement and G. Zito will submit the proposal to the SC at their April 9 SC meeting.*

d. Process to Improve the Effectiveness of Managing Ballot Pools – L. Lee and B. Nutter

L. Lee reported on the status of the process to improve the effectiveness of managing ballot pools. She noted that the scope document had been refined and B. Nutter provided information on NERC’s strategies for improving the issue of achieving quorum on ballots. The new balloting software is in the last stage of development and, with its release, may address some of the current issues. She explained that the SCPS and NERC staff could then investigate if additional enhancements to the ballot pool management process are still necessary after reviewing results of the new balloting system. Final recommendations could then be presented to the SC for endorsement.

Discussion continued on current issues associated with ballots achieving quorum, and it was noted that part of the issue results from individuals joining ballot pools early in the process and then deciding not to participate; if they do not at least abstain, this non-activity of the ballot pool members affects achieving quorum. The SCPS gave suggestions on outreach efforts and possible process changes.

*L. Lee will set up a call with the task group to further discuss options and possible additional recommendations.*
e. **SCPS and PMOS Discussion: Consensus Building – B. Li**

B. Li provided an update on the scope document for this project, noting that it is a holistic approach to improving Standard Authorization Request (SAR) development, initial outreach, and building consensus. Discussion then focused on eliminating the overlapping efforts on consensus building with the PMOS. It was decided that the PMOS would no longer own this effort in terms of developing a process—this will be an SCPS-only project that will continue to benefit from PMOS input and eventual implementation. The next step is to finalize the scope document. E. Chanzes emphasized that NERC staff will need to review and provide further feedback. B. Murphy noted that he is finalizing work with the Reliability Issues Steering Committee (RISC) Chair with respect to RISC’s involvement in triaging SARs that are submitted to the SC and would share the outcomes with the SCPS.

_E. Chanzes will facilitate providing feedback from NERC staff and B. Murphy will circulate the final RISC triage diagram for discussion at the April 23 SCPS meeting._

f. **Modifications to Quality Review Process – K. Porterfield and S. Noess**

K. Porterfield led a discussion on the ongoing conversation of aligning the SCPS Quality Review (QR) process with NERC staff’s position on how QR is conducted from an operational standpoint. S. Noess provided a document titled “Coordinating Quality Review”, which outlined NERC’s philosophy for the execution of QRs over the last year. He noted that there has been a lot of good input from the SCPS and the SC, and the continued efforts ensure that QR is flexible and part of the fabric of standard development. Discussion led to the decision that the task group will review the Standards Process Manual (SPM), the SC Charter, and the SCPS-proposed NERC Reliability Standards Quality Review Process and Revised Template for Quality Review of NERC Reliability Standard or Interpretation documents to see if NERC’s documented attributes satisfy the spirit of what is required by these documents in relation to QR.

_E. Chanzes will set up a conference call for the task group to review the principles of the above-mentioned documents as they relate to QR to decide how to best move forward with respect to NERC staff’s preferred approach._
g. Management of FERC Remands of Interpretations – **K. Smith**

K. Smith provided a status of this effort and noted that S. Tyrewala assisted with the one-pager and G. Zito with the flow chart that had been provided to the SCPS for review. After discussion on specific aspects of the proposed guiding process, it was decided that K. Smith will update the scope document where necessary based on the feedback and distribute to the SCPS for review prior to submitting it to the SC for endorsement at the April 9 SC meeting.

*K. Smith will work with G. Zito and B. Li with respect to their proposed edits and circulate the documents to the SCPS for review before submitting them to the SC for endorsement at their April 9 meeting.*

h. Review of Standards Processes and Procedures (Task #2 from 2013 Strategic Work Plan) – **J. Tarantino and P. Heidrich**

J. Tarantino led a discussion on the Review of Standards Process and Procedures task. He noted that this task had been on the back-burner to give time for the revised SPM to be in place. Now the task team wants to focus on evaluating and subsequently improving specific elements of the SPM. It’s a two-phased approach, with the first phase concentrating on identifying the effectiveness of the processes set forth by the SPM, specifically the recently revised processes, by effectively utilizing a survey questionnaire identified in the project scope statement. The second phase is directed at using that data to implement improvements to identified areas.

E. Chanzes voiced concern from NERC’s perspective, noting that this may be premature with respect to how long the most recent revisions have been in place, and that many of the identified areas of evaluation are already being looked at by other SCPS initiatives. S. Noess also noted that the group should be mindful of the successes the current processes have allowed. S. Tyrewala also added that the SCPS needs to consider the timeline of this project in relation to the other SCPS tasks that would require changes to the SPM so that SPM is only opened once. Discussions led to the decision that the scope document would continue to be refined by further looking into NERC staff input, the depth of the efforts to inform what NERC resources are needed, and the idea of using the SCPS members’ base of knowledge to inform the needed improvements instead of a survey.
i. Interpretations Process – G. Zito

G. Zito reported on this topic, noting that after discussions with S. Tyrewala, he is recommending not moving forward with looking at this process. He explained that the proposed outcome may end up being similar to Compliance Action Notices (CANs), which were problematic for industry, and that any allocation of NERC Compliance resources could lead to organizational governance issues. The SCPS agreed to remove this project from the work plan.

4. SCPS Work Plan – B. Li and L. Lee

B. Li led a discussion on the SCPS Work Plan. Discussion centered on B. Murphy’s concern about taking the work plan to the SC for approval without it being fully vetted and agreed upon with NERC staff. It was noted that the purpose of the SCPS’s project scope documents is to do this, though E. Chanzes noted that there is NERC staff concern with some of the proposed projects. P. Heidrich volunteered to reformat the work plan document so that the tasks are more clearly categorized to see if that would help the concern. The SCPS agreed that this topic will need to continue at the next SCPS meeting.

P. Heidrich will work on/reformat the SCPS Work Plan for SCPS review at their April 23 meeting.

5. Communication with Industry – L. Lee

L. Lee noted that focus on communication of the status of CEAP and strategies to address ballots not achieving quorum should be ongoing.

6. Items Slated for Presentation at Next Standards Committee Meeting – L. Lee and E. Chanzes

Provide Guidance Doc for FERC Remand of Interpretations (K. Smith)
Provide list of resource docs recommended for retirement (G. Zito)
Provide CEAP report on Disturbance Monitoring pilot (G. Zito)
7. **Review of Actions/Assignments – E. Chanzes**

**Administrative**

Send out official announcement for April 23 SCPS call *(E. Chanzes)*
Notify the SCPS plus list of any planned subgroup meetings; make this a separate, informational email after you have coordinated with and sent calendar invites to subgroup members *(Subgroup leads)*

**Task-specific**

**SCPS Membership**: Coordinate announcement for solicitation of additional SCPS members *(E. Chanzes)*

**Charter Revisions**: Send Charter revisions to S. Miller to coordinate with the PMOS Charter; make discussed edits and provide to the SCPS for further discussion at the next SCPS call *(B. Li)*

**FERC Remands of Interpretations**: Make edits discussed at SCPS meeting and work with S. Tyrewala to finalize documents to circulate to the SCPS and provide to the SC for the April 9 SC call *(K. Smith)*

**Consolidate SC Resource Documents**: Finalize list of recommended docs to retire to circulate to the SCPS for review and provide to the SC for the April 9 SC call *(G. Zito and M. Benson)*

**CEAP Pilot**: Meet with those identified at the SC meeting to develop project selection criteria. Circulate Disturbance Monitoring CEAP report to the SCPS for review and provide to SC for the April 9 SC call *(G. Zito)*

**Process to Improve the Effectiveness of Balloting**: Schedule a meeting for the subgroup to look at NERC strategies and brainstorm further ideas to bring to the next SCPS call *(L. Lee)*
SCPS 2014 Work Plan: Reformat work plan to categorize statuses of the tasks in prep for further discussion at the next SCPS call (P. Heidrich)

QR Process: Set up call for subgroup to review the SPM, SC Charter, NERC Coordinating QR document, and SCPS-proposed QR process and template to inform how best to move forward (E. Chanzes)

Consensus Building Process: - Facilitate input on scope doc from NERC staff (E. Chanzes)
- Circulate finalized RISC triage diagram (B. Murphy)
- Incorporate changes and send scope doc to SCPS for review for further discussion at next SCPS call (B. Li)

Review Standards Development Processes and Procedures: - Research whether there is usable information from the NERC Performance Assessment (E. Chanzes)
- Identify NERC staff to provide initial input and assistance (E. Chanzes)
- Pull together subgroup to continue to work on scope document, including breadth of NERC resources, for further discussion at the next SCPS call (J. Tarantino)

8. Future Meetings

a. Meetings in coordination with Standards Committee:

   June 10–11, 2014 (8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. | 1:00–5:00 p.m.) Denver
   September 30–October 1, 2014 (8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. | 1:00–5:00 p.m.) Portland
   December 9–10, 2014 (8:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m. | 1:00–5:00 p.m.) Atlanta

b. Interim Meetings

   April 23, 2014 (1:00–4:00 p.m.) Conference Call
9. **Adjourn**

   P. Heidrich adjourned the meeting at Thursday, March 13, 2014 at 10:30 a.m. ET.
Standards Committee Process Subcommittee  
Activity Status Overview – April 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recently Completed Projects</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Team Lead and Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop a Process to Manage FERC Remands of Interpretations | Task Initiated: June 2013  
Current Target Completion: April 2014 SC Meeting  
COMPLETED: April 2014 SC Meeting | Kate Smith; Katherine.Smith@nationalgrid.com  
Stacey Tyrewala (NERC); stacey.tyrewala@nerc.net |

K. Smith presented the guidance document and process diagram to the SC at their April 9 meeting. With some agreed upon changes, the SC approved the documents. G. Zito implemented the changes and will send to NERC staff to post on the Resources page of the Standards section of the NERC site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Approaching Close/SC Submittal</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Team Lead and Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Charter Revisions | Task Initiated: December 2013  
Current Target Completion: May 2014 SC Meeting | Ben Li; ben@benli.ca  
Guy Zito; gzito@npcc.org  
Pete Heidrich; pheidrich@frcc.com  
Scott Miller; smiller@meagpower.org  
Erika Chanzes (NERC); erika.chanzes@nerc.net |

B. Li has drafted revisions to the SCPS Charter to include a communication piece, the role of the SCPS in training, and to be consistent with the PMOS Charter (officer elections, etc.). Edits were discussed at the March SCPS meeting that B. Li incorporated for the SCPS to review during their April 23 call. This also includes feedback from S. Miller with respect to being consistent with the PMOS Charter.

| Modify SC Quality Review Process | Task Initiated: Originally October 2012; Revisited jointly with NERC Staff December 2013  
Current Target Completion: May 2014 SC Meeting | Keith Porterfield; keith.porterfield@gasoc.com  
Andy Pusztai; apusztai@atcllc.com  
Ed Skiba; eskiba@misoenergy.org  
Pete Heidrich; pheidrich@frcc.com |

Keith Porterfield; keith.porterfield@gasoc.com  
Andy Pusztai; apusztai@atcllc.com  
Ed Skiba; eskiba@misoenergy.org  
Pete Heidrich; pheidrich@frcc.com
The small group had a call on March 26 to review the SPM, SC Charter, and NERC Coordinating QR document to determine how to move forward. There was consensus that the Coordinating QR doc was consistent with the principles relating to QR in these docs and the formerly approved SCPS-drafted template and could replace the QR process/template provided that NERC staff commits to communicating what was done for QR prior to an initial posting. K. Porterfield will work with NERC staff to provide a write-up of this approach for the SCPS’s consideration during the April 23 SCPS conference call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Projects</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Team Lead and Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Consolidate SC Resource Documents**  
*(Phase 1 of Updating the Drafting Team Guidelines Completed)*  
(This task also satisfies Task #5 from the 2014–2016 SC Strategic Work Plan)*  
| Task Initiated: July 2012  
Current Target Completion: April 2014 SC Meeting (Complete) and June 2014 SC Meeting | G. Zito and M. Benson finalized a list of documents to be retired and presented it to the SC at their April 9 meeting. The SC approved the list and M. Benson will archive the documents.  
M. Benson has identified documents needing updating (templates, style, etc.) and is working on a version history system on the NERC side. All remaining updated documents will be consolidated and target presentation to the SC is the June 2014 meeting. | Guy Zito; gzito@npcc.org  
Linn Oelker; linn.oelker@lge-ku.com  
Monica Benson (NERC); monica.benson@nerc.net |
| **Develop a Process to Improve the Effectiveness of Balloting** | Task Initiated: December 2013  
Current Target Completion: June 2014 SC Meeting | Laura Lee; Laura.Lee@duke-energy.com  
Robert Rhodes; rrhodes@spp.org  
Pete Heidrich; pheidrich@frcc.com |
The small group had a call on April 14 and discussed current NERC strategies with M. Benson and B. Nutter. It was determined that L. Lee would draft a report for the SC to explain what NERC has done in the past to address quorum issues, steps that are continuing to be executed by NERC while projects are still in the old balloting system, and that the SCPS will wait until the new SBS has been in place for six months before evaluating what the continued issues are and how to address.

L. Lee will work on the report with M. Benson and share with the SCPS in preparation for the June SC meeting.

| CEAP Pilot | Task Initiated: April 2012  
Current Target Completion: December 2014 SC Meeting |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Zito presented the finalized DM CEAP report to the SC at their April meeting and it was endorsed for posting with some suggested changes. The CEAP team is moving forward to think outside of the box to make the process more flexible so it can be applied to more projects. At the March SC meeting, it was decided that the CEAP team, Laura Hussey, and Michele D’Antuono would meet to develop project selection criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stevie Rueckert; | steve@wecc.biz  
Stacey Tyrewala (NERC); | stacey.tyrewala@nerc.net  
Monica Benson (NERC); | monica.benson@nerc.net |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Guy Zito; | gzito@npcc.org  
Pete Heidrich; | pheidrich@frcc.com  
Andy Pusztai; | apusztai@atcllc.com  
Steven Rueckert; | steve@wecc.biz |
<p>| Laura Hussey | (<a href="mailto:laura.hussey@nerc.net">laura.hussey@nerc.net</a>) is now NERC staff support. |
| Additional committee resources and NERC resources needed. | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects Needing Clarity (In scoping or need evaluation)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Team Lead and Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Current Target Completion: TBD | Ben Li; [ben@benli.ca](mailto:ben@benli.ca)  
Erika Chanzes (NERC); [erika.chanzes@nerc.net](mailto:erika.chanzes@nerc.net) |
| Consensus Building and SAR Development (Formerly: Improving Consensus Building at the SAR Stage) | Task Initiated: Originally October 2012; Revisited jointly with PMOS March 2014  
Current Target Completion: Early 2015 | Ben Li; [ben@benli.ca](mailto:ben@benli.ca)  
Pete Heidrich; [pheidrich@frcc.com](mailto:pheidrich@frcc.com)  
Steven Rueckert; [steve@wecc.biz](mailto:steve@wecc.biz)  
Guy Zito; [gzito@npcc.org](mailto:gzito@npcc.org)  
Val Agnew; [Valerie.agnew@nerc.net](mailto:Valerie.agnew@nerc.net)  
Soo Jin Kim; [soo.jin.kim@nerc.net](mailto:soo.jin.kim@nerc.net) |
Current Target Completion: TBD | Joe Tarantino; [joseph.tarantino@smud.org](mailto:joseph.tarantino@smud.org)  
Brenda Hampton; [Brenda.Hampton@energyfutureholdings.com](mailto:Brenda.Hampton@energyfutureholdings.com)  
Fred Plett; [frederick.plett@state.ma.us](mailto:frederick.plett@state.ma.us)  
Pete Heidrich; [pheidrich@frcc.com](mailto:pheidrich@frcc.com)  
Ed Skiba; [eskiba@misoenergy.org](mailto:eskiba@misoenergy.org)  
Guy Zito; [Guy Zito; gzito@npcc.org](mailto:Guy Zito; gzito@npcc.org)  
Erika Chanzes (NERC); [erika.chanzes@nerc.net](mailto:erika.chanzes@nerc.net)  
Stacey Tyrewala (NERC); [stacey.tyrewala@nerc.net](mailto:stacey.tyrewala@nerc.net)  
Jordan Mallory (NERC); [Jordan.mallory@nerc.net](mailto:Jordan.mallory@nerc.net) |

At the March SCPS meeting there was still some concern from B. Murphy with regard to further vetting of the tasks with NERC staff. P. Heidrich will break up Work Plan to categorize the status of the tasks for discussion during the April 23 SCPS call.

Per discussions with PMOS at the March SCPS meeting, this will now be an SCPS-only project, which will continue to benefit from PMOS input. B. Li will further revise the scope document based on feedback from NERC staff and B. Murphy’s work with RISC for additional discussion during the April 23 SCPS call.
Guidance Document for Management of Remanded Interpretations
Approved by the Standards Committee
April 9, 2014

NERC Legal and NERC Standards staff will consult with the original requestor regarding whether further action is necessary in order to provide clarity on the issue.

- If the requestor determines that further action is not necessary, then NERC Legal and Standards staff will report the decision to the other Applicable Government Authorities in the same manner as is contemplated by Section 309 of the NERC Rules of Procedure for remanded Standards. A copy of the communication will be provided to: 1) the Standards Committee; 2) the Regional Entities; and 3) the original requestor of the Interpretation. If the Standards Committee determines that there is an outstanding issue, it may submit a new Request for Interpretation or Standards Authorization Request pursuant to the SPM.

- If the requestor determines that further action is necessary in order to provide clarity on the issue, then NERC Legal and NERC Standards staff will evaluate the remand order as soon as is practicable and will make a recommendation to the Standards Committee regarding whether the Interpretation should be re-developed or the applicable standard(s) be revised.

  - The Standards Committee will make a decision regarding whether the Interpretation will be redeveloped as soon as is practicable or the applicable standard(s) will be revised and will document the basis of this decision. This decision is a procedural decision only and is not a substantive decision based on the technical content of the Interpretation.

  - If the Interpretation will be redeveloped, the Standards Committee should also decide whether to assign the Interpretation to the existing interpretation drafting team, or whether to dismiss the existing interpretation drafting team and assign the project to a new interpretation drafting team. The Interpretation will be redeveloped in accordance with the SPM. If a new Interpretation request is required, it shall be reviewed by NERC Reliability Standards and NERC Legal staff to ensure that the request is consistent with Section 7.0 of the NERC Standard Process Manual.

  - If the Interpretation will not be redeveloped or the applicable standard(s) will be revised in lieu of redeveloping the interpretation, the Standards Committee will dismiss the existing interpretation drafting team.
• If the Standards Committee determines that revisions to the involved Standard(s) are necessary, a Standard Authorization Request must be submitted by any entity or individual, including NERC committees or subgroups and NERC staff, and development initiated pursuant to the Standard Processes Manual.

• Once the Standards Committee has made a decision regarding the procedural status of the Interpretation, NERC Legal or NERC Standards staff will report the decision to the other Applicable Government Authorities in the same manner as is contemplated by Section 309 of the NERC Rules of Procedure for remanded Standards. A copy of the communication will be provided to: 1) the Standards Committee; 2) the Regional Entities; and 3) the original requestor of the Interpretation.

The Standards Committee will refer any compliance questions arising from the remand to the Compliance & Certification Committee.
NERC Process for Management of Remanded Interpretations

1. NERC Notifies Requestor of Remand
   - Requestor Decides Further Action Necessary?
     - YES
       - NERC Legal and Standards Staff reviews and makes recommendation to SC
     - NO
       - Report Requestor Decision not to Redevelop Interpretation to SC
   - NO
     - SC determines if existing or new IDT will be required
     - YES
       - Requestor notified and SC initiates Standards Development Processes
     - NO
       - SC reviews and determines if a new RFI or SAR should be developed pursuant to the SPM

2. SC Decides to Redevelop Interpretation?
   - YES
     - Legal reviews to determine consistency with Section 7.0 of SPM
     - Legal reports and communicates decision to redevelop the Interpretation
   - NO
     - SC Decides to Revise Standard?
       - YES
         - Requestor notified and SC initiates Standards Development Processes
       - NO
         - SC dismisses IDT and notifies NERC Legal

3. NERC Legal reports decision not to redevelop and notifies Requestor

SC Endorsed
April 9, 2014
Scope of NERC SCPS Project
Consensus Building for Standard Authorization Request (SAR) Development

Need for Project:

To develop a process which will facilitate the effective and efficient development of technical information and building of industry consensus leading to the Standards Committee’s acceptance/approval of the SAR for proposed standard projects.

Project Scope Statement:

The objective of this task is to develop a new or revised process which will improve the effectiveness and efficiency of consensus building tasks for standard projects starting at or before the initial project proposal stage and continuing to the acceptance/approval of the SAR by the Standards Committee.

A standard project can be initiated by any one of the following means:

a. Recommendation by the Reliability Issues Steering Committee (RISC) to address an emerging reliability risk/issue;
b. Compliance with, or a response to, directives by regulatory authorities or the NERC Board of Trustees;
c. A review/revision or need identified in the Standards Committee’s Reliability Standards Development Plan (RSDP);
d. A request by industry participants through the submission of a SAR;
e. Input by a stakeholder into the Single Portal for a potential reliability related issue.

This project will require a comprehensive review of the existing SAR and Informal development processes and proposing changes-, where appropriate, to improve effectiveness and efficiency in consensus building activities leading to the posting and acceptance/approval of the SAR. The project also will have to be fully coordinated with the RISC, PMOS and other SC activities and SCPS projects. The project is to be conducted in 2 stages.

Stage 1  (March 2014 to September 2014)

Develop a revised process that covers the following key activities:

- Collection of technical information needed to support the proposal for a standard project;
- Informal outreach and consensus building on the need and scope of the project;
- Drafting/revising the SAR to achieve clarity with sufficient technical information that supports the proposed purpose and scope of project;
- Posting of SAR and responding to public comments, and revising SAR to address industry comments;
- Conduct a Cost Impact Analysis (CIA) as outlined in the NERC Cost Effective Analysis Process Phase 1 to determine potential cost impacts of potential proposed solutions;
- Recommending acceptance/approval/rejection of the SAR to the SC with due consideration given to industry input.

The role of the RISC throughout these activities should be considered and clearly stated as appropriate.

Stage 2 (Latter Part of 2014 to Early 2015)

Revise the Standard Processes Manual to incorporate pertinent elements of the revised process.

Resources:

A small team comprising of 4-5 SCPS members, 1-2 PMOS members and 1-2 NERC Standards and NERC Legal staff.

Stage 1 is expected to start in March 2014 ending September 2014; Stage 2 is expected to start in the latter part of 2014 in conjunction with other SPM changes following the completion of another SCPS task to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of standards development, including balloting.
Reliability Risk Triage Process

ANNUAL RELIABILITY STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROCESS

Standards Committee
- Develop Draft RSDP, send to RISC for review
- Consider RISC feedback; Post RSDP for stakeholder comment; finalize, send to Board
- Evaluate RSDP, against priorities, send feedback to SC
- Aligns with RSDP?
  - Yes: Execute per RSDP/Prioritization
  - No: Chairs of RISC and SC collaborate on proposed triage strategy for RISC action, targeting for consent agenda where possible.

Standards Committee
- New SAR Received
  - Aligns with RSDP?
    - Yes: Execute per RSDP/Prioritization
    - No: Consider RISC feedback; Post RSDP for stakeholder comment; finalize, send to Board
- Board-Approved Annual RSDP, filed at FERC

Reliability Issues Steering Committee
- RISC Meeting Triage Received Issues and Referred SARs
- SAR Issue
  - Issue Received
    - Other Sources: Nominations, RISC members, NERC Staff, Committees
  - Completed Technical Review Received
- Needs Technical Review?
  - Yes or UNSURE: Send to appropriate Technical Committee(s)
  - NO: Recommend SC exercise own judgment
- Urgent?
  - NO: Consider in Annual Prioritization Process. Advise Board.
- Problem Valid?
  - YES: Recommend SC accept the SAR for posting/stakeholder comment.
  - NO: Address outside Annual Prioritization Process. Staff, RISC, and Committees collaborate to develop reliability risk management strategy, including what tools are needed (e.g., standard, guideline, alert, etc.); Advise Board.
- Recommend SC remand the SAR for additional work.
- Recommend SC reject the SAR for good cause.
- Recommend SC exercise own judgment.

Reliability Issues Steering Committee (Technical Committee)
- Technical Committee (Operating Committee, Planning Committee, or Critical Infrastructure Protection Committee)
  - Request for Technical Review Received
    - NO: Recommend rejection or no action.
    - YES: Recommend consideration through Annual Prioritization Process.
  - Problem well-defined?
    - NO: Research, define, and scope.
    - YES: Problem Valid?
      - NO: Recommend urgent consideration outside normal process.
      - YES: Urgent?
        - NO: Recommend rejection or no action.
        - YES: Recommend consideration through Annual Prioritization Process.

Process flow for new SARs, Nominations, Issues and problems identified by the technical committees during the course of their regular activities. Note that exceptions will be handled on an as-needed basis.
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Standards Committee
Process Subcommittee Charter

Section 1: Purpose

The purpose of the Standards Committee Process Subcommittee (SCPS) is to develop, maintain and document processes and guidelines to aid the Standards Committee, Standards Drafting Teams, NERC staff and industry in developing clear, effective and enforceable Reliability Standards. It also works to ensure that the documents provide transparency to the industry to ensure understanding of the standard development process and to promote the efficient use of industry technical subject matter expertise.

The SCPS takes direction from the Standards Committee and collects information from all Standards Committee members to identify needed process improvements and modifications.

Section 2: Overview and Functions

The SCPS ensures effectiveness of standard process documents and references. The SCPS maintains a list of all the documents it has responsibility for and establishes a review cycle for each of the standards process documents, and conducts reviews of the documents at least once every three years. In addition, the SCPS shall propose key subjects on standards development process documents and references, and coordinate with NERC staff to ensure effective communication of these subjects to the industry. As needed, the SCPS shall liaise with NERC’s Training Department and act as resource support for training materials on new/revised standard development process documents and references.

The SCPS will establish an annual workplan and present to the Standards Committee for acceptance.

Section 3: Reporting

The SCPS reports and is accountable to the Standards Committee. The SCPS will report on its activities at regularly scheduled Standards Committee meetings and calls and between meetings as requested.

Section 4: Membership

General
SCPS membership is open to SC members and other interested parties. Open nominations from interested parties will be considered. The SCPS Chair and Vice Chair will provide the Standards Committee with a recommended slate of members for its approval. The SC chair and vice chair may participate and support the SCPS as non-members.

Term
SCPS members will serve staggered two year terms with no term limits. Nominations for new members will be requested every year and as needed to add or replace members.
Standards Committee
Process Subcommittee Charter

Size
The SCPS size will be determined by the workload needs of the subcommittee.

Secretary
A member of the NERC staff shall serve as Secretary and has the responsibility to support the business of the subcommittee as agreed to with the SCPS Chair.

Section 5: Officers

- The SCPS will have a Chair and Vice Chair that are elected by the SCPS and approved by the Standards Committee.
- At least one officer must also be a member of the SC.
- Officers will serve 2 year terms with no limits on terms.
- Officers shall recommend the members of the SCPS for approval by the SC.
- Officers will prepare meeting agendas and manage SCPS meetings.

Officer Selection
Prior to the annual election of SCPS members in odd numbered years, the members of the SCPS shall select a chair and vice chair from among its membership by majority vote of the members of the SCPS. A nominating committee consisting of three (3) members of existing SCPS members shall be formed to solicit nominations for chair and vice chair no less than 30 days prior to the election.

The SCPS officer election shall be conducted at the 3rd quarter SCPS meeting. The nominating committee shall provide to the SCPS members the qualifications of the chair and vice chair nominees proposed. Also, at the time of the election, the Subcommittee can accept nominations from the floor. Following the election, the successful candidates shall be presented to the SC for approval.

Section 6: Meetings

Conducting meetings
The SCPS chair will set the agenda and preside over the meetings and calls. The chair may transfer this authority to the vice chair for short periods of time, including when absent from a meeting or call.

General Requirements
The SCPS shall hold meetings as needed and may use conference calls or email to conduct its business. Meeting notices and agendas are publicly posted on the NERC website. The SCPS secretary shall announce regularly scheduled meetings with a written notice (letter, facsimile, or e-mail) sent to all SCPS members.

Rules
The SCPS shall conduct its meetings guided by spirit of the most recent edition of Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised.

Draft May 16, 2013

Revised March 13, 2014
Open Meetings
SCPS meetings are open to any and all observers.

Recommendations
Consensus recommendations will be presented to the Standards Committee. However, when a consensus cannot be achieved, majority and minority opinions may be presented to the Standards Committee for final decision.

Proxies
Members of the SCPS may send a proxy.

Meeting Notes
Meeting notes will include the date and time of the meeting, attendance and a summary of significant actions taken. The meeting notes shall be posted in the NERC website.

Section 7: Charter Approval
This Charter shall be effective upon approval of the Standards Committee. The Standards Committee must approve any changes to this Charter for the changes to be effective.
NERC Quality Review

[SUGGESTED SC ACTION -- FOR SCPS CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION]

Action
Endorse the NERC Coordinating Quality Review document, accompanied by a commitment by NERC staff to communicate to the Standards Committee (SC) the Quality Review (QR) steps taken prior to each draft Reliability Standard’s initial formal posting. These items would replace the NERC Reliability Standards Quality Review Process that was approved by the SC but has not yet been implemented.

Background
Following SC approval in September 2013 of the SC Process Subcommittee (SCPS)-proposed NERC Reliability Standards Quality Review Process and Revised Template for Quality Review of NERC Reliability Standard or Interpretation documents, NERC staff expressed concern regarding the ERO operational governance provisions stipulated in the process document. Since, the SCPS, the SC Chair and Vice Chair, members of PMOS, and NERC staff have engaged in discussion to reach consensus on the documentation of NERC QR attributes and procedures.

As a result, NERC staff drafted an informational document titled “Coordinating Quality Review,” which outlines several attributes that NERC standards staff currently use in executing its obligation under the NERC Standards Process Manual (SPM) to coordinate QR of draft Reliability Standards. All parties agreed that this document is consistent with the principles relating to QR established in the SC Charter, the SPM, and the Revised Template for Quality Review of NERC Reliability Standard or Interpretation. It is noted that the Coordinating Quality Review document references the template as an excellent tool to facilitate a review.

To account for the needs and limitations of the respective groups, discussions led to a compromise between the SCPS and NERC staff that identifies the Coordinating Quality Review document as an appropriate replacement to the process document with respect to the fact that it accurately qualifies what QR should consist of but does not mandate NERC operational procedures. It was also agreed that this document should be coupled with a commitment from NERC staff to communicate to the SC what specific QR steps were conducted for a draft Reliability Standard when it is submitted to the SC for approval of its initial posting.
Coordinating Quality Review
March 1, 2014

This informational document outlines several attributes that NERC Reliability Standards Staff ("Standards Staff") currently use in executing its obligation under the NERC Standards Processes Manual¹ ("SPM") to coordinate Quality Review ("QR") of draft Reliability Standards.

As specified in section 3.5 of the SPM, "NERC Reliability Standards Staff works to ensure the integrity of the Reliability Standards processes and consistency of quality and completeness of the Reliability Standards." (Emphasis added). Section 4.6 of the SPM addresses "Quality Review," and it specifies that "NERC Reliability Standards Staff shall coordinate a quality review of the Reliability Standard, implementation plan, and VRFs and VSLs in parallel with the development of the Reliability Standard and implementation plan, to assess whether the documents are within the scope of the associated SAR, whether the Reliability Standard is clear and enforceable as written, and whether the Reliability Standard meets the criteria specified in NERC’s Benchmarks for Excellent Standards and criteria for governmental approval of Reliability Standards." (Emphasis added).

Standards Staff continues to work collaboratively with stakeholders and Standards Committee ("SC") ² in our equal interest to ensure the highest level of quality. Specifically, the following attributes guide Standards Staff in its coordination of QR:

1. QR is part of the fabric of standards development activities, from project inception through completion, with a focus on quality.
2. QR must be flexible; it must support and not detract from, hinder, or delay the development process.
3. QR input provides important feedback to drafting teams and will be made available to them for consideration in a timely manner before posting.
4. Each NERC Director of Standards Development will work with their associated Standards Developers to coordinate a collaborative QR. The QR scope will consider the facts, circumstances, and complexity associated with each project. This may include group calls, meetings, or email reviews with industry participants.
5. Each project has a primary and secondary standards developer, increasing support for QR throughout the standards development process. Standards Staff also coordinates input from NERC Technical, Compliance, Legal, and Enforcement staffs, further enhancing QR.

² The SC charter similarly acknowledges the importance of quality in accomplishing these common goals. For example, an SC duty under the charter is to establish quality assurance and quality control processes, recognizing the important role of the SC under the SPM in accepting the work of drafting teams.
6. The template for use in QRs created by the SC Process Subcommittee is an excellent tool for assessing the attributes of quality, and Standards Staff will continue review the items from this template in coordinating QR.

7. Outside input (a.k.a. using “fresh eyes”) from individuals not directly connected to the drafting team is important, and Standards Staff is committed to continuing to use and incorporate such input.

8. QR will seek diversity of perspectives, to include NERC, regional, or industry technical, compliance, enforcement, and/or legal expertise.

9. The SC Project Management Oversight Subcommittee (“PMOS”) has assigned a liaison for each standard development project. Standards Staff and drafting teams work closely with the PMOS liaison as an additional source of input to support QR.

10. QR efforts will include consideration of Paragraph 81 criteria and assessment of the content and quality criteria from the 2013 Independent Experts Review Panel³.

11. Standards Staff is committed to ensuring that any QR process considers the full spectrum of quality. Key topics include, but are not limited to, the following:
   a. Does the requirement (and any associated attachments) meet results-based criteria? Namely, does it identify “Who” (functional entity), under what conditions (if any), shall perform what action (including the word “shall”), to achieve what particular result or outcome (that reduces a stated risk to the reliability of the bulk power system)?
   b. Is the requirement stated with sufficient detail and in a clear and concise manner without using ambiguous words or unnecessary explanatory information?
   c. Does the standard satisfy applicable regulatory directives?
   d. If a specific performance can’t be identified, is the acceptable performance qualified and bounded by measurable conditions/parameters?
   e. Quality of Measures.
   f. VRF and VSL consistency with guidelines.
   g. Consistency of the standard with the Standard Authorization Request (SAR).
   h. Resolution of relevant Interpretations or Compliance Application Notices (CANs).
   i. Consistency with the Ten Benchmarks of Excellent Reliability Standards⁴.

---


NERC SCPS Action Item –


**Need for Project:**

The *Standards Committee Strategic Work Plan 2013-2015* established a work plan with specific implementation tasks. Task No. 2 (see below) was assigned to the Standards Committee Process Subcommittee (SCPS).

**Task No. 2: Review of the Standards Processes and Procedures:**

Implement revisions needed to NERC’s Rules of Procedure/SMP and SC processes and procedures to enhance SC and SDT accountability to timely deliver high quality Reliability Standards and execute the Strategic Plan, including the completion of Standards Process Input Group (SPIG) recommendations. All revisions, creation or elimination of processes and procedures provisions shall be presented to the SC for adoption, prior to presenting to the NERC Board of Trustees (BOT) for approval.

**Implementation: Review the Standards Development Process**

The SC Process Subcommittee (SCPS) shall review all aspects of the Standards development process map. The criteria for this review will include increasing effectiveness, timely completion and consensus building. Flexibility should be considered in the review to ensure that appropriate safeguards for open, transparent and consensus construction are part of process, while ensuring that it is geared towards production, and cannot be used for obstruction. The SCPS shall identify each step and the need to enhance or revise each step to conform to the SPIG recommendations and BOT resolutions. After process mapping is complete, SCPS shall draft proposed revisions to processes, procedures and NERC Rules of Procedure/SPM, as necessary, which shall include, at a minimum, the following:

For processes and procedures:

Include coordination with the NERC standing committees. Coordination should include the following: (i) receiving technical research or input from the committees prior to a standard being developed, as necessary, and (ii) a technical review of the draft standards.

For the NERC Rules of Procedure/SPM:

1. That the SC has the authority to approve draft and final SARs and the work product of SDTs as consistent with producing high quality, technically sound, clear and results-based Reliability Standards.
2. Review the need for, or reshaping of, the quality review process in light of the new composition of the SDTs.
3. Periodically review the SPM to ensure it meets the minimum requirements of the ANSI-accredited process.
**Project Scope Statement:**

The SCPS will review all aspects of Standards development with focus on the following areas:

- Overall and specific effectiveness of the SPM in individual areas (i.e., posting process, commenting, balloting, development of supporting documents) and
- Historical completion time for projects and what may have affected the ability to adhere to project milestones and
- Consensus building throughout the project.

Phase 1: The SCPS, in conjunction with the SC will identify the present and past effectiveness of the current Standard Processes Manual (SPM) (dated: June 26, 2013) (SPM). The SCPS will review stakeholder standards related input from the NERC Performance Assessment results, and as may be necessary, utilize focused surveys, questionnaires, etc. to confirm and expand upon issues related to the effectiveness of the Standards development processes. The SCPS will then evaluate all input received and develop two lists of recommendations. The first will be a list of potential areas for improvement to the SPM and the second list will contain other potential Standards process improvements, such as those which may require changes to the NERC ROP, training materials, etc. to support changes to the SPM. These lists will be brought to the SC for approval and further action.

Phase 2: The SCPS will develop a mapping document to identify the specific areas of the SPM where potential improvements would benefit the process. If necessary, the SCPS will draft revisions to the Standard Process Manual to support the final recommendations and also facilitate whatever other changes may be necessary to other documents and process to effectuate the issues identifying improvements in Phase 1.

All results will be presented to the Standards Committee for approvals/endorsement prior to any recommendations to the NERC BOT.

**Resources:**

NERC Standards staff support will be required:

- To provide standards and legal departments support in the development and deployment of strategies to enhance the current SPM and Standards Development processes during Phase 1), and
- To further provide support in the development of the deliverables associated with phase 2 of the project (i.e., mapping document, potential revisions to the SPM, ROP etc.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Scope of Task</th>
<th>Task Initiated</th>
<th>Target Completion</th>
<th>Status/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Modification to SC Quality Review Process Document</td>
<td>Staff has suggested changes to the QR process document that was approved by the Standards Committee at its September 2013 meeting. The SCPS will review and implement the proposed changes, and seek the SC’s approval of the revised QR process document to enable implementation of the QR process. <strong>Placeholder for Link to Scope Document</strong></td>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>May 2014 SC Meeting</td>
<td>Ongoing. A small team including reps from SCPS, PMOS and NERC staff to meet to collaborate on perspectives and develop a scope document to move forward with implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improving Consensus Building at the SAR stage</td>
<td>A draft document was developed in mid 2013. The document to be revised/refined pending finalization of the informal outreach process so that the improved SAR development process considers all activities leading to the formal development and posting of SARs for projects that are on or to be added to the RSDP. <strong>Placeholder for Link to Scope Document</strong></td>
<td>October 2012 (Task revisited jointly with PMOS starting March 2014)</td>
<td>June 2014 SC Meeting</td>
<td>Task to be combined with consensus building proposal (currently led by PMOS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Consolidate SC Resource Documents | There exist a number of resource documents some of which are being used by the Standards Committees and drafting teams while others are either not used or out of date. The SCPS thus will:  
  a. Propose a list of documents to be retired, and | July 2012 | April 2014 SC Meeting | Ongoing |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Scope of Task</th>
<th>Task Initiated</th>
<th>Target Completion</th>
<th>Status/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.   | Improve standards development process (Assignment resulting from 2013 Strategic Work Plan – Task #2) | a. Review effectiveness of the revised Standard Processes Manual approved by the FERC in June 2013, and identify areas/changes that can further improve the efficiency and quality of standard development;  
   b. Propose changes to the SPM as necessary, post for comments and finalize changes for balloting and BoT adoption.  
   **Placeholder for Link to Scope Document** | January 2013 | June SC Meeting  
   December 2014 SC Meeting | Ongoing |
| 5.   | CEAP Pilot Project | Conduct CEAP pilots:  
   a. CEAP Subteam is conducting the CEA portion of the CEAP on the second project of the pilot. The Team will develop a report for the SC and the Industry.  
   b. The CEAP Subteam will propose a list of | April 2012 | March 2014 SC Meeting  
   March 2014 | Ongoing |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Scope of Task</th>
<th>Task Initiated</th>
<th>Target Completion</th>
<th>Status/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  Standards development projects to conduct the CEAP on for 2014 and bring these to the SC and industry for approval and comment.  
   c. Upon completion of the pilot, the current CEAP guideline document will be revised accordingly to reflect lessons learned during the pilot and to address potential “benefits” of standard projects.  
   **Placeholder for Link to Scope Document** | SC Meeting | December 2014 SC Meeting | Ongoing |
| 6. Managing FERC Remands of Interpretations | Develop a process to manage FERC remands of interpretations such that the original request for interpretation will be duly addressed.  
   **Placeholder for Link to Scope Document** | June 2013 | June 2014 SC Meeting | Ongoing |
| 7. Process to improve the effectiveness of balloting | Develop a process aiming at:  
a. Maintain an effective ballot pool  
b. Managing situations where a quorum is not reached by the end of a ballot such that balloting can be conducted in the most effective and efficient manner.  
   **Placeholder for Link to Scope Document** | December 2013 | June 2014 SC Meeting September 2014 SC Meeting | Ongoing |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Scope of Task</th>
<th>Task Initiated</th>
<th>Target Completion</th>
<th>Status/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placeholder for Link to Scope Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>