Frequently Asked Questions
Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading

The following questions and answers are intended to facilitate understanding about the Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading process. For additional information, contact Chris Larson (via email) or at (404) 446-9708.

Q1: Why are Reliability Standards being graded?

A1. The Standards Committee (SC), at its March 9, 2016 meeting, endorsed the use of the grading tool used by the Independent Expert Review Panel (IERP) as the metric to grade all NERC Reliability Standards. The Periodic Review (PR) Standing Review Team (SRT), with the SC chair facilitating the meetings, will conduct an initial grading of all currently-enforceable Reliability Standards with requirements that have been subject to enforcement in the United States for at least one year. The grading activity is conducted during pre-scheduled public meetings/calls open to stakeholders. The most up-to-date information can be found on the 2020 Periodic Review Standing Review Team - Standards Grading project page.

Upon completion of initial grading by the SRT, the grading tool will be posted for a 45-day industry comment period to solicit input prior to finalizing the grades. The finalized grading will be appended to the Reliability Standards Development Plan (RSDP).

Q2: Who comprises the SRT?

A2: The chairs (or delegates) of the SC, Operating Committee (OC), Planning Committee (PC), a representative for the Regional Entities, and NERC staff comprise the Periodic Review SRT. The primary role of the SC chair (or their delegate) is to facilitate the meetings, and not to grade the standards. The SC chair also assists to resolve differences of opinions.

Q3: What are the grades used for?

A3: The final grades will be an early input to future Periodic Review (PR) teams, along with additional information collected, as required under the PR Template. If a PR team recommends revising standard requirements that were graded, the SRT will re-grade those standard requirements based on the recommended revision. The re-graded requirements will also be posted for additional stakeholder comment prior to final SRT grading.

Q4. What is the grading tool?

A4. The grading tool is based on the grading tool from the 2013 [Standards Independent Experts Review Project](). The SC endorsed using the same decisions-tree and grading criteria, with the addition of one quality question on cost effectiveness. For purposes of the 2018 standards grading, the cost-effectiveness quality question does not contribute to the final numeric grade for quality. The grading tool, upon completion by the SRT, will be available on the [2020 Periodic Review Standing Review Team - Standards Grading]() project page.

Q5: What are the eligibility criteria for a standard to be graded?

A5: All requirements of a Reliability Standard must have been in effect, based on the implementation/compliance dates approved by the applicable governmental authority, for at least a year. In some instances, a standard may be eligible if:

- It has been a year since the effective date of the order approving that standard if entities are "early adopting" the requirements as they implement their programs to prepare for the effective date; or
- If the standard is a revision to a standard that has been in effect greater than a year.

For example, the SRT may grade a standard that is subject to future enforcement, when the revised version covers materially the same or similar topics.

Q6: How did the SRT determine the posted grades?

A6: Each SRT member uses a standards grading tool to develop initial grades, which the team discusses at public meeting(s). The SRT focuses their discussion on developing a consensus grade when individual grading shows variances. The SRT requests comment from industry on specific standards grades where the SRT is unable to reach consensus or desire specific stakeholder input before finalizing a consensus position. In those instances, additional input from industry would assist the team to finalize its grading.