NERC
NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY CORPORATION

Consideration of Comments

Project Name: 2024-03 Revisions to EOP-012-2 | Draft 3
Comment Period Start Date: 1/27/2025
Comment Period End Date: 3/12/2025
Associated Ballot(s):

There were 43 sets of responses, including comments from approximately 108 different people from approximately 77 companies representing 7 of the Industry Segments as shown in the table on the following pages.

Summary Response to Comments

Thank you to all who submitted comments on the draft of proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-3 posted under Section 321.5 of The North American Reliability Corporation (NERC) Rules of Procedure. The comments provided meaningful insights and guidance to the NERC Staff and Standards Committee volunteers charged with carrying out the Board-directed responsibilities under Section 321 of the NERC Rules of Procedure.

Under Section 321.5.2 of the Rules of Procedure, the Board of Trustees may consider approval of a standard "with such modifications as the Board of Trustees determines are appropriate in light of the comments received." The stakeholder comments received during this comment period informed the development of the following recommendations to the NERC Board of Trustees for further modifications:

- Revised definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint, to better reflect what is meant by "freeze protection measures" in the context of improving generator cold weather preparedness.
- Revised Requirement R2 to provide that a Generator Owner (GO) with a generating unit entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if

applicable. A new footnote is added to clarify that the October 1, 2027 date may be different in non-U.S. jurisdictions. The implementation issue supported originally by Requirement R2 Part 2.1 and Part 2.2 is addressed in the implementation plan instead, where the compliance obligations and timelines can be stated much more clearly. This change addresses the concerns that were raised about potential gaps in applicability and retroactive applicability of requirements. However, it maintains extra implementation time for some entities, a concept supported by stakeholders.

- Related to the above, the implementation plan adds a phased-in compliance date for Requirement R2; the revisions clarify that a generating unit entering commercial operation on or after the October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but enters commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability.
- Requirement R6 Footnote 14 clarifies, in response to a comment, what is meant by an "early season event" (i.e. an event in September, October, or November).
- Requirement R8 Part 8.4 clarifies the required action when a GO experiences a repeat Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event at the same or a similar unit, and already has a validated Generator Cold Weather Constraint addressing the corrective actions that would be required to address the issue.
- EOP-012-3 Attachment 1, "Case-by-Case Determinations of Generator Cold Weather Constraints" 5a and 5b (accelerated premature retirement, cancellation of a planned unit) are revised to require the GO to have an attestation signed by an officer of the company to accompany its determination, made through an analysis, that the constraint applies. This addition was intended to address a concern about potentially questionable economic constraint declarations being submitted for Compliance Enforcement Authority (CEA) review. The change is not expected to meaningfully increase the administrative burden for affected GOs seeking to make such a declaration.

Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in Generator Cold Weather Constraint evaluations across The Electric Reliability Organization (ERO) Enterprise or offering suggestions to improve the appeal process. These comments were shared with Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program (CMEP) staff. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. The draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process has been revised to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished. The ERO

Enterprise is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated. Guidance will include the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the entity and the ERO Enterprise for making these determinations in a timely manner. Consistent with the comments, NERC has also expanded the time available to request a joint CEA/NERC review of a denial.

Other entities have sought clarification on how the various parts of EOP-012-3 will work together. Individual responses to these comments are provided below. ERO Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Staff are collecting Frequently Asked Questions about the EOP-012 standard that will inform future communications. Entities may always reach out to their CEA for specific guidance or questions.

While all comments received were given due consideration, not all comments or suggestions resulted in a recommended change to proposed EOP-012-3. For example, recommendations to include cost/benefit analysis in the standard were not considered to be responsive to The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) June 2024 Order directives. Similarly, the recommendation to create a standard Corrective Action Plan implementation timeframe of 12 months for units experiencing Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events was not thought to fully address the reliability concerns underlying the Commission's directive for a timelier implementation of such plans.

Other suggestions, such as to require an out of cycle review of a declared Generator Cold Weather Constraint upon receiving a notification that material facts had changed, were considered; however, it was determined that alternative, more targeted mechanisms may be equally effective in driving understanding of new technologies and present fewer implementation concerns than a broadly worded requirement that would apply to all Generator Cold Weather Constraints.

Recommendations to incorporate the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process into the standard were not adopted, on the basis that the standard sets forth mandatory obligations for registered entities for the reliable operation of the Bulk-Power System (BPS), and this process document describes how the CMEP program will oversee this aspect of compliance with some flexibility to account for the expected entity timing issues.

Further revisions to the Attachment 1 Generator Cold Weather Constraint lists were considered but not recommended at this time.

Please refer to the individual comment responses below for a more detailed discussion of how the individual comments were considered in developing the final recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

All comments submitted can be reviewed in their original format on the project page.

If you feel that your comment has been overlooked, let us know immediately. Our goal is to give every comment serious consideration in this process. If you feel there has been an error or omission, contact Director of Standards, Jamie Calderon (via email) or at (404) 446-9647.

Questions

1. In paragraph 47 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC to revise EOP-012-2 and/or the definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint to "ensure that the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration criteria included within the proposed Reliability Standard are objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them." FERC provided several examples of how NERC may meet directives in this paragraph and explained that NERC may address these concerns in an equally efficient and effective manner, provided NERC explains how it addresses FERC's concerns. FERC further directed NERC to remove references to "cost", "reasonable cost", "unreasonable cost" and "good business practices" and to replace them with clear and auditable criteria.

Proposed EOP-012-3 would revise the definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint and provide a list in Attachment 1 to the standard of situations which would comprise "known" generator constraints, as well as a list of situations which may constitute constraints, depending on the facts and circumstances. In developing this list, the drafting team considered remarks from the November 2024 technical conference and industry comments on prior drafts.

Do you agree that the proposed revisions to the definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint and addition of Attachment 1 address the FERC directives in paragraph 47? Please provide any additional comments to consider. If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

2. In paragraph 54 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC to modify EOP-012-2 "so that NERC receives, reviews, evaluates, and confirms for validity the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations in a timely manner."

To address this directive, proposed EOP-012-3 would require each Generator Owner that declares a constraint to submit it to the CEA for validation (Requirement R8 Part 8.1). Constraints shall be submitted within 45 calendar days of determining that the Generator Cold Weather Constraint is applicable (for new units this time is within 15 days of entering commercial operation). The process for ERO review is addressed separately in an ERO process document.

Do you agree that the modifications in Requirement R8 are responsive to the FERC directive in paragraph 54? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

3. In paragraph 68 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC to modify Requirement R7 of EOP-012-2 "to require shorter deadlines to implement corrective actions for existing or new equipment or the freeze protection measures for those generating units that experience a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event". FERC provided an example for how to address this directive, such as to require shorter timeframes for those units that have experienced issues and allow longer timeframes to address similar potential issues across a fleet for those units that have not experienced issues.

In proposed EOP-012-3, requirements for Corrective Action Plans for Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events are combined in Requirement R6. Requirement R6 now includes timeframes for CAP implementation for the unit that experiences the Generator Cold Weather Event (before the next winter season), timeframes for reviewing similar units for the same issue (12 months from the event) and timeframes for implementing CAPs on similar units that were determined to be susceptible to the identified freezing issues (24 months from the review, or 36 months from the event). In developing these modifications, feedback from previous postings of the EOP-012-3 standard were considered.

Do you agree that the modifications in Requirement R6 are responsive to the FERC directive in paragraph 68? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

4. In paragraph 70 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC "to develop and submit modifications to Requirement R7 of proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-2 to ensure that any extension of a corrective action plan implementation deadline beyond the maximum implementation timeframe required by the proposed Reliability Standard is pre-approved by NERC." In paragraph 3 of the June 2024 Order, FERC stated that NERC should "ensure that the generator owner informs relevant registered entities of operating limitations in extreme cold weather during the period of the extension."

In proposed EOP-012-3, Requirement R6 Part 6.4 and Requirement R7 Part 7.2 were added to require any Generator Owner seeking to extend a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) implementation deadline beyond the maximum implementation timeframe, to seek pre-approval of the extension by the CEA. The standard specifies the information that must be included in any submission to allow for this review, including an explanation of the circumstances causing the delay and why those circumstances are beyond the control of the GO, revisions to the CAP in the interim, and an updated timetable for completion.

The drafting team determined that any entities with a need could request information on operating limitations – temporary or otherwise - under the data specification standards (TOP-003, IRO-010), or through other mechanisms for obtaining up-to-date

information on the status and availability of generators, and determined to not include a separate requirement for such notifications in EOP-012-3.

Do you agree that the modifications in Requirement R6 Part 6.4 and Requirement R7 Part 7.2 are responsive to the FERC directives above? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

5. Paragraph 72 June 2024 Order, FERC stated: "[W]e…find that generators that are commercially operational after October 1, 2027, should have freeze protection measures either designed into their generating systems, or, if a corrective action plan is needed, then it should be completed by the time that such generating units go into commercial operation." FERC directed NERC to develop and submit modifications to Requirement R7, Reliability Standard EOP-012-2 to clarify that any Requirement R7 Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) for new generation (i.e. commercially operational after October 1, 2027) must be completed prior to the generating unit's commercial operation date.

To remove the CAP option from new generation entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027, which is consistent with the original EOP-012-1 standard. The drafting team chose to allow a limited CAP option for certain generators whose design criteria were finalized prior to the first version of the EOP-012 standard being approved, and that will come into commercial operation during the first winter the more stringent requirements for new generation are in effect (i.e. winter 2027-2028). These units would be allowed the option to enter commercial operation and complete any required CAPs by April 1, 2028.

To address industry comments on previous drafts, further clarification is made in Requirement R6 as to scope and applicability and to confirm no retroactive applicability is intended, and additional supporting rationale for the selected bookend dates is provided in the Technical Rationale.

Do you agree that the modifications in EOP-012-3 Requirement R2 are responsive to the FERC directives? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

6. In paragraph 76 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directs NERC to remove ambiguities in the Corrective Action Plan implementation plan timelines. As an example, FERC cites the timelines for new, compared to existing, freeze protection measures.

Requirement R7 was revised to clarify that actions to address issues with existing measures must be completed within 24 months, regardless of any longer timeframes for new measures. Requirements for Corrective Action Plans for Generator Cold Weather

Reliability Events are discussed in further detail above. Do you agree that the edits are responsive to the FERC directive in paragraph 76? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

7. In paragraph 94 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directs NERC "to develop and submit modifications to Requirement R8, Part 8.1 of proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-2 to implement more frequent reviews of Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations" (i.e. more frequent than every five years) "to verify that the declaration remains valid".

In proposed EOP-012-3, new Requirement 9 was created to require a review of each constraint at least once every 36 calendar months. In establishing this timeframe, the drafting team considered feedback provided on appropriate periodicities and sought to balance the burdens of more frequent reviews with the benefit to reliability of implementing new technologies as they become available. Do you agree that the modifications reflected in new Requirement R9 are responsive to the FERC Directives? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

8. Under Section 321.5.1 of the NERC Rules of Procedure, the Board of Trustees is to consider whether any proposed standard developed under that section is practical, technically sound, technically feasible, cost-justified and serves the best interests of reliability of the Bulk Power System, among other things. Considering the FERC directives provided above, please provide any other comments you wish the Board of Trustees to consider in whether to adopt proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-3.

The Industry Segments are:

1 — Transmission Owners
2 — RTOs, ISOs
3 — Load-serving Entities
4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
5 — Electric Generators
6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
7 — Large Electricity End Users
8 — Small Electricity End Users
9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
10 — Regional Reliability Organizations, Regional Entities

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
BC Hydro and Power Authority	Adrian Andreoiu	1,3,5	WECC	BC Hydro	Hootan Jarollahi	BC Hydro and Power Authority	3	WECC
					Helen Hamilton Harding	BC Hydro and Power Authority	5	WECC
					Adrian Andreoiu	BC Hydro and Power Authority	1	WECC
MRO	Anna Martinson	1,2,3,4,5,6	MRO	MRO Group	Shonda McCain	Omaha Public Power District (OPPD)	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Michael Brytowski	Great River Energy	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Jamison Cawley	Nebraska Public Power District	1,3,5	MRO
					Jay Sethi	Manitoba Hydro (MH)	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Husam Al-Hadidi	Manitoba Hydro (System Preformance)	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Kimberly Bentley	Western Area Power Administration	1,6	MRO
					George Brown	Pattern Operators LP	5	MRO

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
					Amy Key	MidAmerican Energy Company (MEC)	1	MRO
					Dane Rogers	Oklahoma Gas and Electric (OG&E)	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Seth Shoemaker	Muscatine Power & Water	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Michael Ayotte	ITC Holdings	1	MRO
					Peter Brown	Invenergy	5,6	MRO
					Angela Wheat	Southwestern Power Administration	1	MRO
					Joshua Phillips	Southwest Power Pool	2	MRO
					Patrick Tuttle	Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority	4,5	MRO
					Hayden Maples	Evergy	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Kirsten Rowley	MISO	2	MRO

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
WEC Energy Group, Inc.	Christine Kane	3,4,5,6		WEC Energy Group	Christine Kane	WEC Energy Group, Inc.	3	RF
					Michelle Hribar	WEC Energy Group, Inc.	5	RF
					David Boeshaar	WEC Energy Group, Inc.	6	RF
					Candace Morakinyo	WEC Energy Group, Inc.	4	RF
ACES Power Marketing	Jodirah Green	1,3,4,5,6	MRO,NPCC,RF,SERC,Texas RE,WECC	ACES Collaborators	James Shultz	Hoosier Energy Electric Cooperative	1	RF
					Kris Carper	Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.	1	WECC
					Jordan Mcclellan	Southern Illinois Power Cooperative	1	SERC
					Jason Procuniar	Buckeye Power, Inc.	4	RF
					Scott Brame	North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation	3,4,5	SERC

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
					Bill Pezalla	Old Dominion Electric Cooperative	3,4	SERC
Black Hills Corporation	Josh Schumacher	1,3,5,6		Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	Trevor Rombough	Black Hills Corporation	1	WECC
					Josh Combs	Black Hills Corporation	3	WECC
					Sheila Suurmeier	Black Hills Corporation	5	WECC
					Josh Schumacher	Black Hills Corporation	6	WECC
Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.	Kennedy Meier	2		ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	Kennedy Meier	Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.	2	Texas RE
					Joshua Phillips	Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (RTO)	2	MRO
					Kirsten Rowley	Midcontinent ISO, Inc.	2	RF
					Gregory Campoli	New York Independent System Operator	2	NPCC
					Thomas Foster	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.	2	RF

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
					Darcy O'Connell	California ISO	2	WECC
					John Pearson	ISO New England, Inc.	2	NPCC
FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	Mark Garza	1,3,4,5,6		FE Voter	Julie Severino	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	1	RF
					Aaron Ghodooshim	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	3	RF
					Robert Loy	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Solutions	5	RF
					Mark Garza	FirstEnergy-FirstEnergy	1,3,4,5,6	RF
					Stacey Sheehan	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	6	RF
DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company	Mohamad Elhusseini	3,5		DTE Energy	Mohamad Elhusseini	DTE Energy	5	RF
					Patricia Ireland	DTE Energy	4	RF

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
					Marvin Johnson	DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company	3	RF
Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc.	Pamela Hunter	1,3,5,6	SERC	Southern Company	Matt Carden	Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc.	1	SERC
					Joel Dembowski	Southern Company - Alabama Power Company	3	SERC
					Ron Carlsen	Southern Company - Southern Company Generation	6	SERC
					Leslie Burke	Southern Company - Southern Company Generation	5	SERC
	Sean Bodkin	5,6		Dominion	Victoria Crider	Dominion Energy	3	NA - Not Applicable

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc.					Sean Bodkin	Dominion Energy	6	NA - Not Applicable
					Steven Belle	Dominion Energy	1	NA - Not Applicable
					Barbara Marion	Dominion Energy	5	NA - Not Applicable
Western Electricity Coordinating Council	Steven Rueckert	10		WECC Entity Monitoring	Steve Rueckert	WECC	10	WECC
					Curtis Crews	WECC	10	WECC
Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Tim Kelley	1,3,4,5,6	WECC	SMUD and BANC	Nicole Looney	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	3	WECC
					Charles Norton	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	6	WECC
					Wei Shao	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	1	WECC
					Foung Mua	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	4	WECC
					Nicole Goi	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	5	WECC

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
					Kevin Smith	Balancing Authority of Northern California	1	WECC

1. In paragraph 47 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC to revise EOP-012-2 and/or the definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint to "ensure that the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration criteria included within the proposed Reliability Standard are objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them." FERC provided several examples of how NERC may meet directives in this paragraph and explained that NERC may address these concerns in an equally efficient and effective manner, provided NERC explains how it addresses FERC's concerns. FERC further directed NERC to remove references to "cost", "reasonable cost", "unreasonable cost" and "good business practices" and to replace them with clear and auditable criteria. **Proposed EOP-012-3 would revise the definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint and provide a list in Attachment 1 to the standard of situations which would comprise "known" generator constraints, as well as a list of situations which may constitute constraints, depending on the facts and circumstances. In developing this list, the drafting team considered remarks from the November 2024 technical conference and industry comments on prior drafts.** **Do you agree that the proposed revisions to the definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint and addition of Attachment 1 address the FERC directives in paragraph 47? Please provide any additional comments to consider. If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.**	
Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see the response to EEI's comments.	
Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5	
Answer	No

Document Name	
Comment	

AES US Renewables support North American Generator Forum (NAGF) comments.
While we agree that some of the constraint criteria have been clarified and refined, we are concerned the language used in several of the criteria can be left to interpretation by the Regional Entities. For example, the phrase used in several of the constraint criteria: "comparable types in regions that experience similar winter climate conditions" can be interpreted differently if there is no guidance provided. We request NERC to provide more clarity and consistency via updates in the technical rationale or a CMEP practice guide.

AES US Renewables also supports ACP's comment regarding the first criterion under Known Generator Cold Weather Constraints, particularly on the October 1, 2029, date for wind turbine towers. Additionally, we request that the second date (currently listed as October 1, 2031) be removed. The rationale for this is that the commercial operation date of a new wind project can face delays due to multiple factors (eg: supply chain, weather, etc). So, setting up a second date does not allow flexibility for Generator Owners (GOs) or developers to account for these delays that are beyond the control of the GO or developer.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

As to your second comment, the October 1, 2031 date was added to avoid creating an incentive for entities to stockpile older equipment not meeting the more stringent criteria for later installation well into the future. As discussed in the Technical Rationale, feedback was received during the development process of the expected development timeframes for new technologies. The drafters believed the standard needed to provide time to account for these development timeframes, but that this time should not extend so long as to disincentivize the timely development of newer technologies that can better withstand extreme cold weather conditions at the sites where they are being installed. As

this October 1, 2031 date is six years past the anticipated effective date of EOP-012-3 and four years past the date by which new generating units must meet more stringent requirements, NERC believes this timeframe would allow entities sufficient time to account for incorporating improved equipment in their future plant designs expected to enter commercial operation in late 2031 and beyond.	
Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
NextEra does not agree that the proposed revisions to EOP-012-3 satisfy paragraph 47 of the FERC directive, particularly the language *"Specifically, we direct NERC to ensure that the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration criteria included within the proposed Reliability Standard are objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them,"* as there are still many unknowns regarding specific criteria for solar generation. NextEra appreciates the efforts made by the Standard Drafting Team (SDT) to include additional constraint language for icing on wind turbines, however there should be similar language provided that addresses solar panels. As such, the modifications are not objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. In the drafting process for proposed EOP-012-3, it was acknowledged that no single list could account for all circumstances across North America for all technologies developed now and in the future. Hence, the team developed two lists: one addressing issues known to be constraints, and the second addressing issues which may, depending on the facts and circumstances, reasonably preclude implementation of corrective actions and therefore constitute a constraint. With respect to constraints for solar panels, in particular, during the development of various versions of the EOP-012 standard, it was acknowledged that solutions that call for removing frozen precipitation on solar panels would be impractical to implement; therefore, it is a specific situation that is included on the list of "known" constraints. Other constraints on the case-by-case list could apply to solar facilities depending on the facts and circumstances. For example, implementation of a measure would adversely affect reliability, or it would result in the premature closure of a facility. Whether a specific circumstance on this list applies would be up to the entity to demonstrate. The team	

endeavored to explain these possible circumstances in as much objective detail so that entities could generally understand whether their situation would qualify, and the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process would help ensure that these constraints are being applied evenly to all entities. To the extent NERC experience implementing the standard identifies additional solar-specific constraints, they could be considered for formal inclusion in Attachment 1 through the standards development process.	
Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Black Hills Corporation agrees with the comments provided by NAGF and EEI.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please sese response to the comments provided by NAGF and Edison Electric Institute (EEI).	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
MP agrees with NAGF comments, in that there needs to be a standardized process and documentation to follow to eliminate regional inconsistencies.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner. Please also see responses to the NAGF comments.

Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation concurs with NAGF comments. In addition, while the revised wording is an improvement over prior revisions, and elements of the "Known" Constraints are sufficiently clear to allow consistent application, many of the Constraint determinations rely on an uncertain "analysis", which while allowing latitude for particulars of each situation, also render the result subject to interpretation and difficult to audit. These uncertainties may be defined through application during the "abeyance" period, or implementation guidance, or by further refinement in a later version of the Standard. Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. In the drafting process for proposed EOP-012-3, it was acknowledged that no single list could account for all circumstances across North America for all technologies developed now and in the future. Hence, the team developed two lists: one addressing issues known to be constraints, and the second addressing issues which may, depending on the facts and circumstances,

reasonably preclude implementation of corrective actions and therefore constitute a constraint. Whether a specific circumstance on this list applies would be up to the entity to demonstrate. The team endeavored to explain these possible circumstances in as much objective detail so that entities could generally understand whether their situation would qualify, and the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process would help ensure that these constraints are being applied evenly to all entities.

Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

As you suggest, NERC will consider compliance guidance and further refinements to the standard as needed to provide further clarity, or, in the case of standards revisions, make needed improvements. NERC will also be reporting on implementation of the EOP-012 standard regularly to FERC to assess its effectiveness, in accordance with the directives in the February 2023 Order approving EOP-012-1.

Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

Constellation concurs with NAGF comments. In addition, while the revised wording is an improvement over prior revisions, and elements of the "Known" Constraints are sufficiently clear to allow consistent application, many of the Constraint determinations rely on an uncertain "analysis", which while allowing latitude for particulars of each situation, also render the result subject to interpretation and difficult to audit. These uncertainties may be defined through application during the "abeyance" period, or implementation guidance, or by further refinement in a later version of the Standard.

Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you. In the drafting process for proposed EOP-012-3, it was acknowledged that no single list could account for all circumstances across North America for all technologies developed now and in the future. Hence, the team developed two lists: one addressing issues known to be constraints, and the second addressing issues which may, depending on the facts and circumstances, reasonably preclude implementation of corrective actions and therefore constitute a constraint. Whether a specific circumstance on this list applies would be up to the entity to demonstrate. The team endeavored to explain these possible circumstances in as much objective detail so that entities could generally understand whether their situation would qualify, and the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process would help ensure that these constraints are being applied evenly to all entities.

Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

As you suggest, NERC will consider implementation guidance and further refinements to the standard as needed to provide further clarity, or, in the case of standards revisions, make the necessary improvements. NERC will also be reporting on implementation of the EOP-012 standard regularly to FERC to assess its effectiveness, in accordance with the directives in the February 2023 Order approving EOP-012-1.

Sean Bodkin - Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc. - 5,6, Group Name Dominion

Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment

Dominion Energy supports the EEI comments but has the following additional comments. While Dominion Energy agrees with the revised definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint, we continue to have concerns that the first 9 scenarios listed under “Case-by-case

Determinations of Generator Cold Weather Constraints" in Attachment 1 belong in the "Known Generator Cold Weather Constraints". Each of the scenarios are specific in nature and required to be validated by the CEA and a subjective view by NERC. These scenarios should be expected to be confirmed and approved automatically rather than relying on "interpretation". The 10th scenario is the only one that is general enough to warrant further review on a case-by-case basis.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see the response to the EEI comments. With respect to your additional comments, NERC has determined that the present record is insufficient to support the inclusion of all the "case-by-case" constraints on the "known" constraints list. NERC believes that, while this list is sufficiently detailed and objective and represents a significant improvement upon the status quo, additional review and analysis of the "case-by-case" constraints would help ensure that these constraints are being applied consistently across entities, and consistently with the overall intent of the EOP-012 standard to advance Generator Cold Weather Reliability. To the extent NERC's experience reviewing declared constraints provides a factual or technical basis to move the case-by-case constraints to the "known" list (such as with further supporting detail or clarification), NERC would recommend such changes be considered through the standard development process.	
Usama Tahir - Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. - 1,3,4,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Seminole Electric Cooperative SMEs request sufficient detail on how to adjust missing or invalid data. For example, is the missing/invalid data to be excluded from the dataset? If not, should the data be supplemented or estimated? Will the 'Determination of Location's Extreme Cold Weather Temperature' guide be updated to include specific criterion for adjustment of missing/invalid data?	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comment. It is NERC's intent that the revised Requirement R1 Part 1.1 will clarify that entities have flexibility to determine how they will account for missing or invalid data in their datasets. This change was made in response to comments on an earlier version of the draft EOP-012 standard that suggested potential compliance concerns when an entity had a less than perfect weather data set for a generating unit location. NERC has proposed a two-year compliance abeyance period for Requirement R1 Part 1.1 to gather information to support the development of additional guidance to entities regarding the treatment of missing data and, if needed, inform the development of further revisions to the standard or Extreme Cold Weather Temperature formula that would better advance the goal of Generator Cold Weather Reliability. NERC understands that other industry efforts may be underway to develop implementation guidance for ERO endorsement that may provide further guidance and information.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
The NAGF notes that the proposed EOP-012-3 Draft #3 does not contain the information necessary to ensure consistent application of the proposed "Known Generator Cold Weather Constraints" or "Case-by-Case Generator Cold Weather Constraints" as shown in Attachment 1. Without sufficient details provided to ensure the process is followed consistently across all regions, the end results of the process do not appear to be auditable. As such, it fails to meet the expectations of FERC as well as NERC's Ten Benchmarks of an Excellent Reliability Standard. If NERC continues to move the proposed standard forward, the NAGF asks that NERC staff work with industry to develop a new high-priority Standards Authorization Request to address this and other issues identified by industry to address this and other identified issues. As currently structured, there is no consideration of the cost versus reliability benefits for investing in hardening generator facilities for extreme cold weather. For example, how will NERC and the CEA evaluate the need to implement freeze protection measures to meet an ECWT of -15.1 degrees with a design minimum of -15 degrees at cost of $20 million to make a change to meet this ECWT? The existing documentation does not provide clarity related to the process, needed information or any level of cost/benefit or other means to determine what is expected to meet compliance.	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. In the drafting process for proposed EOP-012-3, it was acknowledged that no single list could account for all circumstances across North America for all technologies developed now and in the future. Hence, the team developed two lists: one addressing issues known to be constraints, and the second addressing issues which may, depending on the facts and circumstances, reasonably preclude implementation of corrective actions and therefore constitute a constraint.

Whether a specific circumstance on this list applies would be up to the entity to demonstrate. The team endeavored to explain these possible circumstances in as much objective detail so that entities could generally understand whether their situation would qualify, and the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process would help ensure that these constraints are being applied evenly to all entities. NERC believes that, while this list is sufficiently detailed and objective and represents a significant improvement upon the status quo, additional review and analysis of the "case-by-case" constraints would help ensure that these constraints are being applied consistently across entities, and consistently with the overall intent of the EOP-012 standard to advance generator cold weather reliability.

Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner. To the extent NERC's experience provides a factual or technical basis to move any case-by-case constraints to the "known" list" (such as with further supporting detail or clarification), NERC would recommend such changes be considered through the standard development process.

With respect to the comment about cost/benefit analysis, FERC specifically directed NERC to remove all references to "reasonable cost," "unreasonable cost," "cost," and "good business practices" from the EOP-012 standard. June 2024 Order at P 47. Consistent with FERC's guidance, NERC has removed such language. NERC instead proposes to include a limited set of clearly defined circumstances which, in the opinion of the various industry subject matter experts that have provided input on this project, would generally constitute an acceptable economic constraint, subject to case-by-case review. Attachment 1 also includes other circumstances that, while not directly mentioning costs or economics, have economic implications (e.g., a corrective action that would require an entity to replace wind turbines solely to install

blade de-icing technologies is a “known” constraint). NERC believes the EOP-012 development record supports the inclusion of these constraints, which are clear, specific, and auditable, even if the individual facts and circumstances may vary by entity. To the extent NERC or an industry stakeholder identifies additional specific instances where application of freeze protection measures would be unreasonable, those specific instances may be considered for formal inclusion on the constraint list through the standard development process in a future project. Similarly, if a specific, auditable, and evenly applied formula for identifying “unreasonable costs” is identified, it may be considered for inclusion through the standard development process.	
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Ameren supports EEI's and NAGF's comments, with more support towards NAGF's comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please refer to the responses to the EEI and NAGF comments.	
Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
WEC Energy Group supports the NAGF comments as submitted.	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
NYPA supports NAGF Comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
The Independent System Operator/Regional Transmission Organization (ISO/RTO) Standards Review Committee (SRC) (consisting, for purposes of these comments, of CAISO, ERCOT, ISO-NE, PJM, MISO, NYISO, and SPP) appreciates the work undertaken to date. The SRC through these comments responds to NERC's questions as to whether the revised draft of EOP-012-3 adequately addresses FERC's directives. The SRC notes that, for the reasons outlined below, the proposed revisions to the definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraint do not fully address the FERC directives in paragraph 47 of the June 2024 Order. Specifically, the second sentence of the revised definition is inconsistent with paragraph 47 and should be deleted or revised. Additionally, to fully address the Commission's concern that constraint declaration criteria be "sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them," certain constraint criteria in	

Attachment 1 need to be accompanied by a detailed, well-documented evaluation process to ensure entities understand what will be required of them and reduce the risk of uneven application of the constraint criteria undermining EOP-012-3's underlying goal of improving winterization across the generating fleet. In order to provide constructive comments for NERC's consideration, the SRC proposes specific recommendations that would address these concerns and bring the proposed standard in line with FERC's directives.

Constraint Definition: The Generator Cold Weather Constraint definition defines a constraint as any condition that would preclude a GO from implementing freeze protection measures on Generator Cold Weather Critical Components, then goes on to indicate that freeze protection measures include winterization technologies and practices implemented by similarly situated members of the electric industry. This effectively links the concept of a constraint to existing industry practice, but does not provide guidance on how similar an industry peer might need to be in order to be relevant to the entity declaring a constraint. Linking the constraint concept to existing industry practice is inappropriate for a standard like EOP-012-3 that is designed to improve the overall state of winterization across the generation fleet, not merely maintain the winterization status quo.

Even with the list of potential constraints in Attachment 1, the second sentence of the definition does not meet FERC's directive to be objective and sufficiently detailed to enable applicable entities to understand what is required of them. While the SRC recognizes and supports the drafting team's goal of clarifying that unreasonable freeze protection measures are not required, the second sentence of the definition does not achieve this goal, as it gives the impression that the status quo is a sufficient benchmark.

Proposed Remedy: This SRC concern can be addressed by deleting the second sentence of the revised definition and retaining the first sentence, or by revising the second sentence of the definition to replace the link to existing industry practice with a link to freeze protection measure effectiveness. If NERC elects to revise the second sentence, the SRC recommends the sentence be revised to read as follows: "Freeze protection measures are not intended to be limited to optimum practices, methods, or technologies, but are also intended to include practices, methods, or technologies that would reasonably be expected to result in effective facility performance while operating at the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature."

Attachment 1 Constraint Criteria: While the SRC believes that EOP-012-3's proposed approach of requiring Compliance Enforcement Authority (CEA) review and approval of constraint declarations is a significant improvement over EOP-012-2, two of the example constraints from the *Case-by-case Determinations of Generator Cold Weather Constraints* section of Attachment 1 require additional clarification regarding how NERC will ensure the Commission's concern that the standard's provisions be "objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them" is adequately addressed. The SRC outlines its concerns below and proposes as a

remedy that, as part of its submission, the NERC Board commits to developing and filing a well-documented, rigorous evaluation process to ensure consistent, objective evaluation of constraints that are based on these two example constraints.

Specifically, constraint declarations that resemble the examples found in items 5.a (accelerated premature retirement of an existing generating unit) and 5.b (cancellation of plans to finish development of a new generating unit) in the *Case-by-case Determinations of Generator Cold Weather Constraints* section of Attachment 1 should be reviewed under a well-documented evaluation process to ensure they meet the FERC directive that constraint criteria provide sufficient detail for applicable entities to understand what is required of them. This evaluation process will need to explain how the CEA will evaluate the following factors for these constraint criteria:

Item 5.a. For item 5.a, the evaluation process will need to address how the CEA will determine how "accelerated" or "premature" a retirement must be in order to qualify as a constraint under this example. It will also need to specify how the CEA will determine that the requirement to implement freeze protection measures was the clear cause of the premature retirement.

To effectively evaluate whether the requirement to winterize would result in an accelerated premature retirement, the CEA would need to examine the cost of the freeze protection measures, forecasts of future energy prices, and commercially sensitive data about unit operating costs and profitability to determine whether winterizing the unit would truly be uneconomic over the unit's future remaining life. Moreover, the analysis would also need to consider the across-the-board electricity price impacts that could result from competitors of that unit attempting to pass through the costs of similar weatherization work. Such price increases could offset the costs of implementing freeze protection measures, making it extremely difficult to effectively review a determination that the requirement to implement the winterization measure would **result** in accelerated premature retirement. Such a review would likely require a complete examination of the projected future profitability of the unit under a range of scenarios.

This degree of economic analysis and forecasting would also involve what could be a highly subjective examination of that unit's competitive position relative to its peers on a forward-looking basis, and the entire process will need to be thoroughly documented to ensure consistency with FERC's directive that constraint declaration criteria be objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them. Along these same lines, the constraint evaluation process for item 5.a should address how the CEA will determine whether an "acceptable replacement" is available for the unit in question. In competitive markets, this information is highly confidential and market sensitive, which means the GO declaring the constraint will need clear, detailed guidance on how to make the required showing. The SRC raises these issues to highlight the difficult nature of consistently and objectively applying this evaluation and to emphasize the importance of developing a well-documented evaluation process to ensure consistent application of the exception enabling the intent of EOP-012-3 for improving weatherization across the generation fleet.

Item 5.b. Item 5.b similarly needs a detailed process documenting how the CEA will determine whether implementation of the freeze protection measures would **cause** the GO to cancel plans to finish development of a new generating unit.

Decisions to cancel a unit could be based on many factors, including changes to the underlying economics of developing the unit. In this case, evaluating the asserted basis for cancelling the development of the planned new generating unit could require the CEA to attempt to forecast future generator revenues while accounting for higher wholesale electricity prices resulting from increased costs faced by other units as a result of installing freeze protection measures. Without clear processes, the CEA could have to examine minutes of board meetings and interview company officials in order to effectively determine whether the decision to cancel the development of the new unit would truly be caused by the requirement to install freeze protection measures instead of some other factor, such as higher interest rates or increased permitting costs (as compared to expected future revenues).

The constraint evaluation process should require more than a simple assertion or attestation that the GO would prematurely retire the unit or cancel the construction of a new generating unit if required to implement the freeze protection measure in question. Otherwise, it will be difficult to distinguish constraint declarations that truly implicate the existence of a generating unit from those that are driven by a desire to avoid costs that are inconvenient but manageable. Inconsistent application of this example constraint criterion could undermine the goal of ensuring reliability by bringing all generating units up to a minimum winterization level (subject to only a limited set of constraints based on the physical limitations of certain units) based on expected conditions.

To ensure constraint approvals are consistent, the case-by-case considerations for these constraint criteria should be supported by a rigorous, well-documented evaluation process. This would not eliminate the CEA's authority to evaluate special circumstances, rather it would avoid a potential race to the bottom where units could arbitrarily seek constraints, ultimately resulting in a class of partially winterized units with lower operating costs (and therefore a competitive advantage when they are able to operate) compared to fully winterized units in the same region. Inconsistent application of these constraint criteria could incentivize unit owners to declare these constraints to protect their competitive positions relative to other units. This could be detrimental to reliability, as it could result in uneven winterization of generation units within a region, posing operational challenges for grid operators seeking to manage the grid during extreme cold weather conditions. To help avoid this result, the NERC Board must develop a detailed process explaining how these types of constraint declarations will be evaluated and the types of documentation it will expect GOs to provide to support declarations of these types of constraints. The process should be filed with FERC to provide Industry an opportunity to review the process and provide comments on the process before EOP-012-3 goes into effect and GOs begin submitting constraint declarations for review and approval. Given time constraints, the SRC acknowledges that such a filing could be made as a supplemental filing after EOP-012-3 is filed.

Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC responds to each of the comments as follows:

Constraint Definition: Feedback received in previous comment periods indicated support for retaining the second sentence in the definition intended to elaborate on what is meant by "freeze protection measures". NERC, however, agrees that this sentence could be improved to reflect other changes in the EOP-012 standard to improve generator cold weather preparedness, not maintain the status quo. While NERC agrees with what it understands to be the intent of the suggested revisions, concerns were identified with the use of the terms "reasonably" and "effective" which may introduce potential ambiguity or uncertainty as to the intended scope. Therefore, NERC has revised the definition as follows: "Freeze protection measures are not intended to be limited to optimum practices, methods, or technologies, but are also intended to include practices, methods, or technologies that would be expected to result in improved generating unit performance during cold temperatures."

Attachment 1 Constraint Criteria:

Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. The SRC's comments further note the need for appropriate rigor in this review to ensure consistency with the overall goal of the EOP-012 standard to improve generator cold weather preparedness. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency, transparency, and appropriate rigor in ERO Enterprise constraint reviews will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how these goals will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner. NERC recognizes the importance of timely and transparent communications with stakeholders regarding this novel CMEP process and will keep stakeholders informed as refinements are made and new guidance is available.

Regarding the specific examples provided in the comment, NERC understands that the SRC is concerned that entities may be inclined to declare constraints for examples 5.a. and 5.b in the case-by-case constraints list of Attachment 1 to avoid costs that are "inconvenient but manageable." While the SRC proposes that NERC require "more than a simple assertion or attestation" to support declaring such constraints, NERC notes that the posted draft EOP-012-3 did not include an attestation requirement, but a requirement that the determination be supported by analysis. A thorough analysis would consider, among other things, the availability of cost recovery mechanisms (see June 2024 Order at n. 92), and it must support the determination made. While NERC originally believed this would be sufficient to avoid "simple assertions" of economic unreasonableness, after considering the SRC's comments, NERC believes the addition of an attestation requirement

would help mitigate the SRC's concerns regarding potentially spurious constraint declarations. Further, FERC suggested an attestation regarding such constraints would be an acceptable way to meet its directive in its June 2024 Order. See June 2024 Order at P 46:

> For example, one approach could be for NERC to provide a limited set of clearly defined circumstances that could serve as constraints, such as an attestation from a GO or Generator Operator (GOP) that…(2) implementing freeze protection measures in accordance with the Reliability Standard would cause the generating unit to retire within two years; or (3) they would cancel a newly scheduled generating unit that has not yet achieved commercial operation if required to comply with the freeze protection requirements of a Standard.

As such, NERC has revised examples 5.a and 5.b to require that any entity seeking to declare such a constraint must include an attestation signed by an officer of the company affirming the determination (supported by analysis) that the implementation of freeze protection measures, while feasible, would result in the accelerated premature retirement of an existing generating unit with no acceptable replacement available within the accelerated timeframe (5a), or the implementation of freeze protection measures would cause the GO to cancel plans to finish the development of a new generating unit (5b).

NERC believes that these revisions would provide an additional level of assurance that these constraints are not being declared more than truly necessary and only after an analysis has been performed that supports the determination. NERC also believes that the addition of this attestation requirement would impose no significant additional burden on entities seeking to declare such constraints. The ERO Enterprise will review all declared constraints for consistency with the EOP-012 standard.

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
See comment to question 8.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to question 8.	

Michael Goggin - Grid Strategies LLC - 5	
Answer	No
Document Name	Comments on EOP-012.docx
Comment	

Thank you for your comments.

With respect to your first comment, NERC appreciates the additional feedback and information that has been provided regarding the potential timelines for developing wind turbine towers to meet a lower temperature threshold below the -30C (-22F) design standard and the considerations involved. As indicated in the Technical Rationale, NERC has recognized that the wind turbine tower issue should constitute a "known" constraint, as NERC understands that presently no manufacturer sells a wind tower that would be capable of providing the EOP-012 required capability for locations with an ECWT below -30C (-22F). However, the Commission has recognized that generator cold weather reliability is an extremely important matter, and it has directed NERC in two EOP-012 approval proceedings to ensure that the EOP-012 standard is working to address cold weather reliability risks more quickly. If this "known" constraint did not have an end date, it would not encourage the development of new technologies that would be able to meet the criteria expected of units being installed well after these criteria were established in the first version of the EOP-012 standard approved in February 2023. To the contrary, it would preserve the status quo indefinitely. Including an end date signals that there will be a time past which this situation will not be afforded the same deference as a "known" constraint. NERC believes the proposed dates represent a reasonable start, as they are 6.5 years and 8.5 years, respectively, from the date the criteria for new units was approved in Reliability Standard EOP-012-1 (Feb. 2023), and five years from the effective date of the first version of the EOP-012 standard (Oct. 2024). Therefore, NERC has not made the recommended revisions.

With respect to your second comment, NERC has declined to make the suggested revision to provide that known constraints should not be subject to pre-clearance validation, only after the fact audit, as NERC does not believe such a provision would be consistent with the Commission's directives in the June 2024 Order. *See, e.g.*, June 2024 Order at P 53 ("[G]iven the significant reliability risk evidenced by the failure of generating units during recent extreme winter weather events, we continue to believe that an enhanced level of oversight remains necessary to ensure that Generator Cold Weather Constraints are only declared when warranted"); P 54 ("Accordingly, we again direct NERC, pursuant to section 215(d)(5) of the FPA, to modify proposed Reliability Standard so that NERC receives, reviews, evaluates, and confirms for validity the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations in a timely manner."). The revised EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process provides that "known" constraints will generally be reviewed within 10 days of confirming receipt of the submittal. Consistent with Attachment 1, the CEA will be looking to confirm that the circumstances described in the "known"

constraint are present. The "case-by-case" constraints will require a more fact-specific evaluation. NERC is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

With respect to your third comment regarding actions taken after a denial, an entity shall update its Corrective Action Plan with corrective actions that will be completed within the timetables in Requirement R6 Part 6.3 or Requirement R7 Part 7.1. Communication efforts between the submitting entity and the CEA related to updates of the Corrective Action Plan and timetables resulting from a denial of a Generator Cold Weather Constraint are strongly encouraged. NERC believes this clarification addresses your concerns, but welcomes additional feedback on further enhancements that can be made.

Regarding your comment on the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature, the supporting rationale for the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature was explained in detail in the proceeding approving EOP-012-1 and is not being revised as part of this project. NERC will validate or approve Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations based on whether they meet one of the stated criteria in Attachment 1, regardless of what inability to winterize that creates.

Regarding your comment on visibility of approved and denied constraints, NERC has revised the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide that aggregated, anonymized information may be collected by NERC to facilitate industry awareness. NERC has not specified a timeline to allow flexibility to provide updates as needed.

Regarding your comment to move three of the items presently on the "case-by-case" list to the "known" list, NERC has declined to make the suggested revision. NERC believes that, while these constraints are sufficiently detailed and objective and represent a significant improvement upon the status quo, additional review and analysis of these constraints would help ensure that they are being applied consistently across entities, and consistently with the overall intent of the EOP-012 standard to advance generator cold weather reliability. To the extent NERC's experience reviewing declared constraints provides a factual or technical basis to move any case-by-case constraints to the "known" list (such as with further supporting detail or clarification), NERC would recommend such changes be considered through the standard development process.

With respect to your suggestion to expand the compliance abeyance period to cover all of proposed EOP-012-3, NERC also declines to make the suggested revision. The proposed compliance abeyance period is intended to address a specific concern related to the calculation of the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature when an entity is working with one or more incomplete data sets. It is intended to encourage entities

with questions about their calculations to seek ERO Enterprise guidance so that any potential issues may addressed more quickly than they might otherwise be found through compliance monitoring activities and inform any future refinements that may be needed. While NERC will continue to develop lessons learned and guidance as needed to aid entities in implementing EOP-012 requirements, NERC does not believe a compliance abeyance period for the entire standard would serve the same reliability benefit, particularly as it would also apply to requirements that have been moved over from EOP-011-3 and have been in effect for some time.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
See response to all comments included in the attached Word file at the conclusion of the document.	
Brian Lindsey - Entergy - 1,3,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
No Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AEPC has signed on to ACES comments. See ACES comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to ACES comments.	
Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AZPS does not object to the proposed Generator Cold Weather Constraint criteria. AZPS agrees with comments submitted by EEI on behalf of their members listed below that the section titled Case by Case Determination of Generator Cold Weather Constraints is too subjective and could result in regional inconsistencies.	

In paragraph 47, the Commission recognized this concern and suggested that NERC "establish a pre-approval process for all Generator Cold Weather Constraint" and while that process was left to NERC to establish, the Commission was clear that the process needed to provide consistent compliance and enforcement outcomes. The process document titled "Generator Cold Weather Extension and Constraint Process", does not appear to meet the expectations set by the Commission. To address this concern, we suggest modifying the process to include oversite that ensures that Cold Weather Constraints are approved in a manner that makes certain that GO declarations are reviewed and approved consistently across all regions. Also, the process should be enhanced to provide clearer guidance regarding entity submissions to ensure consistency in both entity submissions and CEA assessments. (See EEI comments regarding the Compliance Process in our response to Question 8.)	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.	
Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
WECC supports the development of Attachment 1 and additional materials delivered by the drafting team 321 team in meeting the FERC directives. Industry should work towards providing clarity in freeze protection measures and Generator Cold Weather Critical Components which, effectively, are the basis for a Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration. It would be beneficial for the ERO Enterprise to	

consider posting (anonymized) examples of case-by-case determinations of Generator Cold Weather Constraints to support overall industry efforts.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Evergy supports and incorporates by reference the comments of the EEI and the North American Generator Forum (NAGF) on question 1	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the responses to the comments provided by NAGF and EEI.	
Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
It is the opinion of ACES that the proposed revisions to Attachment 1 are largely insubstantial changes and overall provide greater clarity over the previous revision.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment.	
Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
EEI does not object to the proposed definition of Generator Cold Weather Constraints or proposed Attachment 1. While we do not object to Attachment 1 and support the list of Known Generator Cold Weather Constraints, the second part of Attachment 1, which includes a Section titled Case by Case Determination of Generator Cold Weather Constraints is too subjective and could result in regional inconsistencies. In paragraph 47, the Commission recognized this concern and suggested that NERC "establish a pre-approval process for all Generator Cold Weather Constraint" and while that process was left to NERC to establish, the Commission was clear that the process needed to provide consistent compliance and enforcement outcomes. The process document titled "Generator Cold Weather Extension and Constraint Process", does not appear to meet the expectations set by the Commission. To address this concern, we suggest modifying the process to include oversite that ensures that Cold Weather Constraints are approved in a manner that makes certain that GO declarations are reviewed and approved consistently across all regions. Also, the process should be enhanced to provide clearer guidance regarding entity submissions to ensure consistency in both entity submissions and CEA assessments. (See EEI comments regarding the Compliance Process in our response to Question 8.)	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.	
Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Southern Company agrees if EEI's "Proposed Language for Review and Comment" concerns are met.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to EEI comment.	
Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to MRO NSRF Comments.	
Jessica Cordero - Unisource - Tucson Electric Power Co. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Thank you for your response.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Joanne Anderson - Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington - 1,4,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your response.	
Anna Martinson - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO Group	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mohamad Elhusseini - DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company - 3,5, Group Name DTE Energy	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Langston - Tallahassee Electric (City of Tallahassee, FL) - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mark Flanary - Midwest Reliability Organization(MRO) - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Israel Perez - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your response.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Adrian Andreoiu - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

Rachel Coyne - Texas Reliability Entity, Inc. - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Greg Sorenson - ReliabilityFirst - 10 - RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Donna Wood - Tri-State G and T Association, Inc. - 1,3,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Duane Franke - Manitoba Hydro - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
The definition of cold weather constraint appears unchanged.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. The definition was not changed in the prior posting, however, it has been revised to be clearer with the intent of the EOP-012 standard to advance Generator Cold Weather Reliability and not maintain the status quo in response to comments received during this posting.	

2. In paragraph 54 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC to modify EOP-012-2 "so that NERC receives, reviews, evaluates, and confirms for validity the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations in a timely manner."

To address this directive, proposed EOP-012-3 would require each Generator Owner that declares a constraint to submit it to the CEA for validation (Requirement R8 Part 8.1). Constraints shall be submitted within 45 calendar days of determining that the Generator Cold Weather Constraint is applicable (for new units this time is within 15 days of entering commercial operation). The process for ERO review is addressed separately in an ERO process document.

Do you agree that the modifications in Requirement R8 are responsive to the FERC directive in paragraph 54? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
See comment to question 8.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to comment in question 8.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

Requirement R8 is not fully responsive to the FERC directive in paragraph 54. In paragraph 54, the example FERC included to illustrate its intent contemplated NERC or Regional Entity review of both new constraint declarations and changes to existing constraint declarations. However, Requirement R8 does not require NERC or Regional Entity review of changes to existing constraint declarations. To address this omission, the SRC recommends that the following language be added to the end of Requirement R8, Part 8.1: "For changes to existing Generator Cold Weather Constraints, submit within 45 calendar days of identifying the change to the Generator Cold Weather Constraint."	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC understands your concern to be what happens if an entity "changes" their constraint. Constraint declarations are highly dependent on the facts and circumstances. NERC interprets Requirement R8 and R9 such that, if a validated constraint no longer applies for whatever reason, the constraint is no longer "valid." The entity must develop or update a Corrective Action Plan addressing the underlying issue. If no constraint would be valid, the entity must implement the corrective actions according to the specified timeframe. If a different constraint would apply, the entity must submit a new constraint for CEA review within the specified timeline. As NERC believes your concern is addressed within the existing framework, NERC has not made the suggested change.	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
NYPA supports NAGF Comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	

Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
WEC Energy Group supports the NAGF comments as submitted.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Ameren supports EEI's and NAGF's comments, with more support towards NAGF's comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you. Please see the responses to the EEI and NAGF comments.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	
Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment
As stated above, FERC does not require NERC to approve the constraint. The CEA has to validate the submitted constraint. The NAGF recommends that NERC modify the proposed standard to ensure NERC is informed of any constraints and confirm the Generator Owner has appropriately addressed all areas of reasonableness. The NAGF is also concerned that the CEAs do not have the expertise, staff or processes in place to manage this process. Several CEAs currently have a large backlog of compliance and enforcement efforts outstanding. The NAGF is concerned that adding the review and determination of constraints under the needed timeline will cause the backlog to grow even more. The NAGF has concerns related to interaction between the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process document. While we appreciate that the drafting team added language in the latest version concerning the ability to request a joint NERC and CEA review of a denial of a constraint declaration, this still does not resolve our concern regarding the scenario of a denial of constraint declaration from second NERC and CEA review. Particularly, our concern is in regard to a new project that has reached commercial operation status under R2.2 where no CAP is allowed. The process does not specify next steps that the Generator Owner can take. For example, does the Generator Owner cease operation of a brand-new generation facility to avoid going into non-compliance because the Generator Owner could not get constraint declaration approved? In addition, the process document is not part of EOP-012-3, but there are timelines specified in the process document. It is not clear what happens if the timelines are not followed by the Generator Owner/Operator. Additionally, the process document only describes the process that should be followed but does not provide the criteria in which the CEA will use to approve/deny a CAP extension or Constraint Declaration. This raises a concern that the CEAs will not be following a consistent set of criteria across the ERO.
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments.	

With respect to your comment regarding CEA review of constraints, NERC disagrees that FERC did not contemplate ERO pre-approval of any constraints. FERC contemplated situations where NERC could address its directive by validating those constraints met certain pre-defined criteria, or requiring pre-approval of all constraints.

In paragraph 47 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC as follows:

> Accordingly, we direct NERC, pursuant to section 215(d)(5) of the FPA, to develop and submit to the Commission for approval modifications to proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-2 that address concerns related to the ambiguity of the newly defined Generator Cold Weather Constraint term and criteria. Specifically, we direct NERC to ensure that the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration criteria included within the proposed Reliability Standard are objective *and* sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them. One approach to satisfy this directive could be to incorporate into the proposed Reliability Standard a limited and discrete list of circumstances that would qualify as acceptable constraints… Alternatively, NERC could establish a pre-approval process for all Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations. While a clearly defined list may be preferable, a pre-approval process could be established to ensure entities' declared Generator Cold Weather Constraints are appropriate and can be supported and defended."

NERC has proposed a hybrid approach with elements of both in proposed EOP-012-3. Certain "known" constraints would be validated by the CEA; others would be subject to CEA pre-approval to help ensure they would be applied consistently with the stated criteria and supported by reasonable justification. This pre-approval process would help avoid the potential gamesmanship of the constraint process identified in previous EOP-012 approval proceedings that would harm cold weather reliability. As FERC specifically stated that NERC could delegate this task to the Regional Entities in paragraph 54 of the June 2024 Order, NERC has chosen to do so. NERC understands that NAGF is concerned about CEA staffing and capabilities to address constraints; NERC is responsible for oversight of the ERO Enterprise CMEP and will exercise that oversight in the management of the constraint review process.

To that end, several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

With respect to your concern about timelines in the process document, these timelines are intended to promote timely reviews and avoid delays associated with the receipt of multiple last-minute submissions. For example, NERC asks entities to submit Corrective Action Plan extension requests at least 60 days in advance. However, NERC recognizes that in certain situations the submittal timeframes may not be met due to circumstances beyond the control of a Generator Owner. The ERO Enterprise will prioritize efforts to help ensure timely processing of extension requests as these circumstances arise. However, these efforts will be greatly assisted if entities are proactive in seeking any necessary validations or approvals as soon as they become aware of the need for one.

With respect to your question about the specific application of the EOP-012-3 standard to a Generator Owner owning a new generating unit subject to Requirement R2, NERC notes that, in paragraph 72 of the June Order, FERC found "that generators that are commercially operational after October 1, 2027, should have freeze protection measures either designed into their generating systems, or, if a corrective action plan is needed, then it should be completed by the time that such generating units go into commercial operation." The next steps following a constraint denial will be highly dependent on the facts and circumstances. As a general matter, if a specific constraint declaration is denied or found to be invalid, the Generator Owner may work with its Compliance Enforcement Authority to determine if an alternative constraint in Attachment 1 would apply. Timely and proactive contact with the Compliance Enforcement Authority would help ensure that any potential issues can be addressed early on.

Usama Tahir - Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. - 1,3,4,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Seminole Electric Cooperative requests the standard drafting team to modify the standard to submit to the regional CEA considering the established relationship between Generator Owners and their regional entities.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comment. Proposed EOP-012-3 would require the Generator Owner to submit any declared constraints to its CEA, which in most cases would be its Regional Entity.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Recommend the following modification of R8.4 (the addition of the word 'if' to the first sentence): Document and provide notice to the CEA, when a generating unit experiences a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event, **if** the cause of Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event is the same as that of a previous Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event at the same or a similar unit, and one or more corrective actions to address the cause of the more recent Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event are addressed by an existing validated Generator Cold Weather Constraint for the same or a similar unit.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC received several suggestions to improve the wording of this Requirement R8 Part 8.4 and has clarified the language consistent with those suggestions. This provision now reads, "Document and provide notice to the CEA, when a generating unit experiences a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event with the same cause of a previous Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event at the same or a similar unit, and one or more corrective actions to address the cause is addressed by an existing validated Generator Cold Weather Constraint for the same or a similar unit."	
Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

It is the opinion of ACES that the timeline identified for new units identified in Requirement R8, part 8.1 bullet point one is unclear. It is not readily apparent to ACES how this requirement applies to any potential Generator Cold Weather Constraint(s) determined after the generating unit(s) began commercial operation.

Furthermore, the term commercial operation is listed in the NERC Glossary of Terms as a WEEC Regional Definition. Is this term meant to have a different application in the WECC region as opposed to other NERC regions?

We recommend striking the WECC Regional Term "Commercial Operation" and adding a new Continent-wide Term "Commercial Operation" with the following definition:

Commercial Operation:

The stage when an Element connected to the Bulk-Power System begins operating under a contractual or regulatory agreement.

Note: This phase typically

- follows initial start-up testing and/or commissioning activities.
- is associated with the ability of the owner/operator of the Element to begin collecting revenue from said Element.

Additionally, we recommend the following modification to Requirement R8 for the sake of clarity:

R8. Each Generator Owner that declares a Generator Cold Weather Constraint in accordance with Attachment 1 shall:

8.1 Submit its Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration(s) to the CEA as follows:

8.1.1 For any Generator Cold Weather Constraint(s) determined prior to a generating unit(s) beginning Commercial Operation (in accordance with Requirement R2), submit no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after beginning Commercial Operation;

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comment. Requirement R8 Part 8.1 is intended to address the identification of Generator Cold Weather Constraints that would preclude the implementation of freeze protection measures to provide the required capability at the time of entering commercial operation. As a practical matter, the entity should identify those constraints in advance of entering commercial operation and reach out to their CEA to initiate the review process; however, concerns were raised earlier in the development of the proposed EOP-012-3 standard regarding the standard requiring specific actions of entities prior to them being registered and subject to mandatory compliance with NERC Reliability Standards. For that reason, NERC has declined to make the suggested revision to Requirement R8 Part 8.1.1. With respect to the term "commercial operation", proposed EOP-012-3 footnote 1 clarifies that "commercial operation means achievement of this designation indicating that the facility has received all approvals necessary for operation after completion of initial start-up testing." The WECC definition of Commercial Operation is not being proposed as a continent-wide term at this time. If appropriate, a future project could consider development of a continent wide definition; until then, the term is intended to be used with its common meaning in the continent-wide standards where it is used.	
Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
MP agrees with NAGF – stating CEA's are do not have the expertise, staff, or process to manage validation. The current backlog would likely increase, delaying the approval process.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments, which addresses NERC oversight of the Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program of which the CEA review process is a part, and that FERC specifically stated in the June 2024 Order that NERC may choose to delegate the review task to the Regional Entities.	
Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment
Black Hills Corporation agrees with the comments provided by NAGF.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.

Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment
NextEra does not agree that the proposed revisions to EOP-012-3 satisfy paragraph 47 of the FERC directive, particularly the language *"Specifically, we direct NERC to ensure that the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration criteria included within the proposed Reliability Standard are objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them,"* as there are still many unknowns regarding specific criteria for solar generation. NextEra appreciates the efforts made by the Standard Drafting Team to include additional constraint language for icing on wind turbines, however there should be similar language provided that addresses solar panels. As such, the modifications are not objective and sufficiently detailed so that applicable entities understand what is required of them.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early

implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

With respect to constraints for solar panels in particular, during the development of various versions of the EOP-012 standard, it was acknowledged that solutions that call for removing frozen precipitation on solar panels would be impractical to implement; therefore, it is a specific situation that is included on the list of "known" constraints. Other constraints on the case-by-case list could apply to solar facilities depending on the facts and circumstances. For example, implementation of a measure would adversely affect reliability, or it would result in the premature closure of a facility. Whether a specific circumstance on this list applies would be up to the entity to demonstrate. The team endeavored to explain these possible circumstances in as much objective detail so that entities could generally understand whether their situation would qualify, and the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process would help ensure that these constraints are being applied evenly to all entities. To the extent NERC's experience implementing the standard identifies additional solar-specific constraints, they could be considered for formal inclusion in Attachment 1 through the standards development process.

Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

AES US Renewables still has concerns about the process described in the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process. Although the timelines listed in the document (eg: no less than 60 calendar days) are considered un-enforceable, we are concerned that this document leaves a lot of room for interpretation by each Regional Entity's team that will be utilizing this document to review and approve CAP Extensions and Constraint Declarations. We do appreciate that there is language added in the latest version concerning the ability to request a joint NERC and CEA review of a denial (applies to both CAP extension and constraint declaration). However, this still does not resolve the concern regarding the second NERC and CEA review resulting in a denial, particularly for a new project that has reached commercial operation status under R2.2 where no CAP is allowed. The process does not specify next steps that the Generator Owner can take. For example, what choices does the Generator Owner have if there are no commercially available solutions to mitigate the freeze protection issue?

We request that NERC take these scenarios into account to provide further clarifications or include additional language in the "Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process" document to make the process clearer, including guidance on next steps when a constraint declaration is denied under R2.2 (after a joint NERC and CEA review) and whether the GO can continue to operate the facility as is. The EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process document also does not have sufficient detailed language to ensure that Cold Weather Constraints declarations would be reviewed consistently across all regions for approvals. Also, since the process falls outside of Reliability Standard EOP-012-3, changes to the defined process may not include industry review and comment. We request that NERC consider addressing consistency concerns as well as clarifying to industry how this document will be enforced or otherwise.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

With respect to your question about the next steps following a constraint denial for a Generator Owner owning a new generating unit subject to Requirement R2, NERC notes that, in paragraph 72 of the June Order, FERC found "that generators that are commercially operational after October 1, 2027, should have freeze protection measures either designed into their generating systems, or, if a corrective action plan is needed, then it should be completed by the time that such generating units go into commercial operation." The next steps following a constraint denial will be highly dependent on the facts and circumstances of the unit. As a general matter, if a specific constraint declaration is denied or found to be invalid, the Generator Owner may work with its Compliance Enforcement Authority to determine if an alternative constraint in Attachment 1 would apply. Timely and proactive contact with the Compliance Enforcement Authority would help ensure that any potential issues can be addressed early on.

Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1

Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
AEPC has signed on to ACES comments. See ACES comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment, please see response to ACES.	
Brian Lindsey - Entergy - 1,3,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Entergy notes that the NERC "Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process" (Step 2 – ERO Enterprise Review, page 2) requires the CEA to "*complete the review within 45 calendar days of acknowledgement or provide notification to the submitting entity that they are extending the time needed for review*", but does not limit or cap the amount of time the CEA has to complete the review explicitly, which could result in significant delays.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. NERC recognizes that entities may be concerned if the Compliance Enforcement Authority unreasonably delays the review of their Corrective Action Plan extension request or their Generator Cold Weather Constraint, and the implications that may have for the registered entity if the extension request is denied or the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration is deemed invalid. It is NERC's expectation that all such requests will be reviewed in a timely manner across the ERO Enterprise and to the extent any delay would	

impact compliance obligations, that would be handled on a case-by-case basis with the entity. NERC will provide guidance as needed to ensure that entities provide the proper documentation and support to facilitate a timely review.	
Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments. Additionally, changes to R8 do not support standard language regarding administrative burden for this question. For example, Duke Energy notes that changes to R8, and the associated reasoning provided in the Technical Rationale document for Paragraph 54's directive, to add a timeliness component for the CEA to review constraints does not appear to meet the FERC directive. R8 does not provide guidelines or processes on how the CEA will provide or perform reviews in timely manner.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see response to EEI's comments. NERC proposes to address the Commission's paragraph 54 directive through Reliability Standard requirements, addressing what users, owners, and operators of the BPS must do regarding the timely submission of Generator Cold Weather Constraint, and the Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process, which address the timely review by the ERO Enterprise under the umbrella of the Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program. Requirement R8 Part 8.4 was added to address concerns about administrative burdens associated with known issues at generating units that have already completed the process of validating a Generator Cold Weather Constraint. In that case, the entity must notify the CEA of a repeat issue so that reliability oversight may be maintained, but is not required to seek a second extensive validation for its preexisting Generator Cold Weather Constraint. In response to comments, this provision was modified to be more clear as to the required actions.	
Greg Sorenson - ReliabilityFirst - 10 - RF	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Agree with modification. Please consider adding language that any findings when reviewing Corrective Action Plans should be communicated to the RC, PC, BA, etc.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC understands this comment to refer to ERO Enterprise approvals of Corrective Action Plan extensions more generally. The draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process is revised to state that NERC may aggregate anonymized information on Corrective Action Plan extension request to facilitate industry awareness. To the extent that entities responsible for planning and operating the Bulk-Power System would like additional detail from their Generator Owners that is relevant to their responsibilities, they have the ability under other Reliability Standards to request such information.	
Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Southern Company agrees with EEI's concerns and agrees with the statement if EEI's concerns are addressed for Question 2.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the EEI comments.	
Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

EEI agrees that the modifications made to Requirement R8 are responsive to the directive in paragraph 54 of the FERC Order, however, the language in Requirement R8, subpart 8.4 appears to be incorrectly linked to subpart 8.3 through the addition of the "and" after the Requirement. We additionally suggest some minor non-substantive changes to 8.4 to improve the clarity of this requirement.

To address our concerns, we suggest removing the "and" at the end of subpart 8.3 and make the following changes to 8.4 (All changes are in boldface below):

8.3. If the CEA determines the declared Generator Cold Weather Constraint is invalid, update its Corrective Action Plan(s) to require corrective actions be completed in accordance with Requirement R6 or Requirement R7, as applicable, subject to any extensions approved by the CEA, or implement freeze protection measures to provide the necessary capability in accordance with Requirement R2;

8.4. Document and provide notice to the CEA, when a generating unit experiences a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event **when:**

8.4.1. **T**he cause of Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event is the same as that of a previous Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event at the same or a similar unit, and one or more corrective actions to address the cause of the more recent Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event are **in place; or**

8.4.2. **Covered through an** existing validated Generator Cold Weather Constraint for the same or similar unit.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC has removed the "and" at the end of Requirement R8 Part 8.3 as suggested. While it is NERC's general practice to include "and" or "or" in lists, NERC recognizes the inclusion of the word here may create confusion or a link where none was intended.

With respect to your second comment, NERC has received several suggestions during this comment period to clarify this Requirement R8 Part 8.4 and has revised the language to clarify the actions that are required. Specifically, this Requirement Part is intended to address the situation where a Generator Owner experiences repeat Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events due to the same cause, and the corrective action(s) to address that cause are already addressed by a validated Generator Cold Weather Reliability Constraint. The notification to the CEA would be in lieu of pursuing validation of an identical Generator Cold Weather Constraint every time an event occurs. NERC has interpreted the suggestion to add a Part 8.4.1. to refer to Corrective Action Plans that have corrective actions that are **in place** as referring to those with Corrective Action Plans that are being **implemented** to address the cause of the Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event. Proposed EOP-012-3 Footnote 12 is intended to address those situations. ("If a Generator Owner has previously experienced a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event and developed a Corrective Action Plan for the generating unit or units under Requirement R6 Parts 6.1 or 6.2, the Generator Owner may review and update its existing plan(s) in lieu of developing a new plan."). Therefore, NERC has not made the suggested change to Requirement R8.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Evergy supports and incorporates by reference the comments of the Edison Electric Institute (EEI), Midwest Reliability Organization's NERC Standards Review Forum (MRO NSRF), and the North American Generator Forum (NAGF) on question 2	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the responses to the EEI, MRO NSRF, and NAGF comments.	
Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
1. Suggest NERC develop a form for submission of constraint declarations so GOs provide all the needed information to expediate the process for the CEA to make a determination on validity. 2. For generation facilities that have repeated Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events during a winter season that fall into the 'known constraint' category in Attachment 1 (e.g., wind turbine blade icing events), does the GO need to file constraint declarations for each occurrence of the same type of Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event?	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. For comment 1, NERC agrees that a standardized submission form would be helpful and is in the process of developing one. For comment 2, NERC responds that Requirement R8 Part 8.4 was added to the entity's obligations in the case of repeat events and reduce the burden that would be associated with following the constraint process multiple times for known issues. Several entities have recommended revisions to clarify that part, and NERC has responded through clarifying revisions.	
Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
WECC supports the development of NERC process by NERC staff and additional materials delivered by the drafting team/321 team in meeting the FERC directives. Industry should be preparing Generator Cold Weather Constraint materials now to prepare for submittal per the timelines noted within the Standard. While each case may have different facts and circumstances the ERO Enterprise should provide further guidance on expectations of material to be provided to support timely review. That effort would benefit the ERO Enterprise and the industry.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.	
Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AZPS agrees that the modifications made to Requirement R8 are responsive to the directive apart from the recently added Subpart 8.4. AZPS is unclear of certain aspects of 8.4 including what the intent or expectation is. It is unclear how this data will be submitted, including applicable timeframes, while also appearing to possibly duplicate reporting of similar events through the Section 1600 Data Request for Generator Cold Weather Data.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC has received multiple comments suggesting revisions to Requirement R8 Part 8.4 and has revised the language to provide additional clarification as to the required actions. Further information will come regarding the proper form for required reporting. Additionally, NERC will be reviewing its cold weather data reporting requirements in the coming months to identify potential duplication in requirements and streamline future efforts.	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mark Flanary - Midwest Reliability Organization - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Please see our comment in question number 7.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to question number 7.	
Rachel Coyne - Texas Reliability Entity, Inc. - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Sean Bodkin - Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc. - 5,6, Group Name Dominion	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Israel Perez - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Langston - Tallahassee Electric (City of Tallahassee, FL) - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your response.	
Mohamad Elhusseini - DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company - 3,5, Group Name DTE Energy	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Joanne Anderson - Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington - 1,4,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jessica Cordero - Unisource - Tucson Electric Power Co. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Donna Wood - Tri-State G and T Association, Inc. - 1,3,5	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Tri-State Supports MRO NSRF Comments	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you. Please see the response to the MRO NSRF Comments.	
Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response	
Thank you. Please see the response to the MRO NSRF comments.	
Adrian Andreoiu - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
BC Hydro appreciates the opportunity to comment and offers the following. The Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process sets timeline expectations for CAP extensions, including for the CEA. There could be situations where, if the CEA exceeds the 45-day expectation to approve an extension, the submitting GO would be in potential noncompliance to EOP-012-3 if the extension rejection is received after the initial CAP implementation deadline. BC Hydro recommends a provision to allow flexibility for compliance enforcement should there be a case where the CAP timetables are exceeded while an extension request is being processed by the CEA.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. NERC recognizes that entities may be concerned if the Compliance Enforcement Authority unreasonably delays the review of their Corrective Action Plan extension request or their Generator Cold Weather Constraint, and the implications that may have for the registered entity if the extension request is denied or the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration is deemed invalid or not approved. It is NERC's expectation that all such requests will be reviewed in a timely manner across the ERO Enterprise and to the extent any delay would impact compliance obligations, that would be handled on a case-by-case basis with the entity. NERC will provide guidance as needed to ensure that entities provide the proper documentation and support to facilitate a timely review.	
Anna Martinson - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO Group	
Answer	

Document Name	

Comment

To provide a certainty to this process and ensure that entities have a path to ensure documented compliance MRO NSRF would suggest that this standard include language to allow for "automatic" approval of any request if after 60 days no response has been provided by the ERO. This is similar to how FERC has a 60-day approval if no action taken.

MRO NSRF has concerns that the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process may not be enforceable and is subject to change outside of the standard development process. because it is not part of standard EOP-012-3.

To address this, MRO NSRF suggests adding the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process as attachment 2 to the standard.

MRO NSRF recommends the following modification of R8.4 (the addition of the word 'if' to the first sentence):

Document and provide notice to the CEA, when a generating unit experiences a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event, if the cause of Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event is the same as that of a previous Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event at the same or a similar unit, and one or more corrective actions to address the cause of the more recent Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event are addressed by an existing validated Generator Cold Weather Constraint for the same or a similar unit.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments.

With respect to your first comment suggesting a 60-day automatic approval action, NERC responds as follows. NERC has declined to make the suggested modification to allow for automatic approval of any request after 60 days if no response has been provided, as NERC does not believe such a provision would be consistent with the June 2024 Order. *See, e.g.*, June 2024 Order at P 53 ("[G]iven the significant reliability risk evidenced by the failure of generating units during recent extreme winter weather events, we continue to believe that an enhanced level of oversight remains necessary to ensure that Generator Cold Weather Constraints are only declared when warranted"); P 54 ("Accordingly, we again direct NERC, pursuant to section 215(d)(5) of the FPA, to modify proposed Reliability Standard so that NERC receives, reviews, evaluates,

and confirms for validity the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations in a timely manner."). However, NERC recognizes that entities may be concerned if the Compliance Enforcement Authority unreasonably delays the review of their Corrective Action Plan extension request or their Generator Cold Weather Constraint, and the implications that may have for the registered entity if the extension request is denied or the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration is deemed invalid. It is NERC's expectation that all such requests will be reviewed in a timely manner across the ERO Enterprise and to the extent any delay would impact compliance obligations, that would be handled on a case-by-case basis with the entity. NERC will provide guidance as needed to ensure that entities provide the proper documentation and support to facilitate a timely review.

With respect to your second comment regarding adding the process to the standard, NERC notes that Reliability Standards set forth requirements for users, owners, and operators of the Bulk-Power System. The Generator Owner's responsibilities for the timely submission of Corrective Action Plan extension requests and Generator Cold Weather Constraints are specified in the standard. The specific processes that will be used to review such submissions fall under the purview of the ERO Enterprise Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program and are not suitable for inclusion in a Reliability Standard. NERC believes the comments received during this posting generally support NERC revising and refining to this process as needed to provide timely clarifications as to the ERO Enterprise's expectations for these reviews. NERC is committed to transparency in the execution of this process and will continue to keep stakeholders informed of process improvements as they occur.

3. In paragraph 68 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC to modify Requirement R7 of EOP-012-2 "to require shorter deadlines to implement corrective actions for existing or new equipment or the freeze protection measures for those generating units that experience a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event". FERC provided an example for how to address this directive, such as to require shorter timeframes for those units that have experienced issues and allow longer timeframes to address similar potential issues across a fleet for those units that have not experienced issues.

In proposed EOP-012-3, requirements for Corrective Action Plans for Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events are combined in Requirement R6. Requirement R6 now includes timeframes for CAP implementation for the unit that experiences the Generator Cold Weather Event (before the next winter season), timeframes for reviewing similar units for the same issue (12 months from the event) and timeframes for implementing CAPs on similar units that were determined to be susceptible to the identified freezing issues (24 months from the review, or 36 months from the event). In developing these modifications, feedback from previous postings of the EOP-012-3 standard were considered.

Do you agree that the modifications in Requirement R6 are responsive to the FERC directive in paragraph 68? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

Brian Lindsey - Entergy - 1,3,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Entergy agrees that the revision generally addresses paragraph 68, but does not agree with utilization of a footnote in section 6.3.5.1 to address an issue that should be included directly in the Standard Requirement. The footnote language is also ambiguous, a more precise wording such as "*events that occur x days prior to December 1 in the current season*" would be preferred.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comment. NERC considered whether it could redraft 6.3.5.1 to provide the additional information for early season events in the text, and it determined that the additional language may over-complicate the requirement, considering that the majority of Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events will occur in meteorological winter. However, NERC has revised the footnote to be more precise as to what constitutes an early season event (i.e. September-November events), such that the Generator Owner may have until the start of the following winter season to complete a Corrective Action Plan.	
Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
AEPC has signed on to ACES comments. See ACES comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the ACES comments.	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
MP agrees with NAGF in adding footnote 11 into the last paragraph of 6.1.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Reclamation does not agree. Shortening time frames does not alleviate the burden of lack of material, contracting resources, outages or other schedulable items.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comment. NERC is responding to the June 2024 Order directives to shorten timeframes for implementing Corrective Action Plans for Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events. If circumstances beyond the control of the entity preclude implementation during the required timeframes, the entity may seek an extension.	
Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the comments of NAGF.	
Sean Bodkin - Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc. - 5,6, Group Name Dominion	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Dominion Energy generally supports eei comments but has the following additional comments. Section 6.1 of the proposed standard states: *"The Generator Owner shall **develop** a Corrective Action Plan for the generating unit that experienced a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event no later than prior to the first day of the first December following the Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event."* Section 6.3.5 requires the CAP to be implemented on the unit that experienced a Cold Weather Reliability Event prior to the first day of the first December following the Event. Since this is the same date, and development of the CAP must occur before the implementation. Dominion Energy recommends that the wording being changed to make the time-tables clear. Dominion Energy recommends	

combining 6.1 and 6.3 so that the timetables are clear for the unit that experienced a Cold Weather Reliability Event and move the CAP timetables for units affected by the applicability review in 6.2 to that section.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the EEI comments. With respect to your additional comments, NERC responds as follows. In revising EOP-012-2 to meet the FERC directives, the team determined that the focus of Requirement R6 should be on the prompt mitigation of issues known to have caused Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events. A prior draft that included a July 1 or 150 day deadline for developing a Corrective Action Plan did not meet with industry approval, nor did a draft that specified a deadline for Corrective Action Plan completion but failed to include any deadline for developing the Corrective Action Plan itself. To ensure that the focus of the standard would remain on the prompt implementation of corrective measures rather than the specific timing of plan development, the final proposed EOP-012-3 includes the same deadlines for both developing and implementing a Corrective Action Plan. The intent is to provide the entity with some flexibility when it memorializes the causes and corrective actions to be taken, information which would be beneficial in future winter seasons, so the more immediate efforts can be placed on fixing the underlying issue. While NERC acknowledges the suggested revision would be one way to accomplish this objective, NERC believes it would be clearer to maintain the current structure of the requirement with the development of plans addressed first and timelines for completion addressed second.

Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators

Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment

We at ACES greatly appreciate the tremendous effort put forth by the drafting team in developing the proposed updates to EOP-012-2 in accordance with the FERC directives.

From the perspective of ACES, the proposed modifications to Requirement R6 are an improvement over previous drafts; however, we believe further refinement would be beneficial. We believe that, as written, the timelines identified in Requirement R6 are too ambiguous and may

unduly discriminate against a GO based solely upon the date the generating unit(s) experienced a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event ("GCWRE").

It is our opinion that any required compliance timelines would be best defined by removing the inherent obscurity associated with using specific calendar days. In short, we recommend using a timeline based solely on a clearly defined quantity of calendar days and removing all references to explicit months and/or days. Please consider the following hypothetical scenarios as an illustration:

- Generating Unit 1, belonging to Entity A, is a 2x1 combined cycle unit.
  - Unit 1 experiences a GCWRE on October 22nd, 2025, due to a previously unknown freezing issue with the steam turbine lube oil polisher.
  - Per the currently proposed version of Requirement R6 Part 6.3.5.1, Entity A has until December 1st, 2026, to develop and implement a CAP.
    - Entity A develops a CAP for Unit 1 in May 2026.
      - During the development of the CAP, Entity A determines that installing new freeze protection measures (heat trace and insulation) on the lube oil polisher will resolve the identified cause of the GCWRE.
- Generating Unit 2, belonging to Entity B, is a 2x1 combined cycle unit.
  - Unit 2 experiences a GCWRE on March 16th, 2026, due to a previously unknown freezing issue with a coalescing filter on the Station Air system.
    - Unit 2's Station Air system is used for both "Service/Plant" Air and "Instrument" Air.
    - Due to the dual-use nature of the Station Air system, a coalescing filter was installed near each air-operated valve throughout the Combined Cycle plant.
  - Per the currently proposed version of Requirement R6 Part 6.3.5.1, Entity B has until December 1st, 2026, to implement a CAP.
    - Entity B develops a CAP for Unit 2 in August 2026.
      - During the development of the CAP, Entity B determines that installing new freeze protection measures (heat trace and insulation) for the coalescing filter drain will resolve the identified cause of the GCWRE; however, as this is a "Balance of Plant (BOP)" system, Entity B also discovers that 35 such devices exist.
  - Entity B implements the CAP for Unit 2 in November 2026.

In the above examples, Entity A is allowed 405 calendar days after the date of the GCWRE to implement a CAP whereas Entity B is only allowed 260 calendar days after the date of the GCWRE. This results in an unequal application of the Reliability Standard by granting Entity A an additional 145 calendar days to complete the same, or substantially similar, compliance activities as Entity B.

It is the viewpoint of ACES that entities should be provided with an EQUIVALENT length of time to complete compliance activities required by a Reliability Standard. We recommend that the timeline in parts 6.1 and 6.3.5.1 be modified to twelve (12) calendar months regardless of when the Generator Cold Weather Event occurs.

Thus, we recommend modifying Requirement R6 as follows (note: for the sake of brevity, any sections without recommended changes have been omitted):

R6.

6.1 The Generator Owner shall develop a Corrective Action Plan for the generating unit that experienced a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event no later than twelve (12) calendar months following the Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event.

6.3

6.3.5 A timetable specifying that implementation of the Corrective Action Plan(s) shall be completed as follows:

6.3.5.1 For the generating unit experiencing the Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event, no later than twelve (12) calendar months following the Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. NERC believes that you are referring to Requirement R6, Part 6.1. In developing proposed EOP-012-3 Requirement R6, NERC considered the Commission's guidance that NERC could satisfy its directive to require shorter timeframes to implement corrective measures to address Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events by requiring GOs to implement corrective actions on the units experiencing the event prior to the next winter season (PP 67-68). NERC considered the Commission's findings that known freeze protection risks need to be mitigated more quickly, and a more expedited timeframe is appropriate. NERC also considered the Commission's statement, "[b]ased on compliance with Requirements R2 and R3, those generating units should have already had appropriate freeze protection measures implemented to be capable of operating at the generating units' respective Extreme Cold Weather Temperature."

A standardized timeframe for completion would provide a predictable timetable, and most of the commenters that have made this suggestion have suggested that 12 months would be appropriate. However, a 12 month duration could result in some units experiencing late season events

remaining vulnerable to known freezing issues for all, or nearly all, of the following winter season. NERC also observes that many of these plans would be coming due for completion at points during the winter season that have proven to be challenging for the units; if outages are required, those outages would likely be scheduled outside of the winter season. As such, NERC does not believe this potential alternative to FERC's example from the June 2024 Order would be an equally effective or efficient alternative for addressing the Commission's underlying concerns. In this case, NERC believes the reliability benefit of requiring completion before the start of the next winter season, consistent with the Commission's guidance in the June 2024 Order, far exceeds the practical benefit that may be realized from a standardized implementation timeframe and it represents the practical and likely timeframe for completing freeze protection work. To the extent the time provided is not sufficient to complete corrective actions due to circumstances beyond the entity's control, the entity may submit a Corrective Action Plan extension request.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
The NAGF recommends that Footnote 11 should be moved to be the last sentence of 6.1.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. As this requirement presently has two explanatory footnotes, the first after the temperature criteria and the second after the word "implement", NERC has determined to leave the placement of the footnote explaining the temperature criteria as is.	
Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

WEC Energy Group supports the NAGF comments as submitted.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see response to the NAGF comments.	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
NYPA supports NAGF Comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see response to the NAGF comments.	
Donna Wood - Tri-State G and T Association, Inc. - 1,3,5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Tri-State agrees with MRO NSRF Comments	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see response to the NAGF comments.	
Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
See comment to question 8.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to question 8.	
Duane Franke - Manitoba Hydro - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Anna Martinson - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO Group	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
The NSRF appreciates the changes made for clarity.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support.	
Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to the EEI's comments.	
Scott Langston - Tallahassee Electric (City of Tallahassee, FL) - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

R6 could be made even better by including the timelines for corrective action plan implementation in the same section, i.e., move item 6.2 (requirement for implementation of CAP for similar units) to section 6.3.5, so that all the specific timeline requirements for meeting CAPS are together.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Requirement R6 Parts 6.1 and 6.2 address the development of Corrective Action Plans, whereas Part 6.3 addresses the requirements for Corrective Action Plans, including the timelines for completion. After considering this and a similar suggestion, and the changes that may be necessary to restructure the requirement, NERC has determined to leave the current structure as is.	
Mark Flanary - Midwest Reliability Organization - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Please see our comments on Question number 4.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see response to question 4.	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support.	
Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AZPS agrees that the changes are responsive to the FERC directive.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support.	
Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
NextEra further agrees with including non-substantive changes to R8.3, R8.4, including:	

8.3. If the CEA determines the declared Generator Cold Weather Constraint is invalid, update its Corrective Action Plan(s) to require corrective actions be completed in accordance with Requirement R6 or Requirement R7, as applicable, subject to any extensions approved by the CEA, or implement freeze protection measures to provide the necessary capability in accordance with Requirement R2; **and**

8.4. Document and provide notice to the CEA, when a generating unit experiences a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event **when:**

The cause of Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event is the same as that of a previous Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event at the same or a similar unit, and one or more corrective actions to address the cause of the more recent Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event are **in place; or**

Covered through an existing validated Generator Cold Weather Constraint for the same or similar unit.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. On the suggestion of EEI, NERC has removed the "and" at the end of Requirement R8 Part 8.3. While it is NERC's general practice to include "and" or "or" in lists, NERC recognizes the inclusion of the word here may create confusion or a link where none was intended.

With respect to the second suggestion, NERC has received several suggestions during this comment period to clarify this Requirement R8 Part 8.4 and has revised the language to clarify the actions that are required. Specifically, this Requirement Part is intended to address the situation where a Generator Owner experiences repeat Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events due to the same cause, and the corrective action(s) to address that cause are already addressed by a validated Generator Cold Weather Reliability Constraint. The notification to the CEA would be in lieu of pursuing validation of an identical Generator Cold Weather Constraint every time an event occurs.

NERC has interpreted the suggestion to add a Part 8.4.1. to refer to Corrective Action Plans that have corrective actions that are **in place** as referring to those with Corrective Action Plans that are being **implemented** to address the cause of the Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event. Proposed EOP-012-3 Footnote 12 is intended to address those situations. ("If a Generator Owner has previously experienced a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event and developed a Corrective Action Plan for the generating unit or units under Requirement R6 Parts 6.1 or 6.2, the

Generator Owner may review and update its existing plan(s) in lieu of developing a new plan."). NERC believes this change would have a substantive effect, although none may have been intended, and therefore has not made it.	
Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
WECC supports the development of Requirement R6 language and additional materials delivered by the drafting team/321 team in meeting the FERC directives. However, the change to 36 calendar months for other units in a fleet may not meet FERC's expectations and a 24 calendar month timeline seemed reasonable to WECC. Is there any data available from Winter Storm Uri or Elliot to support the longer timelines?	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. The 36 calendar month timeline was selected based on a consideration of stakeholder comments on a previous draft of EOP-012-3 indicating that providing only 24 months to complete a fleetwide review and implement corrective actions would not be reasonable. As developing requirements for staggering based on complexity presents its own challenges, NERC determined a 36 calendar month timeline would be sufficient for most cases and, as the requirement is structured, would incentivize the prompt completion of fleetwide reviews and identification of potential issues.	
Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Black Hills Corporation supports the changes made to Requirement R7 and agrees that the changes are responsive to the FERC directives contained in paragraph 68. However, Black Hills Corporation also agrees with the comments provided by NAGF regarding moving Footnote 11 into the verbiage of the Standard.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Adrian Andreoiu - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Noting the allowance to update an existing CAP in lieu of developing a new one (per Footnote 10 to Requirement R6 and Requirement R9.1), BC Hydro suggests that a similar provision to update an existing CAP also be added to Requirement R7. This would allow increased efficiencies for where a CAP already exists, not just when experiencing an GCWRE subject to Requirement R6 or upon determination of a GCWC declaration where the declaration is no longer valid.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments and suggestions. The footnote (footnote 8 in revised draft) was added to Requirement R6 in response to stakeholder feedback, due to the possibility of higher volumes of repeatable issues in a shorter timeline. However, the entity would have flexibility to manage its Corrective Action Plans under Requirement R7 as well.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Evergy supports and incorporates by reference the comments of the North American Generator Forum (NAGF) on question 3	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
EEI supports the changes made to Requirement R7 and agrees that the changes are responsive to the directives contained in paragraph 68 of the FERC Order.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
Ameren supports EEI's and NAGF's comments, with more support towards NAGF's comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see the responses to the EEI and NAGF comments.	
Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Southern Company supports the changes made to Requirement R7.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see the responses to the EEI and NAGF comments.	
Jessica Cordero - Unisource - Tucson Electric Power Co. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Joanne Anderson - Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington - 1,4,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mohamad Elhusseini - DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company - 3,5, Group Name DTE Energy	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Israel Perez - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Rachel Coyne - Texas Reliability Entity, Inc. - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Greg Sorenson - ReliabilityFirst - 10 - RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

4. In paragraph 70 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directed NERC "to develop and submit modifications to Requirement R7 of proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-2 to ensure that any extension of a corrective action plan implementation deadline beyond the maximum implementation timeframe required by the proposed Reliability Standard is pre-approved by NERC." In paragraph 3 of the June 2024 Order, FERC stated that NERC should "ensure that the generator owner informs relevant registered entities of operating limitations in extreme cold weather during the period of the extension."

In proposed EOP-012-3, Requirement R6 Part 6.4 and Requirement R7 Part 7.2 were added to require any Generator Owner seeking to extend a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) implementation deadline beyond the maximum implementation timeframe, to seek pre-approval of the extension by the CEA. The standard specifies the information that must be included in any submission to allow for this review, including an explanation of the circumstances causing the delay and why those circumstances are beyond the control of the GO, revisions to the CAP in the interim, and an updated timetable for completion.

The drafting team determined that any entities with a need could request information on operating limitations – temporary or otherwise - under the data specification standards (TOP-003, IRO-010), or through other mechanisms for obtaining up-to-date information on the status and availability of generators, and determined to not include a separate requirement for such notifications in EOP-012-3.

Do you agree that the modifications in Requirement R6 Part 6.4 and Requirement R7 Part 7.2 are responsive to the FERC directives above? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.	
Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
See comment to question 8.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to question 8.	
Mark Flanary - Midwest Reliability Organization - 10	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
This comment applies to both R6.4 and R7.2. MRO has concern that there may be a potential issue to enforce the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process because it is a separate document/process outside of the standard language. Specifically, MRO is concerned that the 60-day recommendation in this document is not enforceable. To provide clarity and enforceability, MRO recommends either including the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process in the standard, for example, as an Attachment 2 OR "no later than 60-day" requirement stated in the process should be explicitly included in the requirement language.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. Reliability Standards set forth requirements for users, owners, and operators of the Bulk-Power System. The Generator Owner's responsibilities for the timely submission of Corrective Action Plan extension requests and Generator Cold Weather Constraints are specified in the standard. The specific processes that will be used to review such submissions fall under the purview of the ERO Enterprise Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program and are not suitable for inclusion in a Reliability Standard. Therefore, NERC has determined not to include it as an attachment to the standard. NERC has considered whether to include certain elements of the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process as enforceable elements in the standard, such as a requirement for GOs to submit a Corrective Action Plan extension request at least 60 days in advance. NERC asks entities to submit Corrective Action Plan extension requests at least 60 days in advance to promote timeliness in reviews and avoid delays associated with the receipt of multiple last minute requests. However, NERC recognizes that in certain situations the submittal timeframes may not be met due to circumstances beyond the control of a GO. The ERO Enterprise will prioritize efforts to help ensure timely processing of extension requests as these circumstances arise. However, while these efforts will be greatly assisted if entities are proactive in seeking any necessary validations or approvals as soon as they become aware of the need for one, NERC does not see a reliability need to impose a mandatory submission timing requirement at this time.

Brian Lindsey - Entergy - 1,3,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
The language does require the GO to seek approval from the CEA, but neither section 6.4 nor 7.2 explicitly requires the GO to "inform relevant registered entities" of operating limitations during the extension. The Standard also fails to specify which registered entities would be considered "relevant" or provide guidance on the notification process.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response	
Thank you for your comments. Proposed EOP-012-3 does not specifically require the GO to make this notification. As explained in the Consideration of Directives accompanying this posting, it was determined that other Reliability Standards and mechanisms would address the provision of data regarding generator operating limitations in cold weather so as to keep these reliability entities informed, and that including a requirement in EOP-012-3 specifically to address operating limitations during the period of a Corrective Action Plan extension may not provide any reliability benefit.	
Greg Sorenson - ReliabilityFirst - 10 - RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Agree with modification. Please consider adding language that any findings when reviewing Corrective Action Plans (CAP) should be communicated to the RC, PC, BA, etc.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC understands this comment to refer to ERO Enterprise approvals of Corrective Action Plans extensions more generally. The draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process is revised to state that NERC may aggregate anonymized information on Corrective Action Plan extension requests to facilitate industry awareness. To the extent that entities responsible for planning and operating the BPS would like additional detail from their GO that is relevant to their responsibilities, they have the ability under other Reliability Standards to request such information.	
Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please the response to the MRO NSRF Comments.	
Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Southern Company agrees the modifications in R6 and R7 are responsive to the FERC directives in paragraph 70.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for you response.	
Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

EEI agrees that the modifications in Requirement R6, subpart 6.4 and Requirement R7, subpart 7.2 are responsive to the FERC directives in paragraph 70.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for you response.	
Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Suggest that this standard include language to allow for "automatic" approval of any request if after 15 days no response has been provided by the CEA. This is similar to how FERC has a 60-day approval if no action taken. USV understands that timelines are established within the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process, however, this may be better understood if included within the standard itself.

To address this, USV suggests, as a minimum, adding the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process as attachment 2 to the standard.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. NERC has declined to make the suggested modification to allow for automatic approval of any request after 15 days if no response has been provided, as NERC does not believe such a provision would be consistent with the June 2024 Order. *See, e.g.*, June 2024 Order at P 53 ("Given the significant reliability risk evidenced by the failure of generating units during recent extreme winter weather events, we continue to believe that an enhanced level of oversight remains necessary to ensure that Generator Cold Weather Constraints are only declared when warranted"); P 54 ("Accordingly, we again direct NERC, pursuant to section 215(d)(5) of the FPA, to modify proposed Reliability Standard so that NERC receives, reviews, evaluates, and confirms for validity the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations in a timely manner.").

With respect to your second comment regarding adding the process to the standard, NERC notes that Reliability Standards set forth requirements for users, owners, and operators of the Bulk-Power System. The GO's responsibilities for the timely submission of Corrective Action Plan extension requests and Generator Cold Weather Constraints are specified in the standard. The specific processes that will be used to review such submissions fall under the purview of the ERO Enterprise Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program and are not suitable for inclusion in a Reliability Standard.

NERC recognizes that entities may be concerned if the Compliance Enforcement Authority unreasonably delays the review of their Corrective Action Plan extension request or their Generator Cold Weather Constraint, and the implications that may have for the registered entity if the extension request is denied or the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration is deemed invalid. It is NERC's expectation that all such requests will be reviewed in a timely manner across the ERO Enterprise and to the extent any delay would impact compliance obligations, that would be handled on a case-by-case basis with the entity. NERC will provide guidance as needed to ensure that entities provide the proper documentation and support to facilitate a timely review.

Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
MP agrees. This mechanism for a CAP extension.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Black Hills Corporation agrees that the modifications in Requirement R6, subpart 6.4 and Requirement R7, subpart 7.2 are responsive to the FERC directives in paragraph 70.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
WECC supports the development of the extension language in Requirements R6 and R7 and additional materials delivered by the drafting team/321 team in meeting the FERC directives.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
NextEra agrees that the modifications in Requirement R6 Part 6.4 and Requirement R7 Part 7.2 are responsive to the FERC directives above.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AZPS agrees that the changes are responsive to the FERC directive.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to the EEI's comments.	
Donna Wood - Tri-State G and T Association, Inc. - 1,3,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Sean Bodkin - Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc. - 5,6, Group Name Dominion	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Adrian Andreoiu - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your response.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Israel Perez - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

Scott Langston - Tallahassee Electric (City of Tallahassee, FL) - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mohamad Elhusseini - DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company - 3,5, Group Name DTE Energy	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Anna Martinson - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO Group	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Joanne Anderson - Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington - 1,4,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jessica Cordero - Unisource - Tucson Electric Power Co. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

5. Paragraph 72 June 2024 Order, FERC stated: "[W]e…find that generators that are commercially operational after October 1, 2027, should have freeze protection measures either designed into their generating systems, or, if a corrective action plan is needed, then it should be completed by the time that such generating units go into commercial operation." FERC directed NERC to develop and submit modifications to Requirement R7, Reliability Standard EOP-012-2 to clarify that any Requirement R7 Corrective Action Plans (CAPs) for new generation (i.e. commercially operational after October 1, 2027) must be completed prior to the generating unit's commercial operation date.

To remove the CAP option from new generation entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027, which is consistent with the original EOP-012-1 standard. The drafting team chose to allow a limited CAP option for certain generators whose design criteria were finalized prior to the first version of the EOP-012 standard being approved, and that will come into commercial operation during the first winter the more stringent requirements for new generation are in effect (i.e. winter 2027-2028). These units would be allowed the option to enter commercial operation and complete any required CAPs by April 1, 2028.

To address industry comments on previous drafts, further clarification is made in Requirement R6 as to scope and applicability and to confirm no retroactive applicability is intended, and additional supporting rationale for the selected bookend dates is provided in the Technical Rationale.

Do you agree that the modifications in EOP-012-3 Requirement R2 are responsive to the FERC directives? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

Duane Franke - Manitoba Hydro - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
In Manitoba, EOP-012-1 will not be effective until 2030. The language and dates still create confusion for our effective date. For instance if we contractually commit to design criteria in 2028 and do not enter commercial operation before 2030 its unclear if R2 is enforceable. Regardless we normally operate in cold weather and design for long cold winters.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. NERC understands that the regulatory processes for approval of Reliability Standards in the Canadian provinces are different than those used for approval in the United States, and that the effective dates may differ depending on the jurisdiction. NERC has also received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan. Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a GO entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability. Relevant to your comment, the implementation plan also provides that, in non-U.S. jurisdictions that have not adopted prior versions of the standard or have established different dates for Requirement R2 or R3, entities shall implement the standard with dates appropriate to their jurisdiction, or as directed by the Applicable Governmental Authority. NERC believes this revision will help account for the different dates in effect or will be in effect in the Canadian provinces. NERC has also added a footnote to the October 1, 2027 date in both Requirements R2 and R3 to clarify that this “grandfathering” date may be different in non-U.S. jurisdictions.

Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
AEPC has signed on to ACES comments. See ACES comments.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the ACES comments.

Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5

Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment

While AES US Renewables appreciates the additional clarification provided under R2.1 and the intent of the February 16, 2023 date, we want to repeat that we do not agree that compliance date should be aligned to a regulatory approval date that is not widely known. The industry as a whole relies on the NERC published implementation plan of EOP-012-1 as that is usually what registered entities are held accountable to. In the case of EOP-012-1's implementation plan, the effective date is supposed to be 10/1/2024. Therefore, we request that the drafting team revise the June 29, 2023 date to October 1, 2024.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a GO entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial

operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability.

Therefore, while NERC has not changed the "bookend" date that could allow an entity a slightly longer implementation period, NERC believes it is much clearer that no requirement is being made retroactively enforceable.

Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment

Constellation generally supports comments of NAGF regarding the dates of commercial operation, i.e., that there may be generators that establish design criteria and go commercial outside of the dates established in the Standard. Constellation recognizes that the window of concern ends in 2027, i.e., in a relatively short time, and that a period of abeyance may allow such exceptions to exist as necessary until the limiting time of 2027 is past. However, absence a period of abeyance, the current wording may result in inadvertent exclusion of some generators from the Standard Requirements.

Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability. NERC believes these revisions will address your concern that some generators may be inadvertently excluded from the standard requirements.	
Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation generally supports comments of NAGF regarding the dates of commercial operation, i.e., that there may be generators that establish design criteria and go commercial outside of the dates established in the Standard. Constellation recognizes that the window of concern ends in 2027, i.e., in a relatively short time, and that a period of abeyance may allow such exceptions to exist as necessary until the limiting time of 2027 is past. However, absence a period of abeyance, the current wording may result in inadvertent exclusion of some generators from the Standard Requirements. Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.	

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability.

NERC believes these revisions will address your concern that some generators may be inadvertently excluded from the standard requirements.

Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators

Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment

It is the opinion of ACES that the current language of Requirement 2.1 is only partially responsive to paragraph 72 of the FERC directive. Furthermore, it is our opinion that by including an additional date provision to Part 2.1, the applicability of this part is more confusing than ever.

Additionally, considering the newly added “commercial operation” date range of 10/01/2027-03/21/2028 for applicability, an April 1, 2028, CAP deadline seems at best arbitrary. As written, an entity falling under this provision may only have one (1) calendar day to comply. In this hypothetical one (1) calendar day scenario, what is the point of establishing a CAP process at all?

Paragraph 72 of the FERC directive does not explicitly require a corrective action plan (“CAP”), merely that, if a CAP is needed, “…it should be completed by the time that such generating units go into commercial operation.” We contend that by directing that a CAP must be completed prior to beginning commercial operations, FERC has rendered the formalized CAP process both superfluous and moot for Requirement R2.

In brief, ACES recommends removing the date of demarcation entirely and striking any provisions for a CAP from Requirement R2.

However, if the industry is unwaveringly committed to including a conditional provision for including a CAP process, then, in the opinion of ACES, the date of demarcation for contractual commitments is best defined by the effective date of EOP-012-2. It is our perspective that

Implementation Plans are a useful and valuable tool that provide the industry with time to interpret and implement any required compliance actions or activities.

Succinctly stated, it is our opinion that the SDT should NOT break from established precedent by tying compliance date(s) to the governmental authority approval date in lieu of the effective date of the NERC Reliability Standard.

To comply with the FERC directive, ACES recommends using language that is substantially similar to EOP-012-2 as demonstrated below:

R2. Applicable to generating units that begin commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027: Each Generator Owner, for each generating unit that has a calculated Extreme Cold Weather Temperature at or below thirty-two (32) degrees Fahrenheit (zero (0) degrees Celsius) as determined in Requirement R1, and that self-commits or is required to operate at or below a temperature of thirty-two (32) degrees Fahrenheit (zero (0) degrees Celsius), shall either:

2.1 Prior to beginning commercial operations, implement freeze protection measures to protect Generator Cold Weather Critical Components that provide the capability to operate at the generating unit(s)' Extreme Cold Weather Temperature with sustained concurrent twenty (20) mph (thirty-two (32) km/h) wind speed for (i) a period of not less than twelve (12) continuous hours, or (ii) the maximum operational duration for intermittent energy resources if less than twelve (12) continuous hours; or

2.2 Document in a declaration, with justification, if applicable, a Generator Cold Weather Constraint in accordance with Requirement R8.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The provision relating to Corrective Action Plans is removed as suggested.

Because previous phases of the development of EOP-012 have indicated support for the concept of accounting for those generators thought to be too far along in the development process to implement changes readily, this is carried forward in the implementation plan. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability. NERC believes these revisions will address your suggestion to simplify the language of Requirement R2, eliminate the requirement to implement a short-lived Corrective Action Plan, clarify the various obligations of entities, and still address the underlying concern that prompted the inclusion of the former R2.1. in the first place.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
The NAGF recommends that the Standard Committee delete the last phrase from R2.1 “and which enter commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028”. Otherwise, a generator that signed agreements in 2022 and goes commercial in June 2028 has no obligation under R2 or R3. This is a clear example of why the NERC Standards Development Process is structured to allow a reasonable time for discussion and review of a proposed standard. Time is required to meet the expected level of excellent standards, as detailed in NERC’ Ten Benchmarks of an Excellent Reliability Standard. FERC’s continued insistence on deadlines that cause NERC to shortcut the development process are resulting in subpar, problematic standards.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement	

R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan. Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The provision relating to Corrective Action Plans is removed as suggested. Because previous phases of the development of EOP-012 have indicated support for the concept of accounting for those generators thought to be too far along in the development process to implement changes readily, this is carried forward in the implementation plan. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability. NERC believes these revisions will address your suggestion to simplify the language of Requirement R2 to remove the potential for applicability gaps.
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC

Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment
Ameren supports EEI's and NAGF's comments, with more support towards NAGF's comments.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.
Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group

Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
WEC Energy group supports the NAGF comments as submitted.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
NYPA supports NAGF Comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the NAGF comments.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

The modifications to Requirement R2 are not fully responsive to the FERC directives. Requirement R2, Part 2.1 allows certain generating units that enter commercial operation between October 1, 2027, and March 31, 2028, to develop, implement, and complete a CAP by April 1, 2028. This is contrary to FERC's directive that generators that are commercially operational after October 1, 2027, should complete any necessary CAP by the time they go into commercial operation and that any CAPs under Requirement R2 must be completed before the generating unit's commercial operation date. Fully complying with FERC's directive would require revising the second bullet point in Part 2.1 as follows: "Develop, implement, and complete by ***the earlier of*** April 1, 2028, ***or the generating unit's commercial operation date*** a Corrective Action Plan . . . ."	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan. Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but enters commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability. The rationale for this exception is addressed in the Technical Rationale. NERC has not added the suggested language to the standard about completing Corrective Action Plans prior to the commercial operation date, as NERC has determined to simplify and streamline the requirement, and entities have previously expressed concern about requiring performance in standards prior to the date the entity is registered with NERC for mandatory compliance purposes. However, under the changes to the standard and implementation plan, the practical effect would be the same.	
Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	

Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
See comment to question 8.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to question 8.	
Adrian Andreoiu - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	No
Document Name	2024-03_BCHydro_Comments_EOP-012-3_321_Question5_2025-03-07.pdf
Comment	

(1) The addition of June 29, 2023 to Requirement R2 Part 2.1 creates a potential gap. Generating units that may have their design criteria committed before June 29, 2023 and will enter commercial operation on or after April 1, 2028 do not appear to be subject to the proposed EOP-012-3 R2. Suggest revising to close this potential gap.

The following table may provide further clarification:

Commercial operation	**Design before June 29, 2023**	**Design after June 29, 2023**
Before October 2027	R3	R3
October 2027 – March 2028	R2 Part 2.1	R2 Part 2.2
After March 2028	No Requirement	R2 Part 2.2

(2) Requirement R2 Footnote 4 allows non-U.S. jurisdictions the use of the date the applicable government authority in the relevant jurisdiction approved the first version of the EOP-012 Reliability Standard and the definition of Extreme Cold Weather Temperature. However, there are no similar provisions for the "first winter" period.

BC Hydro requests that similar flexibility to that granted to non-U.S. jurisdictions for the June 29, 2023 design criteria date also be afforded for CAP(s) implementation timelines. This will allow flexibility to align with their regulatory approval processes.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC understands that the regulatory processes for approval of Reliability Standards in the Canadian provinces are different than those used for approval in the United States, and that the effective dates may differ depending on the jurisdiction. NERC has also received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. A footnote is added to reflect that this October 1, 2027 date may be a different date in a non-U.S. jurisdiction, and the appropriate date should be substituted.

The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with the standard upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability.

Relevant to your comment, the implementation plan also provides that, in non-U.S. jurisdictions that have not adopted prior versions of the standard or have established different dates for Requirement R2 or R3, entities shall implement the standard with dates appropriate to their

jurisdiction, or as directed by the Applicable Governmental Authority. NERC believes this revision will help account for the different dates in effect or will be in effect in the Canadian provinces so that similar implementation allowances could be made if needed.	
Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to the EEI's comments.	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AZPS agrees that the changes are responsive to the FERC directive.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
NextEra agrees that the modifications in EOP-012-3 Requirement R2 are responsive to the FERC directives.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
WECC supports the development of Requirement R2 language and additional materials delivered by the drafting team/321 team in meeting the FERC directives.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Black Hills Corporation does not object to the modifications made to Requirement R2.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

MP agrees, however NAGF identifies a compliance gap that could lead to generators not falling under the standard.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to NAGF, which discusses the revisions made to the standard and implementation plan to address this and other issues raised.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Evergy supports and incorporates by reference the comments of the Midwest Reliability Organization's NERC Standards Review Forum (MRO NSRF) and the North American Generator Forum (NAGF) on question 5	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the responses to the MRO NSRF and NAGF comments.	
Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
EEI does not object to the modifications made to Requirement R2.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment.	
Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Southern Company agrees with EEI's position on Requirement R2.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the EEI comments.	
Jessica Cordero - Unisource - Tucson Electric Power Co. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

Joanne Anderson - Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington - 1,4,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mohamad Elhusseini - DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company - 3,5, Group Name DTE Energy	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Langston - Tallahassee Electric (City of Tallahassee, FL) - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mark Flanary - Midwest Reliability Organization - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Israel Perez - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Sean Bodkin - Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc. - 5,6, Group Name Dominion	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Greg Sorenson - ReliabilityFirst - 10 - RF	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Anna Martinson - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO Group	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

MRO NSRF believes that this should be the date that a standard became effective which brought the term ECWT became part of a Reliability Standard that is Subject to Enforcement, which occurred when EOP-012-2 became effective on 10/1/2024 for US Entities.

While this change would not have a substantial material impact on the implementation of this standard, using dates that are not determined by the Standard Drafting Process as part of Standard language adds a level of uncertainty that may have negative repercussions for entities moving forward in many areas. One such area is the wording of contractual obligations for building new or modifying existing facilities.

There is a difference in the dates between R7 and Attachment 1.

Attachment 1

Individual wind turbine towers manufactured prior to October 1, 2029, that have structural limitations established by Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) based on a minimum temperature that is higher than the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature calculated per

Requirement R1 for generating units that began commercial operation prior to October 1, 2031.

MRO NSRF suggests a single timeline to avoid confusion, utilizing the language from Attachment 1.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability.

Therefore, while NERC has not changed the "bookend" date that could allow an entity a slightly longer implementation period, NERC believes the intent behind including these dates is much clearer when it is presented in the context of a phased-in compliance date in an implementation plan.

With respect to Attachment 1, it was determined that the wind turbine structural limitation issue was a real issue and should serve as a "known" constraint; however, an end date needed to be established to incentivize the development of improved technologies that could better withstand the coldest climates and avoid making the status quo permanent. As these are contemplating future dates after which the known constraint will sunset as a "known" constraint, they will be different than the October 1, 2027 grandfathering date for requirements for new vs. existing generation included in the standard.

Rachel Coyne - Texas Reliability Entity, Inc. - 10

Answer	
Document Name	

Comment

Since the change was made to add verbiage in Requirement Part 2.1, Texas RE recommends revising Requirement R7 to include Requirement R2 (change in bold):

R7. Each Generator Owner that is required to develop a Corrective Action Plan under Requirements R1, **R2**, R3, or R9 shall develop and implement the Corrective Action Plan in accordance with the following:

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability.

As the underlying matter is now addressed in the implementation plan, NERC has not made the suggested revision to Requirement R7.

Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6

Answer	
Document Name	

Comment

PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response the MRO-NSRF comments.	
Donna Wood - Tri-State G and T Association, Inc. - 1,3,5	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Tri-State Supports MRO NSRF Comments	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the MRO-NSRF comments.	

6. In paragraph 76 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directs NERC to remove ambiguities in the Corrective Action Plan implementation plan timelines. As an example, FERC cites the timelines for new, compared to existing, freeze protection measures. **Requirement R7 was revised to clarify that actions to address issues with existing measures must be completed within 24 months, regardless of any longer timeframes for new measures. Requirements for Corrective Action Plans for Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events are discussed in further detail above. Do you agree that the edits are responsive to the FERC directive in paragraph 76? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.**

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
See comment to question 8.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to question 8.	

Donna Wood - Tri-State G and T Association, Inc. - 1,3,5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Tri-State supports MRO NSRF comments.	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the MRO-NSRF comments.	
Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the MRO-NSRF comments.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Reclamation does not agree. Shortening time frames to 24 months does not alleviate the burden of lack of material, contracting resources, outages or other schedulable items.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comment. NERC has not proposed to shorten the timeframe for remedying existing freeze protection measures from what is provided in Reliability Standard EOP-012-2; however, consistent with paragraph 70 of the June 2024 Order, NERC has provided that entities may not extend this timeline without pre-approval by the Compliance Enforcement Authority. To the extent circumstances beyond the Generator Owner's control would preclude implementation within the specified timeframe, the Generator Owner may seek an extension.	
Duane Franke - Manitoba Hydro - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
CAPs and implementation should be at the discretion of utilities that normally operate reliably during seasonal cold weather.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Proposed EOP-012-3 is intended to address the February 2023 and June 2024 Orders of the U.S. FERC, which directed NERC to require Corrective Action Plans to be completed on specific timeframes, and for any extensions of those timeframes to be pre-approved by NERC. From discussions with representatives of Canadian entities, NERC understands that different regulatory frameworks are in place in the Canadian provinces that may govern the implementation of corrective actions contained in Corrective Action Plans. NERC has recently received a Standard Authorization Request seeking to develop a Canadian variance to account for these different frameworks.	
Anna Martinson - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO Group	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

Regarding R6.5, this requirement creates a variable time frame from 8 months to 13 months. A generator experiencing a cold weather event in February only has 8 months to develop a CAP whereas a unit experiencing a cold weather event in October has 13 months to develop a CAP.

MRO NSRF suggests that requiring all CAPs have the same fixed time frame for development and completion would still address the issue while also providing timing certainty to entities, for example the requirement could state that CAPs need to be completed within 12 calendar months from the occurrence of the Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. NERC believes that you are referring to Requirement R6, Part 6.1. In developing proposed EOP-012-3 Requirement R6, NERC considered the Commission's guidance that NERC could satisfy its directive to require shorter timeframes to implement corrective measures to address Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events by requiring GOs to implement corrective actions on the units experiencing the event prior to the next winter season (PP 67-68). NERC considered the Commission's findings that known freeze protection risks need to be mitigated more quickly, and a more expedited timeframe is appropriate. NERC also considered the Commission's statement, "[b]ased on compliance with Requirements R2 and R3, those generating units should have already had appropriate freeze protection measures implemented to be capable of operating at the generating units' respective Extreme Cold Weather Temperature."

A standardized timeframe for completion would provide a predictable timetable, and most of the commenters that have made this suggestion have suggested that 12 months would be appropriate. However, a 12 month duration could result in some units experiencing late season events remaining vulnerable to known freezing issues for all, or nearly all, of the following winter season. NERC also observes that many of these plans would be coming due for completion at points during the winter season that have proven to be challenging for the units; if outages are required, those outages would likely be scheduled outside of the winter season.

As such, NERC does not believe this potential alternative to FERC's example from the June 2024 Order would be an equally effective or efficient alternative for addressing the Commission's underlying concerns. In this case, NERC believes the reliability benefit of requiring completion before the start of the next winter season, consistent with the Commission's guidance in the June 2024 Order, far exceeds the practical benefit that may be realized from a standardized implementation timeframe and it represents the practical and likely timeframe for completing freeze protection work. To the extent the time provided is not sufficient to complete corrective actions due to circumstances beyond the entity's control, the entity may submit a Corrective Action Plan extension request.

Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Yes, Southern Company agrees with the modifications made to R7.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment.	
Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
EEI agrees that the modifications made to Requirement R7 are sufficiently clear and align with the FERC directives in paragra ph 76.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Evergy supports and incorporates by reference the comments of the Midwest Reliability Organization's NERC Standards Review Forum (MRO NSRF) on question 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support. Please see the response to the MRO NSRF's comments.	
Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support. Please see the response to NAGF's comments.	
Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support. Please see the response to NAGF's comments.	
Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Black Hills Corporation agrees that the modifications made to Requirement R7 are sufficiently clear and align with the FERC directives in paragraph 76.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment.	
Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

WECC supports the development of language for Requirement R7 and additional materials delivered by the drafting team in meeting the FERC directives. The additional clarity provided in the Technical Rationale around "new" and "existing" freeze protection measures should minimize issues associated with extension requests if used effectively by industry.

However, if we are reading the requirment correctly, it creates a variable time frame from 8 months to 13 months. A generator experiencing a cold weather event in February would only have 8 months to develop a CAP whereas a unit experiencing a cold weather event in October would have 13 months to develop a CAP. Would it not be more consistent if all CAPs had the same fixed time frames, say one year from the occurrence orf the CWRE?

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. NERC believes that you are referring to Requirement R6, Part 6.1. In developing proposed EOP-012-3 Requirement R6, NERC considered the Commission's guidance that NERC could satisfy its directive to require shorter timeframes to implement corrective measures to address Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events by requiring GOs to implement corrective actions on the units experiencing the event prior to the next winter season (PP 67-68). NERC considered the Commission's findings that known freeze protection risks need to be mitigated more quickly, and a more expedited timeframe is appropriate. NERC also considered the Commission's statement, "[b]ased on compliance with Requirements R2 and R3, those generating units should have already had appropriate freeze protection measures implemented to be capable of operating at the generating units' respective Extreme Cold Weather Temperature."

A standardized timeframe for completion would provide a predictable timetable, and most of the commenters that have made this suggestion have suggested that 12 months would be appropriate. However, a 12 month duration could result in some units experiencing late season events remaining vulnerable to known freezing issues for all, or nearly all, of the following winter season. NERC also observes that many of these plans would be coming due for completion at points during the winter season that have proven to be challenging for the units; if outages are required, those outages would likely be scheduled outside of the winter season.

As such, NERC does not believe this potential alternative to FERC's example from the June 2024 Order would be an equally effective or efficient alternative for addressing the Commission's underlying concerns. In this case, NERC believes the reliability benefit of requiring completion before

the start of the next winter season, consistent with the Commission's guidance in the June 2024 Order, far exceeds the practical benefit that may be realized from a standardized implementation timeframe and it represents the practical and likely timeframe for completing freeze protection work. To the extent the time provided is not sufficient to complete corrective actions due to circumstances beyond the entity's control, the entity may submit a Corrective Action Plan extension request.	
Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
NextEra agrees that the edits are responsible to the FERC directive in paragraph 76.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments.	
Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AZPS agrees that the changes are responsive to the FERC directive.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comments.	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments.	
Mark Flanary - Midwest Reliability Organization - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
MRO recommends that all CAPs to have a fixed period for development and completion instead of creating variable periods.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. NERC believes that you are referring to Requirement R6, Part 6.1. In developing proposed EOP-012-3 Requirement R6, NERC considered the Commission's guidance that NERC could satisfy its directive to require shorter timeframes to implement corrective measures to address Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events by requiring GOs to implement corrective actions on the units experiencing the event prior to the next winter season (PP 67-68). NERC considered the Commission's findings that known freeze protection risks need to be	

mitigated more quickly, and a more expedited timeframe is appropriate. NERC also considered the Commission's statement, "[b]ased on compliance with Requirements R2 and R3, those generating units should have already had appropriate freeze protection measures implemented to be capable of operating at the generating units' respective Extreme Cold Weather Temperature."

A standardized timeframe for completion would provide a predictable timetable, and most of the commenters that have made this suggestion have suggested that 12 months would be appropriate. However, a 12 month duration could result in some units experiencing late season events remaining vulnerable to known freezing issues for all, or nearly all, of the following winter season. NERC also observes that many of these plans would be coming due for completion at points during the winter season that have proven to be challenging for the units; if outages are required, those outages would likely be scheduled outside of the winter season.

As such, NERC does not believe this potential alternative to FERC's example from the June 2024 Order would be an equally effective or efficient alternative for addressing the Commission's underlying concerns. In this case, NERC believes the reliability benefit of requiring completion before the start of the next winter season, consistent with the Commission's guidance in the June 2024 Order, far exceeds the practical benefit that may be realized from a standardized implementation timeframe and it represents the practical and likely timeframe for completing freeze protection work. To the extent the time provided is not sufficient to complete corrective actions due to circumstances beyond the entity's control, the entity may submit a Corrective Action Plan extension request.

Brian Lindsey - Entergy - 1,3,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
No Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see the response to EEI's comments.	
Greg Sorenson - ReliabilityFirst - 10 - RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Rachel Coyne - Texas Reliability Entity, Inc. - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Sean Bodkin - Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc. - 5,6, Group Name Dominion	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Adrian Andreoiu - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Israel Perez - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your response.	
Scott Langston - Tallahassee Electric (City of Tallahassee, FL) - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mohamad Elhusseini - DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company - 3,5, Group Name DTE Energy	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Joanne Anderson - Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington - 1,4,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jessica Cordero - Unisource - Tucson Electric Power Co. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

7. In paragraph 94 of the June 2024 Order, FERC directs NERC "to develop and submit modifications to Requirement R8, Part 8.1 of proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-2 to implement more frequent reviews of Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations" (i.e. more frequent than every five years) "to verify that the declaration remains valid".

In proposed EOP-012-3, new Requirement 9 was created to require a review of each constraint at least once every 36 calendar months. In establishing this timeframe, the drafting team considered feedback provided on appropriate periodicities and sought to ba lance the burdens of more frequent reviews with the benefit to reliability of implementing new technologies as they become available. Do you agree that the modifications reflected in new Requirement R9 are responsive to the FERC Directives? If you do not agree, please provide your language change suggestions.

Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	
Answer	No
Document Name	

Comment

Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments with the following enhancements:

9.1. If a Generator Cold Weather Constraint is determined "upon review" to be no longer needed "or requires modification", then within six (6) calendar… These improvements are needed to address not only the removal of constraints that are no longer necessary, but also the modifications of constraints whose reviews determine scope changes.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to EEI's comments. With respect to the additional comment, NERC responds as follows. NERC understands your concern to be what happens if an entity "changes" their constraint. NERC interprets Requirement R8 and R9 such that, if a validated constraint no longer applies for whatever reason, the entity must develop or update a Corrective Action Plan addressing the underlying issue. If no constraint would be valid, the entity must implement the corrective actions according to the specified timeframe. If

a different constraint would apply, the entity must submit a new constraint for CEA validation within the specified timeline. As NERC believes your concern is addressed within the existing framework, NERC has not made the suggested change.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	

Shortening the review period to at least once every 36 calendar months is not adequately responsive to the FERC directive. Paragraph 94 is clear that FERC's underlying goal is to incentivize timely adoption of new freeze protection methodologies, even at the cost of additional administrative burden to the Generator Owner. A 36-month review period allows for substantial lag between the availability of a new freeze protection technology and the evaluation and adoption of that technology, particularly if the technology first becomes available shortly after the completion of a 36-month review. To address this issue and more fully implement FERC's directive, the SRC recommends that Requirement R9 be revised as follows to require Generator Owners to react to knowledge of changed circumstances that comes by way of regulatory entities outside of the 36-month review cycle, such as any guidance NERC or FERC might issue as part of their oversight of the constraint declaration process and monitoring of the technological state of freeze protection measures in the industry:

"The Generator Owner shall review each Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration validated by the CEA at least once every 36 calendar months to determine if it remains valid in accordance with Attachment 1. ***The Generator Owner shall also review each Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration validated by the CEA upon receiving notification from a regulatory authority with jurisdiction over the Generator Owner of a material change in the circumstances that formed the basis for the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration to determine if it remains valid in accordance with Attachment 1.***"

Finally, the SRC recommends that Requirement R9 be revised to require the Generator Owner to submit the results of each constraint review to the CEA. This would provide the CEA additional insight into the overall state and usage of constraints within the industry, and may help the CEA stay informed of the overall pace of changes to freeze protection technology within the industry. It would also help NERC maintain a database of best practices and technological advancements.

Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. NERC disagrees with the assertion that the proposed 36-month timeline is not responsive to the FERC directive. In paragraph 94 of the June 2024 Order, the Commission directed NERC to modify Requirement R8 Part 8.1 to implement more frequent reviews of Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations to verify that the declaration remains valid. The Commission further stated, "We acknowledge that a more frequent review does impose some additional administrative burden to the GO to review the technological advancements that hindered its ability to winterize; nonetheless, a lengthy period between a Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration review by the GO offers little incentive to timely adopt new freeze protection technologies." In the same order, the Commission directed NERC to revise the Generator Cold Weather Constraint criteria to address various concerns, including the concern that the definition "does not provide sufficient guidance on how widely a freeze protection technology must be deployed before it will be considered a "generally implemented" technology."

Proposed EOP-012-3 addresses these concerns by requiring a review that is significantly more frequent than approved EOP-012-2: reviews are required every 36 calendar months instead of every five calendar years (up to 71.99 calendar months). By shortening from the five calendar years currently provided, the 36 calendar month timeline provides a reasonable approach to meeting the Commission's directive without creating undue administrative burden to periodically monitor if Generator Cold Weather Constraints remain valid or if new technologies have become available that effectively obviate the originally validated constraint. Commenters generally agreed that a 36-month cycle better balanced the need to stay up to date with the administrative efforts that would be required to perform the review (See Jan. 27, 2025 Consideration of Comments at 148).

NERC further notes that, in addition to substantially shortening the time between constraint reviews, the Generator Cold Weather Constraint criteria themselves have been significantly revised and expanded. Whereas EOP-012-2 referred to "generally implemented" technologies, which could require keeping apace of market adaptation of technologies, proposed EOP-012-3 refers to more specifically to technologies that are unproven or are proven to be ineffective (*see* Attachment 1 "Case-by-Case" Item 4), or are not available on the commercial market for similar generating units in similar climate conditions (item 8). Given the feedback received through the development process about the pace of technological developments, NERC believes that a 36-month review period is more than adequate for addressing the concerns underlying the Commission's directive in the June 2024 Order.

NERC acknowledges the ISO/RTO's suggestion to balance the administrative burden of an entity having to perform continual reviews of developments in between the 36-month required reviews by only requiring an entity to undertake an intermediate review in response to a

notification by regulatory agency. However, NERC has declined to make the suggested modification to the standard. Based on the information provided to date, it does not appear that new freeze protection technologies are being deployed at such a rapid pace that such a requirement would be necessary to ensure that entities are staying reasonably up to date with available technologies. Further, NERC has concerns about the ambiguity and enforceability of such a requirement, particularly what constitutes a "notification…of a material change in the circumstances that formed the basis for the Generator Cold Weather Constraint declaration". For example, while the SRC example cites changes in technologies, constraints may be declared for reasons outside of NERC's reliability purview (e.g., noncompliance with health and safety requirements or standards, economic considerations, etc.). Clarifying what a "notification" might like in that context would be critical to avoid a continuous burden on the entity to monitor for changes solely to assess the validity of an EOP-012 constraint.

While NERC has not made the recommended changes to EOP-012 due to these considerations, NERC does appreciate the suggestion and will consider other, more targeted options in its reliability toolkit to help keep Generator Owners informed of new developments in freeze protection technologies that may warrant an out-of-cycle review of a declared constraint. For example, NERC has previously used its Alerts system to advance awareness of generator cold weather preparedness issues. NERC will also have opportunities to review the implementation of the standard, in particular the constraints provisions, to determine if further refinements to the criteria or requirements are needed for clarity or to advance reliability.

NERC also acknowledges the ISO/RTO's second suggestion to revise EOP-012-3 to require entities to submit the results of their reviews to the CEA. NERC is declining to make the suggested revision at this time. NERC presently has an ongoing generator cold weather data collection addressing matters identified by the Commission in the February 2023 Order and will be implementing an oversight framework for the review, validation, and approval of constraints as directed in the June 2024 Order. As NERC responded in a previous response to an SRC comment, NERC expects that if a constraint must be revised due to a change in facts or circumstances, it will be submitted to the CEA for review as if it was a newly declared constraint. Further, NERC will be continuing to perform compliance monitoring and enforcement of the EOP-012 standard consistent with the recommendations of the Winter Storm Elliott Report.

NERC recognizes the administrative burden reporting requirements can present to entities. As it is not clear to NERC there is a reliability need for this specific reporting given the other mechanisms in place or underway, NERC has declined to make the suggested revision to Requirement R9.

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	
Answer	No

Document Name	
Comment	
See comment to question 8.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to your comment in question 8.	
Brian Lindsey - Entergy - 1,3,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
No Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support.	
Mark Flanary - Midwest Reliability Organization - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

MRO recommends clarifying R8.4. The sentence is excessively long and therefore susceptible to causing confusion. MRO recommends breaking the sentence into bullets. In its current form, it is hard to understand what R8.4 is trying to address or its objective.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Clarifying adjustments have been made to Requirement R8 Part 8.4 consistent with the suggestion of yours and others' comments. .	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
AZPS agrees that the changes are responsive to the FERC directive.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
NextEra agrees that the modifications reflection in new Requirement R9 are responsive to the FERC directives. NextEra further aligns with EEI's proposed modifications below: **9.1.** If a Generator Cold Weather Constraint is determined to be no longer **valid needed**, then within six (6) calendar months of such determination, the Generator Owner shall **develop or notify the CEA that the update** Corrective Action Plan **is no longer required and submit updates in conformance with that determination** pursuant to Requirement R7.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. NERC has not made the suggested change, as it would appear to obligate the Generator Owner to submit the original Corrective Action Plan which is not generally required under Requirement R7. If a Corrective Action Plan extension is needed to complete corrective actions beyond the timelines provided in Requirement R7 now the constraint no longer applies, then the Generator Owner would need to submit an extension request. If a new constraint is needed due to changed facts or circumstances, then the Generator Owner would need to submit that constraint to the CEA.	
Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
WECC supports the development of language for Requirement R9 and additional materials delivered by the drafting team in meeting the FERC directives.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
However, Black Hills Corporation agrees with the suggested changes to subpart 9.1 provided by EEI.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support. Please see responses to EEI's comments.	
Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	

Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support. Please see responses to NAGF's comments.	
Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support. Please see responses to NAGF's comments.	
Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Southern Company agrees with the proposed changes suggested by EEI in response to this question.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support. Please see responses to EEI's comments.	
Jessica Cordero - Unisource - Tucson Electric Power Co. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Joanne Anderson - Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, Washington - 1,4,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your response.	
Mohamad Elhusseini - DTE Energy - Detroit Edison Company - 3,5, Group Name DTE Energy	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Langston - Tallahassee Electric (City of Tallahassee, FL) - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Israel Perez - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	

Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Adrian Andreoiu - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Sean Bodkin - Dominion - Dominion Resources, Inc. - 5,6, Group Name Dominion	

Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Rachel Coyne - Texas Reliability Entity, Inc. - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	
Answer	Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Greg Sorenson - ReliabilityFirst - 10 - RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	
Document Name	

Comment
EEI does not object to the intent of the proposed modifications contained in Requirement R9 or its alignment to the directives contained in paragraph 94. However, the proposed language in subpart 9.1 is not sufficiently clear and suggest the following non-substantive changes to clarify the intent of subpart 9.1 (changes in boldface): **9.1.** If a Generator Cold Weather Constraint is determined to be no longer **needed**, then within six (6) calendar months of such determination, the Generator Owner shall **notify the CEA that the** Corrective Action Plan **is no longer required and submit updates in conformance with that determination** pursuant to Requirement R7.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comments. NERC has not made the suggested change, as it would appear to obligate the Generator Owner to submit the original Corrective Action Plan which is not generally required under Requirement R7. If a Corrective Action Plan extension is needed to complete corrective actions beyond the timelines provided in Requirement R7 now that the constraint no longer applies, then the Generator Owner would need to submit an extension request. If a new constraint is needed due to changed facts or circumstances, then the Generator Owner would need to submit that constraint to the CEA.

Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6	
Answer	
Document Name	

Comment
PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response
Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to MRO-NSRF's comments.

8. Under Section 321.5.1 of the NERC Rules of Procedure, the Board of Trustees is to consider whether any proposed standard d eveloped under that section is practical, technically sound, technically feasible, cost-justified and serves the best interests of reliability of the Bulk Power System, among other things. Considering the FERC directives provided above, please provide any other comments you wish the Board of Trustees to consider in whether to adopt proposed Reliability Standard EOP-012-3.

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 3,4,5,6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

Proposed modifications to NERC reliability standard EOP-012-2 requires some GOs (not all) that experience a Cold Weather Reliability Event, to develop a Corrective Action Plan CAP (without considering cost), and obtain approval of their CAP from their Regional Entity (RE).

This proposal and the current version are only applicable to GOs that are required to operate at any temperature below, or equal to, 32-degrees F. But, it is not applicable to GOs that are not required to operate below 32-degrees F. Furthermore, the standard footnote 9, in summary says GOs that are not required to operate at or below 32-degrees are exempt from this requirement, but maybe be called to operate anyway, without making any modifications to their Facilities and they do not have to develop a CAP if they have a Cold Weather Reliability Event.

First off, the standard lacks clarity as to who decides if a unit is required to operate during Cold Weather, FERC, NERC, the RE, the BA, the RC?

The current version of the standard and this proposal violates of the NERC Marketing Principle that states: A reliability standard shall not give any market participant an unfair competitive advantage. It requires some GOs to spend personnel time and money, along with capital dollars which increases their costs and thus market bid pricing 24/7. While others GOs are allowed to operate under the exact same operating weather conditions 24/7 and not have to spend or do anything.

NERC, by developing the current standard and endeavoring to make modifications to this standard, are making a Reliability must be available to run standard. By making requirements that force some GOs Facilities to be available, not just at their design temperature, but at newly calculated CCWTs.

This standard and NERCs proposed modifications to it, has requirements that make it a Resource Adequacy based standard. Thus, it violates the NERC marketing principle that states: Standards shall not define an adequate amount of, or require expansion of, bulk power system resources or delivery capability. NERC is forcing some GOs to increase their operating temperature ranges in order to increase delivery capability during Cold Weather periods.

There is no transparency since there is no provision to make available anonymized CAPs. NERC needs to make all entities CAPs available to all GOs. All market participants shall have equal opportunity to access commercially non-sensitive information that is required for compliance with reliability standards. If NERC shared anonymized CAPs, it would not be violating the NERC Market Principle that states: A reliability standard shall not require the public disclosure of commercially sensitive information.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. With respect to your first comment, NERC responds that under proposed EOP-012-3 Requirement R7, a Generator Owner would not generally be required to obtain Compliance Enforcement Authority approval of Corrective Action Plans. If the Generator Owner needs an extension of time to complete corrective actions beyond the timeframes provided, then it would need to submit an extension request. If the Generator Owner determines that it will be unable to complete one or more of corrective actions to address the identified issue due to a qualifying circumstance described in Attachment 1, than it may declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint and submit that constraint the Compliance Enforcement Authority for validation or pre-approval.

With respect to your second comment, NERC notes that Generator Owners that generally do not run in freezing temperatures are exempt from this requirement. If they are in fact able to run and are called to do so during an Emergency, they would be able to assist the grid in that emergency situation without losing their exemption. This has not changed in proposed EOP-012-3. NERC disagrees with the assertion that some Generator Owners would be allowed to run in freezing conditions at all times and not have to do anything, as that is contrary to the letter of the standard. Even the units that are exempt from some requirements are not exempt from others. Please refer to the approval proceedings for Reliability Standards EOP-012-1 and EOP-012-2 for the supporting rationale which discuss self-commitments and requirements to operate.

NERC disagrees that this standard violates the NERC Market Interface Principles. The Reliability Standard requires the same performance of all Generator Owners that self-commit or are required to operate in freezing temperatures. Each is expected to prepare properly for cold weather

and to understand their operating limitations, have operational capability to operate reliably in the extreme cold conditions they are reasonably likely to face, and to take action when experiencing major events at or above that temperature due to freezing. The general legality of the EOP-012 standard under Section 215 of the Federal Power Act was settled in the FERC proceeding approving EOP-012-1. NERC also responds that Requirement R7 does not require Generator Owners to share their Corrective Action Plans with other Generator Owners nor for NERC to publicize them. NERC may publish aggregated, anonymized information regarding Generator Cold Weather Constraints or Corrective Action Plan extension requests so entities would have transparency in to the types of requests and declarations that are being validated or approved; however, care would be taken to avoid publication of any information meeting the criteria for Confidential Information under the NERC Rules of Procedure which would include market sensitive information.	
Donna Wood - Tri-State G and T Association, Inc. - 1,3,5	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Tri-State supports MRO NSRF comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to MRO NSRF's comments.	
Lindsay Wickizer - Berkshire Hathaway - PacifiCorp - 6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

PacifiCorp supports MRO-NSRF comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to MRO NSRF's comments.	
Kennedy Meier - Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc. - 2, Group Name ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee (SRC)	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
The IRC SRC recommends that the Compliance Abeyance Period language in C.1.4 of the standard be revised to require entities that failed to correctly calculate the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature despite acting in good faith to complete a mitigation plan to correct the identified deficiencies. This will help enhance the overall efficacy of the standard, as the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature is a linchpin of the standard, and incorrect calculations have the potential to significantly undermine effective winterization of generation units.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. The intent of the abeyance period is for entities to proactively take steps to ensure their Extreme Cold Weather Temperature calculations are accurate and reasonably supported, and to allow any issues that are identified to be addressed outside the formal enforcement process. To the extent good faith calculation issues are identified and the re-calculation results in a lower Extreme Cold Weather Temperature for the unit, the entity should take prompt action to ensure it is compliant with other requirements dependent on this calculation, including developing Corrective Action Plans as required under the standard where needed to provide additional capability.	

As the intent of the abeyance period is allow such issues to be addressed outside of the formal enforcement process for a time, NERC has declined to include the requirement to complete a mitigation plan, as that is a term defined to mean "an action plan developed by the Registered Entity to (1) correct a noncompliance with a Reliability Standard and (2) prevent re-occurrence of the violation."	
Zahid Qayyum - New York Power Authority - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
NYPA supports NAGF Comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the responses to NAGF's comments.	
Pamela Hunter - Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc. - 1,3,5,6 - SERC, Group Name Southern Company	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Southern Company agrees with EEI's comments on Questions 8 recognizing NERC needs a standardized form to include all entities in North America.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comments. NERC agrees with this comment of EEI and is developing a standardized form.	
Christine Kane - WEC Energy Group, Inc. - 3,4,5,6, Group Name WEC Energy Group	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
WEC Energy Group supports the comments of the NAGF as submitted.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to NAGF's comments.	
Nick Leathers - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,5,6 - MRO,SERC	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Ameren supports EEI's and NAGF's comments, with more support towards NAGF's comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the responses to EEI and NAGF's comments.	
Wayne Sipperly - North American Generator Forum - 5 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,NPCC,SERC,RF	

Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

The NAGF believes that the proposed standard needs to include a cost/benefit evaluation or similar methodology to determine if a constraint is justified. This issue was raised by the NAGF during the technical conference and to this date, there has been no discussion of what is a reasonable cost justified threshold. The NAGF views this extreme cold weather issue as just another form of the resource adequacy issue and therefore should be treated as such. The ultimate goal of this standard is to ensure that the resources exist to meet the loads. We note that there is not a standard addressing how to meet peak loads if there is not sufficient capacity, but we are putting a requirement of the Generator Owners to ensure their resources perform without any means to pay for the costs that may be incurred to upgrade existing generation.

The NAGF notes that the proposed standard is not a design criterion. A design criterion would state that a generator that meets the design requirement, such as under R2 and R3, would not be at risk of a Corrective Action Plan due to a "freeze" event after running for 48 hours at a temperature below the ECWT and then experiences a GCWRE as temperatures begin to slowly warm. Regardless of any language in the Requirements, as currently structured, the number of hours operated below the generator's ECWT does not matter. This failure in the structure of the standard means it is not practical, technically sound or technically feasible. This issue must be addressed in the SAR discussed under Question 1 above.

Specific Requirement Issues:

Requirement 8.3 does not provide a means to appeal the CEA's decision that a constraint is invalid. NERC and the regions have suggested that the appeals process for a potential non-compliance would be available. The NAGF recommends that R8.3 be revised accordingly to address this issue.

In Requirement R1.1, the SDT made a change that is not addressing the FERC order and NAGF believes this change cause more uncertainty and therefore should be removed: "and adjustments utilized for missing or invalid hourly temperature data, if necessary,".

The NAGF requests that this language be removed and be replaced with more accurate and clear language under the efforts of the SAR discussed in Question 1.

Finally, the NAGF is concerned that NERC and the CEAs may not have the necessary expertise needed to determine if a constraint is valid or not. The NAGF suggests that the RSTC be assigned the review of declared constraints and the associated validity of them. The RSTC can assign this obligation to a subcommittee (either existing or stood up for this express purpose) as the RSTC is the recognized experts on technical matters at NERC.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. NERC responds to these comments as follows:

With respect to the comment about cost/benefit analysis, NERC responds that multiple event reports examining the causes of reliability events since 2011 have conclusively demonstrated the need for a strong Reliability Standard addressing generator preparedness for extreme cold conditions. Not being prepared to operate reliably during these conditions can have an enormous human and economic cost, as demonstrated most notably by the 2021 Winter Storm Uri event affecting Texas and the south central United States. While the EOP-012 standard has sought to balance cost effectiveness and avoid unreasonable outcomes, FERC specifically directed NERC to remove all references to "reasonable cost," "unreasonable cost," "cost," and "good business practices" from the EOP-012 standard. June 2024 Order at P 47. Consistent with FERC's guidance, NERC proposes to include a limited set of clearly defined circumstances which, in the opinion of the various industry subject matter experts that have provided input on this project, would generally constitute an acceptable economic constraint, subject to case-by-case review. Other circumstances, while not directly mentioning costs or economics, entail economic considerations indirectly (e.g., a corrective action that would require an entity to install new wind turbine blades solely to install blade de-icing technologies). To the extent further specific instances of unreasonable measures are identified, or a specific and auditable formula for identifying "unreasonable costs" is identified that is consistent with the overall goal of the EOP-012 standard, those recommendations may be considered for formal inclusion through the standard development process in a future project.

With respect to the comment about resource adequacy, NERC disagrees that generator cold weather preparedness is equivalent to resource adequacy and should be treated the same. There may be sufficient generating nameplate capacity available to meet loads; however, if that generation is not prepared to operate reliability during the extreme cold weather conditions that are reasonably likely to occur, the reliability of the grid will be jeopardized.

With respect to the comment about a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event, the existence of a freezing issue at a temperature at or above the ECWT after a long period of cold weather operation suggests a performance issue. If the issue meets the criteria to be considered a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event (e.g. cause is due to freezing of equipment or impacts of freezing precipitation on equipment within the Generator Owner's control and meets the impact criteria), it is appropriate and consistent with the goal of advancing generator cold weather reliability for the Generator Owner to develop a Corrective Action Plan to prevent future recurrence of this issue.

Regarding the recommendations for specific standard revisions:

NERC has declined to embed the appeals process for a constraint declaration within the standard. Reliability Standards set forth mandatory obligations for users, owners, and operators of the Bulk-Power System. Processes for appeals of determinations made regarding compliance with standards are properly maintained in the Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program documents.

Regarding the revision to Requirement R1.1, prior EOP-012-3 drafts added this language in response to previous comments suggesting that compliance may not be possible without a complete data set. *See* December 3, 2024 Consideration of Comments at 285 (NAGF comments: "While the SDT has significantly modified the document related to calculating the ECWT, and while the NAGF supports these modifications, **nothing in this document addresses the unreasonable position that some regions are taking to require a temperature reading for every hour in order to make an ECWT valid**. In the vast majority of cases, the GO is not in a position to have over 54,000 data points for any location, let alone every location. The GO in most cases must gather data from third party providers, and none of the data is perfect. This issue must be addressed through either Requirement R1 or modification to the ECWT definition. The NAGF looks forward to working with the SDT to address this identified concern."). See also January 27, 2025 Consideration of Comments at 190-191 (NAGF comments suggesting that the drafting team specify an "ECWT calculation is complete if the data source has greater than 90 percent of the expected data points and any gap greater than 168 hours is identified" and stating that the issue of missing hourly values in the ECWT calculation process "is an important issue for the NAGF membership.").

The language in Requirement R1.1 is intended to clarify that Generator Owners have flexibility to address missing or invalid data in their dataset, even if the present record does not support the inclusion of a specific metric for "completeness" as suggested in previous comments. To the extent the NAGF identifies such a metric, NAGF may submit a SAR to consider that suggestion through NERC's standard development process. NERC also notes that it has proposed an abeyance period for this requirement to support the collection of information that may inform improved guidance or future revisions to the standard or ECWT definition. In the interim, NERC believes the revision to Requirement R1.1 would address the compliance consideration identified in the comments quoted above.

With respect to the NAGF's suggestion to have the RSTC review constraints, NERC responds as follows. NERC recognizes the important role of the RSTC as providing subject matter expertise on technical matters. The RSTC would make an appropriate forum to discuss new winterization technologies, considerations for the adoption of winterization technologies, or additional changes to the Generator Cold Weather Constraints criteria included in EOP-012-3 Attachment 1 that should be recommended for future standards development projects. However, the RSTC is not an appropriate body to assess entity compliance with Reliability Standards, which is what the constraint review process fundamentally entails. That function is reserved to NERC as the ERO, or the Regional Entities with delegated authority to perform this function.

Mark Gray - Edison Electric Institute - NA - Not Applicable - NA - Not Applicable	
Answer	
Document Name	

Comment

EEI would like to note our appreciation for the changes made to EOP-012 that addressed the concerns cited in our earlier comments and those by our members during the technical conference. Additionally, EEI provides the following comments:

Concern: EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process Document

General Comment: While EEI appreciates the improvements made to the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process document, we do not agree that supporting process documents developed for EOP-012-3 should be outside of the approved Reliability Standard. The changes within process documents have direct impacts on entity compliance and any change to a process document that directly or indirectly impacts responsible entities compliance should be included in the Reliability Standard. Our concerns with this specific process document are as follows:

Enforceable Requirements Not Identified in EOP-012-3

1. Cap Extension Request Review Process: It states that "If a registered entity has determined that a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) developed in accordance with EOP- 012-3 Requirements R6 or R7 cannot meet the timetable provided per R6 Part 6.3 or R7 Part 7.1, then the entity will submit an extension request to the ERO Enterprise for approval no less than 60 calendar days prior to the original required CAP completion date." See Process Overview & Step 1

- While EEI does not object to the requirement, there is nothing in the requirements of EOP-012-3 that aligns this deadline. Moreover, it is unclear how this could be effectively enforced without it being included in EOP-012-3.

2. Step 3 (Registered Entity Notification/Cap Extension Request): If a CAP extension request was denied, the submitting entity may request, within five (5) calendar days of denial, a joint NERC and CEA review of the denial.

- EEI again notes that there are no deadlines contained in EOP-012-3 and either the deadline should be added to EOP-012-3 or include the process document as an attachment to this standard. Additionally, it is important to note that 5 days is a very short period of time to expect an entity to review and request a review of a time extension denial. It is also unclear if this 5 day deadline is inclusive of weekends and holidays. Regardless, EEI asks that GOs be given sufficient time to review and respond review and respond to the denial. For this reason, we ask that the process document be changed to provide GOs with 10-15 business days consistent with the NERC/CEA reviews.

Insufficient Guidance provided for Entity Data Submission

1. The process document supporting EOP-012-3 is inadequate to ensure entities provide the CEA complete and sufficient documentation with their CAP Extension Requests and Constraint Declarations.

- In the CAP Extension Request Review Process it states that Generator Owners are obliged and responsible for providing clear documentation with the extension request, yet there is nothing in the process document that might guide what might be expected. To address this concern, the Process document should be revised to include examples of the types of documentation that should be provided with a Cap Extension Request for synchronous resources, wind turbines and solar facilities. Without this level of guidance in the Process Document entity submission will vary causing delays and inconsistencies between regions in what is acceptable.
- Similar to the CAP Extension Process, the Constraint Review Process does not provide any details or examples of what would constitute "requisite data" necessary to meet the document requirements required by the CEA and NERC. And while we appreciate the Commission's desire that the process result in "consistent compliance and enforcement outcomes" (ref. P47 or FERC Order), this is only achievable through a clear process that sufficiently guides GOs in their Constraint declaration submissions. To do this, the process should be made clear what must be submitted, including examples of documents that would serve that outcome. This should be done for each type of resource. (i.e., synchronous resources, wind, solar facilities, etc.)

Align is not an appropriate tool for submission of Compliance Obligations under EOP-012-3

1. EEI does not agree that Align is a suitable tool for submission of compliance obligations under EOP-012-3. And is NERC proposing a separate module for these submittals? As currently configured, submittals within Align will be unduly burdensome and will co-mingle self-reports and mitigation plans regarding potential non-compliance items with operational reporting. We are additionally concerned that the use of Align will not just be burdensome to the reporting entities, but also to CEA staff leading to processing delays that might be avoided through the use of another system.

Alternatively, EEI suggests using modules similar to what is used for TADS and GADS be considered as a better alternative. Such a change would avoid security risks and concerns.

Process lacks Transparency sufficient to ensure consistent compliance and enforcement outcomes

1. The Process document lacks sufficient transparency and clarity regarding the process reviews and resulting outcomes when CAP extensions or Constraint Declarations are denied. To address this concern, criteria should be added to the document to ensure consistency in entity submission and guide CEA/NERC reviews. Additionally, the process should include periodic reviews by NERC that assess the consistency of declaration outcomes ensuring all regions have consistent outcomes.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments regarding the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

With respect to your comment regarding adding the process to the standard, NERC notes that Reliability Standards set forth requirements for users, owners, and operators of the BPS. The GO's responsibilities for the timely submission of Corrective Action Plan extension requests and Generator Cold Weather Constraints are specified in the standard. The specific processes that will be used to review such submissions fall under the purview of the ERO Enterprise CMEP and are not suitable for inclusion in a Reliability Standard. NERC believes the comments received during this posting generally support NERC revising and refining to this process as needed to provide clarity as to the ERO Enterprise's expectations in these reviews. NERC is committed to transparency in the execution of this process and will continue to keep stakeholders apprised of process improvements as they occur.

NERC has considered whether to include certain elements of the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process as enforceable elements in the standard, such as a requirement for GOs to submit a Corrective Action Plan extension request at least 60 days in advance. NERC asks entities to submit Corrective Action Plan extension requests at least 60 days in advance to promote timeliness in reviews and avoid delays associated with the receipt of multiple last-minute requests. However, NERC recognizes that in certain situations the submittal timeframes may not be met due to circumstances beyond the control of a GO. The ERO Enterprise will prioritize efforts to help ensure timely processing of extension requests as these circumstances arise. However, while these efforts will be greatly assisted if entities are proactive in seeking any necessary validations or approvals as soon as they become aware of the need for one, NERC does not see a reliability need to impose a mandatory submission timing requirement at this time.

NERC appreciates the feedback on the length of time to request a NERC and CEA joint review of a denied Corrective Action Plan extension request. In response to this suggestion, NERC has revised this period to 15 calendar days.

NERC appreciates the suggestion for additional guidance and documentation that would be helpful for aiding entities in making submissions to the CEA, and to ensure consistency in determinations. As noted above, NERC is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner. Your suggestions will be considered as part of these efforts. NERC will also be performing regular oversight to ensure that determinations are being made in a consistent manner.

With respect to the comment regarding Align, thank you for the feedback. The Periodic Data Submittal module is being tested to support the process, which will provide separation for Enforcement activities. Future enhancements (including other tools) may be used if the Periodic Data Submittal module does not meet expectations. NERC will keep entities informed in the months ahead.	
Michael Goggin - Grid Strategies LLC - 5	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Without the revisions ACP recommends in response to Question 1, we do not believe Draft 3 of EOP-012-3 can be considered practical, technically sound, technically feasible, or cost-justified.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. See response to question 1.	
Scott Thompson - PNM Resources - 1,3,5 - WECC,Texas RE	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
PNM agrees with the comments provided by EEI.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Thank you for your comments. Please see the response to EEI's comments.	
Jodirah Green - ACES Power Marketing - 1,3,4,5,6 - MRO,WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF, Group Name ACES Collaborators	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
During our review, ACES noticed a minor clerical inconsistency throughout this draft of EOP-012-3. The proposed language is inconsistent in how numbers are written. For example, Requirement R1 requires an action every five calendar years, whereas Requirement R1 Part 1.1.1 requires an action within six (6) calendar month. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Each of the specified timelines was developed with consideration to the periodicity for the required performance. Please refer ERO Enterprise CMEP Practice Guide, Implementation of "Annual" and "Calendar Month(s)" in the Reliability Standards.	
Hayden Maples - Evergy - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Evergy supports and incorporates by reference the comments of the Edison Electric Institute (EEI), Midwest Reliability Organization's NERC Standards Review Forum (MRO NSRF), and the North American Generator Forum (NAGF) on question 8	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to the EEI/MRO NSRF/NAGF's comments.	
Alison MacKellar - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Alison Mackellar on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to NAGF's comments.	
Richard Jackson - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Reclamation does not agree that this standard is practical, technically sound, technically feasible, cost-justified and serves the best interests of reliability of the Bulk Power System. Comments provided on multiple drafts were not considered. Some examples of that are wind speed, precipitation, lack of temperature data, etc…. This standard will put undo administrative burden on industry without providing adequate weather analysis and protection measures, where required, on components that may be exposed as only 25 years of data are being considered. Also, possible rare weather events that are not predictable (i.e. a 500-year storm) are being ignored.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. All comments received during the development process were reviewed and given due consideration by the respective drafting teams, even if the suggested revisions of one or more commenters were not made or were made differently than recommended. If you feel a particular comment of yours was not addressed during the development process for EOP-012-3, please contact the NERC Director of Standards.

Reliability Standard EOP-012-3 sets the baseline minimum performance for reliable operations during extreme cold weather temperatures. The need for such a standard is well documented in reports examining the causes of multiple cold weather reliability events since 2011. Additional information on the elements identified in the comments (ECWT calculation, cold weather components, etc.) is available in the approval proceedings for EOP-012-1 and EOP-012-2. Entities may choose to exceed the minimum performance by considering 500-year winter storm conditions if they so chose.

Devon Tremont - Utility Services, Inc. - 4 - NA - Not Applicable

Answer	
Document Name	

Comment

Suggest NERC provide clarity on how a wind farm that has derated turbines going into a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event (e.g., low wind availability) determines the possible derate percentage for determining if a GCWRE has occurred. Is this derate percentage calculated based on the nameplate capacity of the facility or the generation availability of facility going into an event (if less than nameplate capacity)?

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. This question was addressed in a recent 2024 Cold Weather Preparedness FAQ :

Q34: Event type 1, "forced derate of more than 10% of the total capacity" – is that total capacity of the unit based on its nameplate, the amount bid into the market at the time of forced derating, or another measure of total capacity?: A:" For a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event, it is the capacity of the generating unit at the time of the event. That is, either its full capacity or a derated amount due to a documented preexisting maintenance/operational issue that limits capacity."	
Kimberly Turco - Constellation - 5,6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Constellation supports comments of NAGF. Kimberly Turco, on behalf of Constellation Segments 5 and 6	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to NAGF's comments.	
Hillary Creurer - Allete - Minnesota Power, Inc. - 1	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
The standard does little to increase reliability of the bulk electric system. The short and long-term burden of the high-cost investments (equipment upgrades, administrative and engineering/research) required to meet one-off low temperature events outweighs the benefit to overall reliability. There appears to be a lack of concern for overall resource adequacy and cost when focused on such a narrow scope.	

Expediting the deadline for this standard creates time pressure, limiting a thorough review process, resulting in inferior standard(s). MP align with both EEI and NAGF comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Multiple event reports examining the causes of reliability events since 2011 have conclusively demonstrated the need for a strong Reliability Standard addressing generator preparedness for extreme cold conditions. As discussed in the approval proceeding for EOP-012-1, the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature formula was intended to identify the extreme cold temperatures the entity is reasonably likely to face. The cost of not being prepared to operate reliably during these conditions can have an enormous human and economic cost, as demonstrated most notably by the 2021 Winter Storm Uri event affecting Texas and the south central United States. NERC remains committed to ensuring it has an effective standard in place to advance cold weather reliability, and it has worked diligently to address Commission directives for additional changes on the timelines set by the Commission. To the extent additional changes are identified in the future as necessary to ensure the standard's efficacy, NERC will promptly initiate the standards development process to make those changes.	
Josh Schumacher - Black Hills Corporation - 1,3,5,6, Group Name Black Hills Corporation Segments 1, 3, 5, 6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Black Hills Corporation supports the additional comments provided by both EEI & NAGF.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see the responses to the comments provided by EEI and NAGF.	

Steven Rueckert - Western Electricity Coordinating Council - 10, Group Name WECC Entity Monitoring	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
It is apparent that compliance fear and other issues not in the FERC Order (e.g., ECWT concerns) played a large part in the balloting failures associated with this Standard and the resulting ROP Section 321 action. The ROP Section 321 path should not be utilized by industry as a way to disagree with FERC. The performance of the generation fleet during extreme cold temperature is the underlying reason a Standard was mandated. Standards are created to support reliable operations and should not be focused on compliance proofing. WECC supports the efforts of the DT in trying to balance the differences in opinions and agendas presented during the development of EOP-012-3.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC appreciates the feedback provided throughout the standard development process.	
Richard Vendetti - NextEra Energy - 5	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
NextEra would like to see industry visibility on the approval and denial of Cold Weather Constraints. NERC should be transparent in the release of this information, as all of the industry faces similar challenges in dealing with extreme cold weather and would benefit in understanding what type of constraints are being approved and denied by the CEA. This could be accomplished in a manner such as quarterly reports and CEA subcommittee meetings. The submitting entity need not be recognized within the reports, however the type of constraint with reasons for approval or denial should be stated.	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. NERC has revised the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to state that NERC may facilitate, for industry awareness, provision of aggregated anonymized constraint decisions to aid in submissions.	
Andrew Smith - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

AZPS agrees with comments submitted by EEI on behalf of their members on concerns with the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process Documents as listed below.

Concern: EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process Document

General Comment: While EEI appreciates the improvements made to the Generator Cold Weather CAP Extension and Constraint Process document, we do not agree that supporting process documents developed for EOP-012-3 should be outside of the approved Reliability Standard. The changes within process documents have direct impacts on entity compliance and any change to a process document that directly or indirectly impacts responsible entities compliance should be included in the Reliability Standard. Our concerns with this specific process document are as follows:

Enforceable Requirements Not Identified in EOP-012-3

1. Cap Extension Request Review Process: It states that "If a registered entity has determined that a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) developed in accordance with EOP- 012-3 Requirements R6 or R7 cannot meet the timetable provided per R6 Part 6.3 or R7 Part 7.1, then the entity will

submit an extension request to the ERO Enterprise for approval no less than 60 calendar days prior to the original required CAP completion date." See Process Overview & Step 1

- While EEI does not object to the requirement, there is nothing in the requirements of EOP-012-3 that aligns this deadline. Moreover, it is unclear how this could be effectively enforced without it being included in EOP-012-3.

2. Step 3 (Registered Entity Notification/Cap Extension Request): If a CAP extension request was denied, the submitting entity may request, within five (5) calendar days of denial, a joint NERC and CEA review of the denial.

- EEI again notes that there are no deadlines contained in EOP-012-3 and either the deadline should be added to EOP-012-3 or include the process document as an attachment to this standard. Additionally, it is important to note that 5 days is a very short period of time to expect an entity to review and request a review of a time extension denial. It is also unclear if this 5 day deadline is inclusive of weekends and holidays. Regardless, EEI asks that GOs be given sufficient time to review and respond review and respond to the denial. For this reason, we ask that the process document be changed to provide GOs with 10-15 business days consistent with the NERC/CEA reviews.
- · **Insufficient Guidance provided for Entity Data Submission**

1. The process document supporting EOP-012-3 is inadequate to ensure entities provide the CEA complete and sufficient documentation with their CAP Extension Requests and Constraint Declarations.

- In the CAP Extension Request Review Process it states that Generator Owners are obliged and responsible for providing clear documentation with the extension request, yet there is nothing in the process document that might guide what might be expected. To address this concern, the Process document should be revised to include examples of the types of documentation that should be provided with a Cap Extension Request for synchronous resources, wind turbines and solar facilities. Without this level of guidance in the Process Document entity submission will vary causing delays and inconsistencies between regions in what is acceptable.
- Similar to the CAP Extension Process, the Constraint Review Process does not provide any details or examples of what would constitute "requisite data" necessary to meet the document requirements required by the CEA and NERC. And while we appreciate the Commission's desire that the process result in "consistent compliance and enforcement outcomes" (ref. P47 or FERC Order), this is only achievable through a clear process that sufficiently guides GOs in their Constraint declaration submissions. To do this, the process should be made clear what must be submitted, including examples of documents that would serve that outcome. This should be done for each type of resource. (i.e., synchronous resources, wind, solar facilities, etc.)

Process lacks Transparency sufficient to ensure consistent compliance and enforcement outcomes

1. The Process document lacks sufficient transparency and clarity regarding the process reviews and resulting outcomes when CAP extensions or Constraint Declarations are denied. To address this concern, criteria should be added to the document to ensure consistency in entity submission and guide CEA/NERC reviews. Additionally, the process should include periodic reviews by NERC that assess the consistency of declaration outcomes ensuring all regions have consistent outcomes.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to the EEI comment below:

Thank you for your comments regarding the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process. Several entities have submitted comments emphasizing the need for consistency and transparency in constraint evaluations across the ERO Enterprise. NERC agrees that ensuring consistency and transparency in these determinations will be of the utmost importance. NERC has revised the draft EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional information on how this will be accomplished, and it is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner.

With respect to your comment regarding adding the process to the standard, NERC notes that Reliability Standards set forth requirements for users, owners, and operators of the Bulk-Power System. The Generator Owner's responsibilities for the timely submission of Corrective Action Plan extension requests and Generator Cold Weather Constraints are specified in the standard. The specific processes that will be used to review such submissions fall under the purview of the ERO Enterprise Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program and are not suitable for inclusion in a Reliability Standard. NERC believes the comments received during this posting generally support NERC revising and refining to this process as needed to provide clarity as to the ERO Enterprise's expectations in these reviews. NERC is committed to transparency in the execution of this process and will continue to keep stakeholders apprised of process improvements as they occur.

NERC has considered whether to include certain elements of the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process as enforceable elements in the standard, such as a requirement for Generator Owners to submit a Corrective Action Plan extension request at least 60 days in advance. NERC asks entities to submit Corrective Action Plan extension requests at least 60 days in advance to promote timeliness in reviews and avoid delays associated with the receipt of multiple last minute requests. However, NERC recognizes that in certain situations the submittal timeframes may not be met due to circumstances beyond the control of a GO. The ERO Enterprise will prioritize efforts to help ensure timely processing of extension requests as these circumstances arise. However, while these efforts will be greatly assisted if entities are proactive in seeking any necessary validations or approvals as soon as they become aware of the need for one, NERC does not see a reliability need to impose a mandatory submission timing requirement at this time.

NERC appreciates the feedback on the length of time to request a NERC and CEA joint review of a denied Corrective Action Plan extension request. In response to this suggestion, NERC has revised this period to 15 calendar days.

NERC appreciates the suggestion for additional guidance and documentation that would be helpful for aiding entities in making submissions to the CEA, and to ensure consistency in determinations. As noted above, NERC is planning additional outreach efforts in the early implementation period to provide guidance to entities on the types of constraints that are and are not being validated and the types of documentation that would be most helpful to the ERO Enterprise to making these determinations in a timely manner. Your suggestions will be considered as part of these efforts. NERC will also be performing regular oversight to ensure that determinations are being made in a consistent manner.

With respect to the comment regarding Align, thank you for the feedback. The Periodic Data Submittal module is being tested to support the process, which will provide separation for Enforcement activities. Future enhancements (including other tools) may be used if the Periodic Data Submittal module does not meet expectations. NERC will keep entities informed in the months ahead.

Ruchi Shah - AES - AES Corporation - 5	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

R2.1 allows for CAP to add new or modify existing or previously planned freeze protection measures for new generating unit that enter commercial operation between 10/1/2027 and 3/31/2028. However, it is not clear what is required to be documented in the CAP (similar to what is listed under R7). Although the CAP in R2.1 needs to be implemented and completed by 4/1/2028, will the CAP be required to document a list of corrective actions, updates to cold weather preparedness plan or identification of operating limitations while the CAP is being implemented? We request NERC to provide clarity on this via changes to R2 Part 2.1 or a guidance document.

AES US Renewables believe that R8.4 is unnecessary and will add to administrative burden that does not provide any additional reliability benefit. A Generator Cold Weather Constraint that has been approved by the CEA and will be applicable to another Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event or a similar generating unit does not require the approved constraint declaration to be documented and notified to the CEA. As the ERO is required by FERC to submit section 1600 data annually, these events and their associated CAPs and constraint declarations can be provided to the ERO at that time. An alternative to R8.4 is to develop a section 1600 data request similar to that of MIDAS (for protection system operations) where entities will be able to input their cold weather events, corresponding CAP information and any constraint declaration that was used to address any of the corrective actions. This avoids having a purely administrative burden on registered entities that can create unnecessary compliance risks.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments.

With respect to your first comment, NERC has received several comments on this Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a GO entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial

operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability. The requirement to implement a short-lived Corrective Action Plan is removed. With respect to your second comment, NERC has received several suggestions during this comment period to clarify Requirement R8 Part 8.4 and has revised the language to clarify the actions that are required. Specifically, this Requirement Part is intended to address the situation where a Generator Owner experiences repeat Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events due to the same cause, and the corrective action(s) to address that cause are already addressed by a validated Generator Cold Weather Reliability Constraint. The notification to the CEA would be in lieu of pursuing validation of an identical Generator Cold Weather Constraint every time an event occurs.	
Jennifer Bray - Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. - 1	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
AEPC has signed on to ACES comments. See ACES comments. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comment. Please see response to the ACES comments.	
Tim Kelley - Sacramento Municipal Utility District - 1,3,4,5,6 - WECC, Group Name SMUD and BANC	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

SMUD and BANC appreciate NERC's inclusion of the Compliance Abeyance Period language in Section C of the EOP-012-2 Standard. This thoughtful addition reflects a commitment to enhancing the ERO Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program processes, that were proposed by NERC last year. Given that we were only permitted to comment on these proposed changes to EOP-012-2 without the opportunity for a ballot, we commend NERC for taking this progressive step as it may instill greater confidence among entities adopting this revised Standard, even if it may not be flawless.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your support.	
Mark Garza - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4,5,6, Group Name FE Voter	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
FirstEnergy has no additional comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Brian Lindsey - Entergy - 1,3,6	
Answer	
Document Name	

Comment	
No Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your response.	
Andy Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
Duke Energy supports and agrees with EEI comments.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. Please see the responses to EEI's comments.	
Duane Franke - Manitoba Hydro - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	

For utilities that routinely operate reliably in seasonal cold weather months, EOP12-3 will not improve BES reliability. It will increase the administrative burden without improving BES reliability.	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Thank you for your comments. NERC disagrees. Multiple cold weather events have demonstrated that the reliability of the Bulk-Power System depends on continued vigilance during extreme cold weather.	
Thomas Foltz - AEP - 3,5,6	
Answer	
Document Name	
Comment	
If the CEA does not agree with the substance of the declaration in R8 and declares it invalid, how would that decision be dealt with in the existing requirements or process? In addition, how soon would the CEA have to provide their determination? In general, there appears to be a lack of clarity regarding the timeline that occurs between R8.1 and R8.3. R8.4 requires that a Generator Owner declaring a Generator Cold Weather Constraint "document and provide notice to the CEA" of the circumstances described in the obligation, however there is no mention of how soon that documentation and notice be given, nor any timeline that the CEA would hold to in providing their response. AEP requests that clarity be added to R8.4 regarding when the GO must provide their documentation and notification, as well as insight be added to the Technical Rationale document regarding what the timeline is for the CEA's response. If the CEA has a list of constraints, it follows that they would likely be maintaining that list as well for all the entities involved. And if they are maintaining it, what would the process be for aligning their own maintained list with the one that each GO is maintaining on *their* end for their own assets? AEP is confused by certain aspects of R8.4, including what its primary intent might be and what it is designed to accomplish. For example, if	

there is already a constraint in place, why would it be necessary to include "one or more corrective actions to address" an underlying cause? Also, what is being requested in R8.4 appears to be redundant with the Section 1600 Data Requests currently being drafted regarding cold weather, so care should be taken to ensure there is no duplications of effort or obligations. We believe that additional content added to the Technical Rationale document would be beneficial to further explain the intent-of and reasoning-behind R8.4. That being said, we believe that R8.4, if it were retained, could be more clearly written while still retaining its (perceived) meaning. As a result, AEP recommends revising R8.4 as follows:

8.4 Document and provide notice to the CEA, when a generating unit experiences a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event with the same cause as that of a previous Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event at the same or a similar unit, and one or more corrective actions to address the cause are addressed by an existing validated Generator Cold Weather Constraint for the same or a similar unit.

In addition, it should be noted that only those causations within the Generator Owner's control would be subject to the root cause analysis. As a result, fuel supply issues (were they found to be a cause) would not be included in the information provided.

Section E "Associated Documents" specifies the "Calculating Extreme Cold Weather Temperature" document, but does not include a hyperlink to it. We suggest that a hyperlink be added for this document, perhaps as a footnote or similar.

Requirement R2.2 states, "Implement freeze protection measures…" and is inferred by measure M2 that the freeze protection measures need to be implemented by the commercial operation date (COD). We recommend the phrase be revised to state "Implemented freeze protection measures…" to reflect the work is done by COD.

Requirement R3 states, "Implement freeze protection measures…; or Develop a Corrective Action Plan…". We recommend the phrase be revised to state "Implemented freeze protection measures…" to reflect the work is done or if not, a CAP is required to complete the work.

Requirement R6 is not clear how a prior approved Generator Cold Weather Constraint is to be addressed when a Generation Cold Weather Reliability Event occurs where the root cause of the event is covered by the constraint. Is a CAP required or does the GO just follow the R8.4?

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. NERC has revised the EOP-012-3 Generator Cold Weather Corrective Action Plan Extension and Constraint Process to provide additional clarifications and explanation.

As provided in the process, the CEA will complete its review following receipt of all necessary information: 10 calendar days for "known" constraints, and 45 days for case-by-case constraints. Denial of a Generator Cold Weather Constraint requires the entity to update its Corrective Action Plans with corrective actions that will be completed within the timetables in Requirement R6 Part 6.3 or Requirement R7 Part 7.1. Communication efforts between the submitting entity and the CEA related to updates of the Corrective Action Plan and timetables resulting from a denial of a Generator Cold Weather Constraint are strongly encouraged.

NERC has received several suggestions during this comment period to clarify this Requirement R8 Part 8.4 and has revised the language to clarify the actions that are required. Specifically, this Requirement Part is intended to address the situation where a Generator Owner experiences repeat Generator Cold Weather Reliability Events due to the same cause, and the corrective action(s) to address that cause are already addressed by a validated Generator Cold Weather Reliability Constraint. The notification to the CEA would be in lieu of pursuing validation of an identical Generator Cold Weather Constraint every time an event occurs.

With respect to the suggestion to include a hyperlink, NERC prefers to include information regarding supporting documents in lieu of hyperlinks which may become outdated. NERC will work to ensure that supporting information is available on the One Stop Shop or other areas of the NERC website so they may readily be found by stakeholders.

Regarding the recommendations to revise Requirement R2 Part R2.2 and Requirement R3, NERC has substantially revised Requirement R2, but maintains the present tense in both requirements as it believes it serves the purpose better.

With respect to the question regarding Requirement R6, if a unit experiences a Generator Cold Weather Reliability Event, an analysis should be performed and actions updated as needed. Updates to existing Corrective Action Plans are addressed by footnote 12 in the revised draft. If the Generator Owner determines the event is due to the same root cause as a prior event, and a corrective action to address the root cause is already covered by a validated constraint, the Generator Owner should then follow Requirement R8 Part 8.4 as revised.

Anna Martinson - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO Group	
Answer	

Document Name	2024-03_Unofficial_Comment_Form_EOP-012-3_321 MRO_NSRF_Final.docx

Comment

MRO NSRF does also appreciate the opportunity to comment, but the lack of ballot and short turnaround time from closing to the Board of Trustees meeting does not instill confidence much input will be utilized.

MRO NSRF recognizes the tight timelines and specific guidelines prescribed by FERC, but is concerned that reliability impacts may result from some of the changes compared to EOP-012-2.

To that point, MRO NSRF would suggest that NERC review the dates of R2, as currently written it would seem that all generating units that "contractually committed to design criteria" prior to June 29, 2023 but does enter commercial operation until after March 21, 2028 are not subject to any compliance obligation under R2. While there will likely be very few generating units that fall under this oversight, this is illustrative of MRO NSRF's concern regarding developing Standards on such extremely tight timelines.

Requirement 2 has the bullet: "Document in a declaration, with justification, if applicable, a Generator Cold Weather Constraint in accordance with Requirement R8." For clarity, suggest adding, "Document in a declaration, with justification, if applicable, a Generator Cold Weather Constraint in accordance with Requirement R8." To requirement 3.

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

Thank you for your comments. NERC appreciates the feedback and comments received through this NERC Rules of Procedure Section 321.5 public comment process. NERC has given every comment received during this comment period due consideration in the development of the final proposed EOP-012-3 standard, and responds to your comments below as follows.

With respect to the comment on Requirements R2, NERC has received several comments on Requirement R2 suggesting further revisions or clarifications, or identifying issues with the drafted language as it applies in non-U.S. jurisdictions. After considering each of these comments, NERC determined that the matter that previous drafts sought to address through the various date-based distinctions in Requirement R2 is fundamentally an implementation matter. As an implementation matter, it would be better addressed through revisions to the implementation plan.

Therefore, Requirement R2 is revised to provide that a Generator Owner entering commercial operation on or after October 1, 2027 shall either implement the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint, if applicable. The implementation plan is revised to clarify that an entity entering commercial operation after this October 1, 2027 date shall comply with Requirement R2 upon entering commercial operation, unless the exception formerly in Requirement R2 Part 2.1 applies. If an entity designed its unit prior to June 29, 2023 but entered commercial operation between October 1, 2027 and March 31, 2028, the entity shall have until April 1, 2028 to comply with Requirement R2 relating to implementing required capability.

NERC believes that this approach would avoid the appearance of any gaps in standard effectiveness.

With respect to the suggestion to revise Requirement R3, NERC has declined to make this suggestion for the following reason. Under Requirement R3, generating units that are unable to implement the required capability are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan. The requirements for such Corrective Action Plans are contained in Requirement R7. That requirement provides that a Generator Owner shall document any Generator Cold Weather Constraints (i.e. any condition that would preclude the Generator Owner from implementing freeze protection measures on one or more Generator Cold Weather Critical Components) in accordance with Requirement R8. In previous development proceedings NERC considered suggestions to include reference to constraints in Requirement R2; however, the placement in the Corrective Action Plan requirement is intended to reinforce that a constraint would preclude implementation of one or more corrective actions; it would not excuse the Generator Owner from developing the Corrective Action Plan, implementing the corrective actions it may feasibly implement, or updating operating limitations or cold weather preparedness plans.

Because the Commission directed that new generating units should not have the ability to implement a Corrective Action Plan post commercial operation, Requirement R2 specifies that they must either have the required capability or declare a Generator Cold Weather Constraint that would preclude them from doing so.