ERO 2020 Work Plan
Priorities - Final Results

Mark Lauby, Senior Vice President and Chief Engineer
Corporate Governance and Human Resources Committee Meeting
February 3, 2021
1. Expand risk-based focus in Standards, Compliance Monitoring, and Enforcement

2. Assess and catalyze steps to mitigate known and emerging risks to reliability and security

3. Build a strong, E-ISAC-based security capability

4. Strengthen engagement across the reliability and security ecosystem in North America

5. Capture effectiveness, efficiency, and continuous improvement opportunities
Objective has been fully achieved

Objective was only partially achieved as management decided to prioritize other activities and/or to not engage industry during acute response phase of the pandemic

Objective not reached due to COVID restrictions on travel and assembly (e.g., sponsored conferences and workshops)
• Impacts of COVID include travel cancellations, reduced stakeholder capacity, or overall reprioritization of efforts

• 59 individual work plan objectives approved in February
  - 45 complete ✓
  - 8 partially achieved, management slowed to unburden industry ✓
  - 6 not reached due to impacts from COVID ✗

• 7 activities added in response to COVID or current events
  - 5 complete ✓
  - 2 continuing to track for completion after COVID ✓
Status Changes Since Q3

- Projected not to be completed to completed
  - Focus Area 2: Energy storage

- Projected not to be completed to partially completed
  - Focus Area 1: Resource availability in operational timeframe
  - Focus Area 1: TPL enhancement with fuel scenarios
  - Focus Area 5: Align release
  - Focus Area 5: Standards Efficiency Review

- Projected at risk for completion to completed
  - Focus Area 2: BES initiating wildfires
  - Focus Area 3: Coordination with the intelligence community
  - Focus Area 3: E-ISAC MOU relationships
• Projected at risk for completion to partially completed
  ▪ Focus Area 1: Design basis for fuel assurance
  ▪ Focus Area 2: Data for resilience and recovery
  ▪ Focus Area 3: CRISP participation

• Projected for completion to partially completed
  ▪ Focus Area 2: ERO’s role with increased DER

New Activities

• Projected for completion to partially completed
  ▪ Focus Area 2: Update Severe Impact Resilience Report
  ▪ Focus Area 2: Publish pandemic lessons learned
Focus Area 1: Risk-Based Focus in Standards, Compliance, & Enforcement

Key Objectives

1. Implement strategy for fuel assurance standards (including cold weather) for BPS operations and planning:

   Complete the development and submit to FERC a Board approved standard focused on resource availability in the operational time frame

   Fuel assurance guideline approved

   Identify tools needed for planners to include fuel scenarios, and work with industry to develop them

   Identify design basis scenarios for use in the planning horizon

   Begin enhancement of NERC's TPL Standards to include fuel scenarios for normal and extreme events (2021–2022)

Status Highlights

(Through Q4)

- SAR accepted by SC and drafting team appointed; extensive stakeholder outreach needed to complete
- Approved by PC in March
- Included in fuel assurance guideline above and in IRC/NERC Whitepaper
- EGWG continues to discuss; IRC/NERC Energy Whitepaper
- Reprioritized due to required stakeholder engagement. IRC/NERC Energy Whitepaper
**Focus Area 1: Risk-Based Focus in Standards, Compliance, & Enforcement**

### Key Objectives

2. **Complete the recommendations in the Supply Chain report:**
   - Adopted at the November Board meeting
   - Implement the supply chain recommendations, continue to assess their effectiveness and sufficiency, and determine further actions, if any, based on the seriousness and nature of risks
   - Work with industry and the NATF to develop consistency and certainty in vendor audits

3. **Consistently embed internal control activities within the compliance monitoring program**

### Status Highlights

(Through Q4)

- Adopted at the November Board meeting
- Meetings with NATF ongoing
- Ongoing activities, including:
  - Oversight activities
  - Annual CMEP staff training
  - Included in CMEP Implementation Plan and Practice Guides
Focus Area 2: Known and Emerging Risks to Reliability & Security

Key Objectives

1. Identify performance trends and develop lessons learned, recommendations, and/or implement mitigations:

- Protection system misoperations
- Reduced situational awareness from loss of EMS
- Unacceptable inverter performance
- Increased amounts of DER
- Reduce potential for the BES initiating wildfires
- Develop RSTC-approved work plan to implement EMP Task Force recommendations

Status Highlights (Through Q4)

- Included in SOR report
- Completed Monitoring and SA Conference; finalized special assessment
- SC accepted IRPTF/RSTC-recommended SAR; additional white papers, guidelines, and reports in development
- SPIDER WG/RSTC-recommended SAR sent to SC; posted two guidelines
- Resource guide completed; will present to RSTC in March
- Work Plan Approved by RSTC
Focus Area 2: Known and Emerging Risks to Reliability & Security

Key Objectives

2. Implement two lessons learned and best practices from GridEx V, including improved use and collaboration with SAFNRv3:
   - Two communication drills between E-ISAC Watch Floor and BPSA
   - Four drills on developed use cases

3. Identify and assess emerging factors impacting BPS reliability and make mitigation recommendations:
   - Assess energy adequacy in the 2020 LTRA
   - Technical assessment on energy storage technologies, applications, and projections
   - Develop position paper on the ERO’s role to ensure BPS reliability with increased DER lower than BES thresholds

Status Highlights
(Through Q4)

- Two communication drills completed
- Four drills completed
- Initial data and results received; analysis for LTRA in progress
- Draft complete; engaging RSTC in March 2021
- In progress in 2020. To be completed in early 2021
Focus Area 2: Known and Emerging Risks to Reliability & Security

Key Objectives

3. Identify and assess emerging factors impacting BPS reliability and make mitigation recommendations (cont’d):

- Develop data requirements and metrics for quantifying BPS resilience and recovery
- Improve models, identify simulation needs, and provide guidance to address reliability considerations from DER penetration
- Begin addressing cybersecurity risks in the planning and operational time horizon

Status Highlights

(Through Q4)

- SOR report contains SRI metrics on resilience; data requirements drafted, delayed industry engagement/Section 1600 load loss data collection into 2021 due to COVID
- SAR on modeling accepted by SC. Two Guidelines produced.
- Stood up BPS and Grid Transformation department; work initiated
Focus Area 3: Strong E-ISAC-Based Security Capability

Key Objectives

1. **Strategy:**
   - Complete Strategic Plan refresh with MEC support
   - Develop performance management process driven by agreed metrics

2. **Information Sharing**
   - Increase overall information sharing by partners and industry through targeted outreach
   - Expand CRISP participation and capture the DOE “+30” opportunity
   - Improve coordination and connectivity to Intelligence Community, especially DOE/CESER, DHS/CISA, and DOD/NSA
   - Effectively activate existing MOU-based relationships (MS ISAC, DNG ISAC, IESO pilot)
   - Expand Watch Operations to 24x7

Status Highlights (Through Q4)

- Completed and Board Approved
- Metrics approved by MEC
- Completed
- CRISP participation continues to expand but COVID has impacted installation of additional sensors
- Regular engagement with DHS, DOE and other US Government Agencies
- New agreement with IESO executed; Joint products developed with DNG and MS ISACs
- Fully operational
## Focus Area 3: Strong E-ISAC-Based Security Capability

### Key Objectives

#### 3. Analysis:
- Increase member shared joint analytical products developed with partners
- Increase member shared content enriched by E-ISAC analysis
- Unclassified Threat Workshop survey results (relevant, unique, timely, actionable content)
- Implement long-term data platform and demonstrate value-add

#### 4. Engagement:
- Expand participation in Industry Engagement Program
- Institutionalize Canadian engagement effort and ensure value add across international border
- Implement and realize value from new CRM system
- Continue to grow GridSecCon and evaluate outsourcing potential for low value added work

### Status Highlights (Through Q4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products &amp; procedures developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred due to COVID-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-ISAC Data Platform operational, including enhanced member dashboards and metrics canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred due to COVID-19, Evaluating virtual options for 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive outreach with CEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased membership 25%; converted to Salesforce platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancelled; RFP issued for 2021 for virtual conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Objectives

1. Expand outreach/coordinated ERO Enterprise communications with stakeholder/policy organizations:
   - Enhance existing and establish new relationships with key industry associations and stakeholder organizations
   - Develop a coordinated approach for NERC’s and Regional Entities’ outreach to FERC
   - Leverage Regional Entities for engagement with state entities and organizations
   - Expand coordinated outreach to Canada related to MOUs as well as regulatory authorities
   - Gain support for recommendations in NERC's reliability assessments

### Status Highlights

(Through Q4)

- Expanded trades meetings and outreach; increased communications w/NARUC, Canadian entities, & US government partners; EU
- Established coordinated calls with FERC; collaboration with FERC on COVID-19 guidance
- RE state outreach reps engaged; NERC and RE coordination on SOR and LTRA report messaging. Met with NARUC
- Expanded Canadian outreach coordinated with REs; update on MOUs provided during NERC Board and Canadian regulator meeting
- Expanded outreach to states on resource adequacy; identifying engagement plan for DER and natural gas risks
Focus Area 4: Engagement Across the Reliability & Security Ecosystem in North America

Key Objectives

2. Work with ERO Enterprise Communications Group (EROCG) to refine and further develop the ERO Communication Strategy, to:

- Enhance existing and establish new relationships with key industry associations and stakeholder organizations
- Amplify initiatives and messages through expanded use of social media
- Support the ERO Executive Committee (EC) pledge to develop and share harmonized messaging across the ERO Enterprise

Status Highlights (Through Q4)

- Government Communication Working Group calls; Chartered Regional Communicators group, and work plan developed from Communication Strategy
- Coordination across ERO Enterprise to build on social media networks and developing metrics on social media impacts
- Finalized Communication Strategy and establishing work plan; talking points; coordinated COVID-19 communications. Successful NARUC meeting
## Focus Area 4: Engagement Across the Reliability & Security Ecosystem in North America

### Key Objectives

3. **Plan resource, and execute joint meeting and conferences where possible:**
   - Joint Regional Entity supported Human Performance conference with NATF
   - Resiliency Summit with NATF and EPRI
   - Storage and Frequency Response with NAGF
   - Regional Entity focused Supply Chain and Facility Rating conferences and best practices with NATF

4. **Support corollary activities within industry and trades, e.g., U.S. DOE’s North American Energy Resilience Model (NAERM), IEEE Standard 2800**

### Status Highlights

(Through Q4)

- September conference rescheduled to virtual 2021
- Spring sessions
- Cancelled; exploring options for 2021
- Resiliency Summit with NATF and EPRI
- Storage and Frequency Response with NAGF
- Cancelled; exploring options for 2021
- NATF webinars on Facility Ratings and Identifying and Managing Potential Compromise of Network Interface Cards held Oct 22
- Collaboration efforts ongoing, including data gathering, meeting participation, and model validation
Focus Area 5: Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Continuous Improvement Opportunities

Key Objectives

1. Complete the “Big 3”:
   - Roll out Align Release 1.0, supported by stakeholder outreach and education, end use training, and business unit readiness activities
   - Complete the CIP and Phase II of the O&P Standards Efficiency Reviews (SERs)
   - Successful implementation of the RSTC

2. ERO Enterprise Biennial Effectiveness Survey:
   - Implement plans addressing key 2018 findings
   - Rethink the biennial survey working with the CCC

Status Highlights (Through Q4)

- Delayed until 2021 due to coordination and Secure Evidence Locker development
- O&P Phase II SER completed; CIP SER will continue into 2021 due to COVID impacts
- RSTC established
- Action plans established in 2019 & incorporated in work plans; activities completed
- Discontinued survey’s going forward. Enable targeted, individual program outreach
### Key Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. NERC:</th>
<th>Status Highlights (Through Q4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finish 2020 at or below budget and maintain at least $3M in operating reserves</td>
<td>Current year-end projections show NERC under budget with above $3M in reserves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Regional Entities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Regional Entity and stakeholder feedback, continue evaluation of compliance monitoring and enforcement processes for efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implement opportunities to centralize and/or standardize processes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Transformation achieves process alignment and shared resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing activities, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Align &amp; SEL development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ROP revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CCC working on methods for gathering feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enterprise-wide agreements for IT tools (Webex, OnSolve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• External communications coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducted three ERO Enterprise Leadership webinars and developed Transformation Roadmaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Objectives

Focus Area 2:

- Publish Level 2 Alert on Pandemic Mitigation Response
- Pandemic Preparedness and Operational Assessment, Winter and Spring 2020
- After action review and update report “Severe Impact Resilience” and HILF reports related to pandemic response and mitigation
- In coordination with NATF, DOE, and FERC, deliver Pandemic Plans and best practices
- Publish Lessons Learned & event report as needed

Focus Area 5:

- After action review and improve NERC's Business Continuity and Crisis Action Plans

Status Highlights
(Through Q4)

- Published; report sent to FERC
- Published; report sent to FERC
- Ongoing review of outcomes and lessons learned. Will publish after COVID
- Published on NATF website
- Ongoing review of outcomes and lessons learned. Will publish after COVID
- Crisis Action Plan updated; Business Continuity Plan working group established
New Objectives Added in Response to Current Events

Key Objectives

Focus Area 2:

Publish Level 2 Alert for extent of condition for certain Chinese and Russian made equipment as outlined in the May 1, 2020 Presidential Order, *Executive Order on Securing the United States Bulk-Power System*.

Status Highlights (Through Q4)

Published; report sent to FERC
Questions and Answers
Board Self-Assessment and MRC Assessment of Board of Trustees Effectiveness Results
Objectives & Methods
• To assess the performance and effectiveness of the NERC Board of Trustees (Board).
• The assessment has 29 questions to be answered by Board members, 23 of which are also answered by MRC members.
• 11 out of 11 Board members participated in the assessment, for a 100% response rate. 20 out of 28 MRC members participated, for a 71% response rate.
Executive Summary
Positive Highlights

• Board and MRC members show commitment to the evaluation process by providing thoughtful comments, many with specific suggestions.
• In general, Board ratings of itself are more modest while MRC ratings of the Board are improved from prior years.
• The Board is seen as clearly effective in its overall function.
• 90% of the MRC feels satisfied or very satisfied that the Board listens to its input.
Potential Focus Areas (based on scores and analysis of verbatim comments):

- Examine and evaluate how the Board oversees the Standards Program and identify opportunities for constructive engagement on particular issues.
- Board should continually assess E-ISAC effectiveness as the program functions evolve.
- Board should continually assess as to how risk is monitored and measured throughout the organization.
- Board should continually assess efficiency and effectiveness of meetings and stakeholder engagement.
- Board should continue focus on FERC, State and Provincial Regulators relationships.
Overall Effectiveness
Overall, how effective is the Board of Trustees at performing their responsibilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE</th>
<th>INEFFECTIVE</th>
<th>VERY INEFFECTIVE</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, how satisfied are you personally with the job you do working on the Board of Trustees? (Board Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY SATISFIED</th>
<th>SATISFIED</th>
<th>NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED</th>
<th>DISSATISFIED</th>
<th>VERY DISSATISFIED</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Most Important Board Functions**

What are the Board of Trustees’ MOST important functions at NERC? (Select No More Than 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>MRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting Company and Management Priorities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding and Approving the Development of Annual Budgets and Business Plans</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Vision for the Future</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring Adherence to NERC’s Mission, Vision and Values</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseeing NERC Management</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving NERC’s Senior Management and Officer Hires</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

- Ensuring that NERC is connected with, anticipating, and responding to the needs of the many stakeholders
- Ensuring NERC/ERO as a whole is focusing on the right topics in a rapidly changing environment.
Strategy
Please rate the Board’s effectiveness in overseeing NERC Management or staff to produce a final annual budget and business plan.

- **VERY EFFECTIVE**: 91%
- **EFFECTIVE**: 60%
- **NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE**: 30%
- **INEFFECTIVE**: 10%
- **VERY INEFFECTIVE**: 0%
- **UNCERTAIN/NOT APPLICABLE**: 0%
Board effectiveness staying in tune with issues and trends affecting NERC and the industry

- VERY EFFECTIVE: 36%
- EFFECTIVE: 64%
- NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE: 10%
- INEFFECTIVE: 0%
- VERY INEFFECTIVE: 0%
- UNCERTAIN/NOT APPLICABLE: 0%

Board effectiveness setting company priorities

- VERY EFFECTIVE: 45%
- EFFECTIVE: 55%
- NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE: 5%
- INEFFECTIVE: 5%
- VERY INEFFECTIVE: 0%
- UNCERTAIN/NOT APPLICABLE: 0%
How satisfied are you with how the board incorporates advice and/or recommendations from the MRC?

- **Very Satisfied**: 30% (Board), 91% (MRC)
- **Satisfied**: 50% (Board), 9% (MRC)
- **Neutral**: 0% (Board), 20% (MRC)
- **Dissatisfied**: 0% (Board), 0% (MRC)
- **Very Dissatisfied**: 0% (Board), 0% (MRC)
- **Uncertain/Not Applicable**: 0% (Board), 0% (MRC)
• Trend shows the Board has increased its effectiveness in overseeing NERC management in producing a final annual business plan and budget.

• Trend shows the Board (up from 64%) has increased its effectiveness at incorporating advice and/or recommendations from the MRC.

• Trends shows the Board needs to increase its effectiveness at providing leadership.
Oversight
Board involvement in the ERO Enterprise’s (NERC and the Regional Entities) annual business planning and budgeting process:

- **TOO MUCH**: 0%
- **ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT**: 100%
- **TOO LITTLE**: 5%
- **UNCERTAIN**: 10%

Board involvement in day-to-day management by NERC’s CEO:

- **TOO MUCH**: 0%
- **ABOUT THE RIGHT AMOUNT**: 100%
- **TOO LITTLE**: 0%
- **UNCERTAIN**: 35%
Board Monitoring

Board effectiveness at monitoring the efficiency (cost effectiveness) of ERO Enterprise processes:

- **VERY EFFECTIVE**: 18% (Board), 15% (MRC)
- **EFFECTIVE**: 82% (Board), 55% (MRC)
- **NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE**: 25% (Board)
- **INEFFECTIVE**: 0% (Board)
- **VERY INEFFECTIVE**: 0% (Board)
- **UNCERTAIN/NOT APPLICABLE**: 5% (Board)

Board effectiveness at monitoring standards development:

- **VERY EFFECTIVE**: 36% (Board), 15% (MRC)
- **EFFECTIVE**: 64% (Board), 65% (MRC)
- **NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE**: 0% (Board), 10% (MRC)
- **INEFFECTIVE**: 0% (Board), 5% (MRC)
- **VERY INEFFECTIVE**: 0% (Board), 5% (MRC)
- **UNCERTAIN/NOT APPLICABLE**: 0% (Board), 0% (MRC)
Board Monitoring

**Board effectiveness at monitoring Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement**

- **VERY EFFECTIVE**: 25% Board, 82% MRC
- **EFFECTIVE**: 18% Board, 55% MRC
- **NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE**: 10% Board, 0% MRC
- **INEFFECTIVE**: 0% Board, 5% MRC
- **VERY INEFFECTIVE**: 0% Board, 0% MRC
- **UNCERTAIN/NOT APPLICABLE**: 0% Board, 0% MRC

**Board effectiveness at monitoring assessments**

- **VERY EFFECTIVE**: 20% Board, 45% MRC
- **EFFECTIVE**: 45% Board, 80% MRC
- **NEITHER EFFECTIVE NOR INEFFECTIVE**: 0% Board, 0% MRC
- **INEFFECTIVE**: 0% Board, 0% MRC
- **VERY INEFFECTIVE**: 0% Board, 0% MRC
- **UNCERTAIN/NOT APPLICABLE**: 9% Board, 0% MRC
• Trend continues to show that the Board has “about the right amount” of involvement in both the ERO Enterprise’s business planning and budgeting process and day-to-day management by NERC’s CEO.
• Trend shows that the Board believes they are becoming more effective at monitoring the efficiency (cost effectiveness) of ERO Enterprise processes.
• Trend continues to show that the Board should continue to provide focus on standards development.
• Trend continues to show that the Board is increasing its effectiveness in compliance monitoring and enforcement.
• Trend shows a marked improvement in the Board’s evaluation of effectiveness in monitoring the E-ISAC.
• The first year including risk as a category shows this is an area of focus for the Board.
Stakeholder Relations
The Board listens to input from the MRC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>MRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board listens to input from NERC management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>MRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board listens to input from Regional Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>MRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board works effectively with management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>MRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board maintains a positive working relationship with Federal regulators

- **Strongly Agree**: 27%
- **Agree**: 73%
- **Neither Agree Nor Disagree**: 0%
- **Disagree**: 0%
- **Strongly Disagree**: 0%
- **Uncertain**: 10%

The Board maintains a positive working relationship with State regulators

- **Strongly Agree**: 18%
- **Agree**: 45%
- **Neither Agree Nor Disagree**: 27%
- **Disagree**: 35%
- **Strongly Disagree**: 0%
- **Uncertain**: 9%
The Board maintains a positive working relationship with Canadian federal and provincial regulators.

- **Strongly Agree**: 36% (Board), 15% (MRC)
- **Agree**: 64% (Board), 60% (MRC)
- **Neither Agree nor Disagree**: 0% (Board), 10% (MRC)
- **Disagree**: 0% (Board), 0% (MRC)
- **Strongly Disagree**: 0% (Board), 0% (MRC)
- **Uncertain**: 15% (Board), 0% (MRC)
• Trend shows increased agreement in the Board listening to input from NERC management.
• Trend shows increased agreement in the Board listening to input from Regional Entities.
• Trend shows the Board should continue its focus on working effectively with management.
• Trend shows the Board should continue its focus on its working relationships with Canadian federal and provincial, state, and federal regulators.
Board Functioning
Aspects of Board Functioning

Board meetings are efficient (Board Only)

- STRONGLY AGREE: 45%
- AGREE: 55%
- NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE: 0%
- DISAGREE: 0%
- STRONGLY DISAGREE: 0%
- UNCERTAIN: 0%

Board meetings are an effective use of my time (Board Only)

- STRONGLY AGREE: 64%
- AGREE: 36%
- NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE: 0%
- DISAGREE: 0%
- STRONGLY DISAGREE: 0%
- UNCERTAIN: 0%
Aspects of Board Functioning

The frequency of Board meetings is appropriate *(Board Only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board members communicate effectively with each other *(Board Only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCERTAIN</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board has established procedures to ensure meetings are able to be run effectively, including delivery of agendas and appropriate background material in time to prepare in advance of meetings. (Board Only)

- **Strongly Agree**: 91%
- **Agree**: 9%
- **Neither agree nor disagree**: 0%
- **Disagree**: 0%
- **Strongly disagree**: 0%
- **Uncertain**: 0%
• Trend continues to show the Board is functioning at an effective level, with a focus on increasing effective communication.
Questions and Answers