

Dismissal Analysis

November 15th, 2011

Disclaimer:

An analysis of the dismissal reasons for certain self reported violations was conducted and is shown here. Providing information to the registered entities on common reasons for dismissals may reduce self reporting of actions that do not constitute violations. NERC and the regions produced this list of self reported dismissals to provide the industry with a better understanding of common reasons for dismissals. Initially, the focus was on dismissals of self reported violations. Further analysis will include common dismissals of violations identified through other monitoring methods. Additional common dismissal reasons and lessons learned will be posted on an ongoing basis.

Standard	Requirement	Initial Facts	Reason for Dismissal	Dismissal Lesson	Date of Publication
PRC-005	R2	The entity has reported station batteries at two substations that were out of compliance with its defined maintenance and testing plan, which lists annual testing intervals. The maintenance and testing plan in place at time of the discovered alleged violation only allowed 25% variance from the annual maintenance, if the equipment is being replaced. The entity has 3 BPS applicable substations. For the Self-Report period 2/23/10 to 10/1/10, the entity had three annual battery tasks and six quarterly battery	On October 1, 2010, the entity submitted a Self-Report citing possible noncompliance with this Standard. Specifically, the entity stated it did not complete annual maintenance and testing scheduled for substation batteries within the interval defined by its Protection System Maintenance and Testing Plan (hereinafter, "Plan"). Upon further review conducted between November 1 through November 12, 2010, Enforcement determined that the entity did not violate PRC-005-1 R2.1 because the entity completed	Occasionally, there can be instances in an entity's maintenance plan which call for an extension of pre-defined intervals. As long as the instances do not violate any other existing standards and do not put the equipment or BPS at risk, the plan is maintaining its defined intervals.	11/15/2011

		<p>tasks. The entity has two non-compliant tasks for a total of 22% non-compliant battery tasks. Quarterly inspections were performed at both stations on time and in accordance with stated intervals. The entity has reviewed the other four components of the "Protection System" and made this statement, "the entity has performed an internal review of all of its five components that make up the Protective System for all PRC-005 R2 applicable BPS substations. The entity has determined compliance with all BPS components other than what has been submitted in the SR."</p>	<p>annual substation battery testing within the interval prescribed by its Plan. The entity's Plan requires "annual" substation battery testing. However, the Plan contains an exception to the annual interval wherein if equipment is scheduled for replacement or upgrade within the annual period, the remaining equipment needing annual testing may be completed within an interval of fifteen months</p>		
VAR-002	R1 and R3	<p>The entity stated that it failed to notify its TOP that five of its generating units operated in manual mode during startup and that those units experienced status changes during startup and shutdown. On approximately 112 occasions for the five generating units: The Automatic Voltage Regulator ("AVR") operated in manual mode for one to ten</p>	<p>In the Self-Report, the entity summarized the TOP's clarification statement as follows: When a generator returns from an outage, one of the steps the TOP will take is to put the AVR in the automatic control mode (voltage or Reactive Power). This may or may not happen initially upon startup, but once a generator is finished with all their internal startup</p>	<p>The entity previously notified its TOP that the entity's generating units operated in manual mode during startup and that the units changed from automatic mode to manual mode during shutdown. The TOP confirmed this notification. The entity's TOP understood that the entity may not place its generating units in the automatic mode during special</p>	11/15/2011

		minutes during startup, after which the AVR was engaged. On approximately 56 occasions for three of the generating units, the AVR operated in manual mode for less than one minute before shutdown. The entity did not notify its TOP of these occurrences because the entity's procedures only required its operators to notify its TOP when the entity's generating units were beginning startup. In addition, the TOP exempted the generating units in question from following a voltage schedule, so the entity operated the generating units by its own guidelines, and its TOP did not rely on those generation units for voltage support when those generating units were online.	procedures and is released to the system for normal dispatch, the AVR shall be assumed by the System Reliability Controller (SRC) to be in the automatic control mode. The TOP is to report to the SRC any deviation from the above process in which the AVR is not expected to be in the automatic control mode after startup. As a result of this clarification, as well as the fact that the TOP has granted the entity an exemption from following a voltage schedule for these units, such that the TOP does not count on them when they are online, ReliabilityFirst dismisses these possible alleged violations of VAR-002-1.1a, R1 and R3.	evolution situations, such as startup and shutdown. Therefore, the TOP had notice, as required by VAR-002. Further, the TOP exempted the generating units involved from following a voltage schedule, so the entity operated the generating units by its own guidelines and the TOP did not rely on those generation units for voltage support. (see NERC Compliance Application Notice 0022)	
Summary of CIP-001	Summary of R4	Entities did not verify or document contact with FBI	Evidence of actual contact with the FBI is not necessary and entities are not required to establish two way communications with the FBI	The following 6 self reported violations across 2 regions of CIP-001 R4 were observed not to be violations due to further NERC guidance clarifying that having FBI contact information is sufficient to be compliant with R4.	9/15/2011
CIP-001	R4	Entity has not contacted the FBI directly for reporting instructions	Guidance from NERC regarding enforcement of R4 says that the	Entities are not required to establish two way communications	9/15/2011

		in the event of a sabotage incident. The Facility's Emergency Action Plans contain the contact phone number for the FBI regional field office in Charlotte, NC.	presence of the correct number for the FBI in the procedure is sufficient; Evidence of actual contact with the FBI is not necessary. Since Entity has submitted a completed mitigation plan with evidence that they verified the number to be correct, there is insufficient evidence to find a violation.	with the FBI.	
CIP-001	R4	Entity had not established direct contact with the FBI prior to March 20, 2008. Entity's sabotage reporting procedure includes contacting the FBI with the correct phone number, but actual contact had not been made.	Based on the revised NERC guidance regarding enforcement of CIP-001 R4 contained in the revised RSAW for CIP-001-1, the fact that Entity had a sabotage reporting procedure that includes contacting the FBI with the correct phone number, and Entity's submittal of a completed mitigation plan with evidence that they verified the number to be correct, SERC staff concludes that there is insufficient basis to allege a violation of CIP-001 R4.	Entities are not required to establish two way communications with the FBI.	9/15/2011
CIP-001	R4	The registered entity's non-compliance is due to the fact that they are only now required to follow ERO Reliability Standards and are now in the process of ensuring that their internal	WECC confirmed that the registered entity has an established communications contact with the FBI. While the registered entity did have contact information regarding the FBI, it	Entities are not required to establish two way communications with the FBI.	9/15/2011

		<p>procedures address all the pertinent aspects. Their non-compliance is due to the lack of required documentation of one or more of the processes as described in this Standard. The regional entity's existing operational procedures, including regular training and review, address all of the non-documentation requirements of this standard.</p>	<p>had not made verbal contact with the FBI to confirm the communications contacts. Since the original Self-Report date, NERC has provided guidance to the regions clarifying that having FBI contact information is sufficient to be compliant with R4. Therefore, the registered entity did not need to establish verbal contact to show compliance with R4. Thus, the registered entity was never in violation of CIP-001-1 R4 because it had established FBI contact information prior to, and continuing from, the effective date of this Standard.</p>		
CIP-001	R4	<p>The registered entity's non-compliance is due to the fact that they are only now required to follow ERO Reliability Standards and are now in the process of ensuring that their internal procedures address all the pertinent aspects. Their non-compliance is due to the lack of required documentation of one or more of the processes as described in this Standard. The regional entity's existing</p>	<p>The entity had an appropriate FBI phone number, NERC provided guidance that the phone number is sufficient, therefore the entity demonstrated compliance with the Standard by having the appropriate phone contact.</p>	<p>Entities are not required to establish two way communications with the FBI.</p>	9/15/2011

		operational procedures, including regular training and review, address all of the non-documentation requirements of this standard.			
CIP-001	R4	The registered entity does not have a formal Sabotage Procedure in place as a part of their Emergency Action Procedures. They have not done any training on Sabotage.	The entity had an appropriate FBI phone number, NERC provided guidance that the phone number is sufficient, therefore the entity demonstrated compliance with the Standard by having the appropriate phone contact.	Entities are not required to establish two way communications with the FBI.	9/15/2011
CIP-001	R4	Procedures have not been documented.	The entity had an appropriate FBI phone number, NERC provided guidance that the phone number is sufficient, therefore the entity demonstrated compliance with the Standard by having the appropriate phone contact.	Entities are not required to establish two way communications with the FBI.	9/15/2011
COM-002	R2	The entity reported a violation due to the lack of 3 way communication when a plant operator called the Generation Dispatch Center to let them know the automatic voltage regulator was taken out of service at a Generating station. No call was made to the TOP or to the RC due to the GDC Operator not aware of the terminology and not	The reporting of the change of status was not a directive requiring the information to be repeated or acknowledged.	Certain information that is not a directive from a BA, RC or TOP do not need to be repeated or acknowledged per the Requirement. However, it is good practice to follow a 3 way communication protocol for all types of communication even if not associated with a directive.	9/15/2011

		recognizing that amplidyne meant the automatic voltage regulator			
FAC-001	R3	A consultant for a generation project requested by phone a copy of information concerning Entity's facilities connection requirements (FCR). Some internal confusion as to whether this request was for the actual FCR or for other interconnection related documents contributed to Entity making the FCR available outside of the requirement's five business day window.	SERC staff finds that there is insufficient basis to allege a violation as the project consultant did not make a specific request of Entity for the FCR. Therefore, Entity was not required to provide the requested information within five business days.	Event-driven dismissal.	9/15/2011
FAC-001	R3	The Registered Entity self-reported that it did not have documentation available to describe the process the entity utilizes to disseminate information to the FRCC within 30 calendar days of the request.	This self-reported violation has been dismissed, as there was no evidence of a request for data from the FRCC which would have been due within 5 business days and documenting the process to make data available to the FRCC is not required by the Standard.	Event-driven dismissal.	9/15/2011
PRC-005	R1	Entity discovered that four devices that may be elements of its Protection Systems affecting the Bulk Electric System were not specifically identified in the Appendix of Entity's Protection System & Maintenance Testing Manual.	Entity is not in violation of PRC-005-1 Requirement 1 because the Standard and requirement does not require Entity to maintain a list of specific Protection System equipment. Entity does in fact have a Protection System program document that addresses	The omitted equipment was not required to be listed and was maintained and tested under specified intervals.	9/15/2011

			<p>maintenance and testing intervals and their basis as well as the summary of maintenance and testing procedures, thereby meeting the requirements of the Standard. The specific devices omitted from Entity's Appendix to its program document were in fact maintained and tested under Entity's specified intervals for microprocessor relays and station batteries.</p>		
PRC-005	R2	<p>The entity recently performed an internal self-evaluation and review of the status of relay maintenance and testing activities scheduled for 2007. Maintenance and testing (Operational Checks) of four equipment relay systems will not be completed in 2007 as originally planned. The planned maintenance and testing cannot be completed at this time due to an outage on an underground distribution line that must be in service to support normal operations while the transmission relays are taken out of service while performing the relay systems operational checks.</p>	<p>In its Self-Report, the entity reported that maintenance and testing of four equipment relay systems at a substation could not be completed in 2007 as originally planned, due to an outage on an underground distribution line that must be in service to support normal operations while the transmission relays are taken out of service to perform the relay systems operational checks. On August 25, 2008 WECC issued a Notice of Alleged Violation to the entity, alleging the entity's violation of this standard; the entity subsequently accepted the NAVAPS. On August 11, 2009, the</p>	<p>Although the maintenance schedule was not maintained, if testing does not exceed the maintenance and testing interval, there is reason for dismissal.</p>	9/15/2011

			<p>entity submitted a document setting forth the entity's transmission protection system maintenance and testing program. The program established the initial interval for maintenance and testing under the Standard from January, 2004 to December, 2009. The entity also submitted a spreadsheet showing that for the first interval, the relays in the substation were all tested on February 2, 2008, well within the established maintenance and testing interval. WECC Enforcement reviewed the supplemental information from the entity and determined that although the entity had missed its scheduled maintenance and testing at the substation, it had not exceeded the intervals in its approved Protection System maintenance and testing program. At the conclusion of its review, WECC determined that the six year maintenance and testing interval for the a substation has not been exceeded, and therefore there is an insufficient basis to pursue this</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			self-reported violation of PRC-005-1 R2. Thus, WECC is dismissing this Self-Report.		
TPL-004	R2	The entity did not own software capable of performing dynamic system studies and does not have personnel trained to accomplish studies.	The requirements obligate the entity to provide the results of its reliability assessments to the RRO as required. The RRO did not require the entity to provide the results.	Event-driven dismissal.	9/15/2011
TPL-004	R2	The entity has not performed a complete set of steady state simulations, transient stability studies, and dynamic assessments identified for compliance with TPL-004 Table 1 Category D requirements.	The entity submitted Self-Reports addressing possible violations of these standards. The entity stated that it had not performed a complete set of steady state simulations, transient stability studies, and dynamic assessments needed for compliance with each of the above requirements. Enforcement reviewed these Self-Reports and determined that the entity did not violate the above listed Standards because these standards require an entity to provide the results of its reliability assessments and corrective plans annually to the NERC Regional Reliability Organization (RRO) as required by the RRO. However, the entity was never required by the RRO (WECC) to provide its	Event-driven dismissal.	9/15/2011

			assessments and corrective plans. Thus, the entity was not in violation of these Standards. Accordingly, WECC has dismissed the entity's violations.		
--	--	--	--	--	--