

# Five-Year Review Recommendation to Revise NUC-001-2.1

October 1, 2013

## Introduction

The North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) has an obligation to conduct a five-year review of each Reliability Standard developed through NERC's American National Standards Institute-accredited Reliability Standards development process.<sup>1</sup> Project 2012-13 – Nuclear Plant Interface Coordination was created to review NUC-001 as part of the current cycle of five-year reviews of standards due for review.

The NERC Standards Committee appointed seven nuclear industry subject matter experts to serve on the NUC-001-2 five-year review team (NUC FYRT) on April 22, 2013.<sup>2</sup> The NUC FYRT used background information on the standard and the questions set forth in the Five-Year Review Template developed by NERC and approved by the Standards Committee, along with associated worksheets and reference documents, to determine whether NUC-001-2.1 should be: (1) affirmed as is (i.e., no changes needed); (2) revised (which may include revising or retiring one or more requirements); or (3) withdrawn. As a result of that examination, the NUC FYRT recommended to revise NUC-001-2.1.

The NUC FYRT's draft recommendation was posted for a 45-day comment period from July 26, 2013 through September 9, 2013. Stakeholders provided feedback on the draft recommendation and associated documents, including a proposed redlined standard and a draft Standard Authorization Request (SAR). There were 25 sets of responses, including comments from approximately 98 different people from approximately 75 companies representing 9 of the 10 Industry Segments. Comments were generally supportive of the NUC FYRT's recommendation and proposed implementation. However, the NUC FYRT carefully reviewed each comment, and after further discussion with NUC FYRT members and industry observers the final recommendation to revise the standard and the accompanying documents were updated to adopt many of the commenters' suggestions.

The NUC FYRT hereby recommends to **REVISE** NUC-001-2.1. Accompanying this recommendation is a SAR outlining the proposed scope and technical justification for the revision, and a redlined version of

<sup>1</sup> The currently effective Standard Processes Manual (SPM), which became effective on June 27, 2013, obligates NERC to conduct periodic reviews of all Reliability Standards at least once every ten years, and periodic reviews of those standards that are American National Standards (approved by the American National Standards Institute) at least once every five years. The NUC standard is not an American National Standard, and thus the NUC standard would only require a periodic review at least once every ten years under the current SPM. However, the former SPM, which became effective on January 31, 2012, required all standards to undergo a five-year review, and this five-year review process was launched under that SPM. The periodic review process is addressed on page 45 of the current SPM: [http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Resources/Documents/Appendix\\_3A\\_StandardsProcessesManual.pdf](http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Resources/Documents/Appendix_3A_StandardsProcessesManual.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> The Standards Committee added the one FYRT member on May 21, 2013.

NUC-001-2.1 as a suggested implementation of the NUC FYRT's recommendation. The NUC FYRT further requests the Standards Committee to prioritize revision of NUC-001-2.1 as a drafting project in 2014, and appoint the existing NUC FYRT members as the drafting team tasked with implementing the SAR. The NUC FYRT has crafted a possible implementation of its recommendation in the form a proposed redlined standard, which industry has commented on and generally supports. Therefore, revision of NUC-001-2.1 is expected to be non-controversial and require less time and industry resources than has historically been required for standard drafting projects.

**Applicable Reliability Standard: NUC-001-2.1**

**Note:** NUC-001-2.1 is the mandatory and enforceable version of NUC-001. As noted in NERC's September 9, 2013 informational filing in Docket No. RD11-13-000, on February 3, 2012, the Commission accepted the capitalization of the term "Protection System" in this standard. Additionally, the NERC Board of Trustees approved retiring R9.1 and its sub requirements on February 7, 2013 as part of the Paragraph 81 project (Project 2013-02) pending applicable regulatory approval. FERC issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on April 18, 2013, proposing to, among other things, approve retiring R9.1 and its sub requirements.

**NUC FYRT Members (name and organization):**

1. John Gyraath (Chair), Exelon Generation LLC (Nuclear)
2. George Attarian (Vice Chair), Duke Energy
3. Mukund "Mookie" Chander, Entergy Services Inc.
4. Kevin Donnelly, Consolidated Edison of NY
5. Pete Jenkins, Luminant Generation Company LLC
6. Jerry Whooley, PJM Interconnection
7. Les Carter, Ontario Power Generation

**Date Review Completed: October 1, 2013**

### Background Information *(initially completed by NERC staff)*

1. Are there any outstanding Federal Energy Regulatory Commission directives associated with the Reliability Standard? (If so, NERC staff will attach a list of the directives with citations to associated FERC orders for inclusion in a SAR.)

Yes

No

Note that several responses to FERC Order 693 directives require retaining specific NUC-001-2 language (relevant language noted in *italics*):

- (S- Ref 10370 - Para 1608): Next-day analysis required of minimum voltages at nuclear power plant auxiliary buses. Next day analysis is required in proposed TOP-002-3, R1. A specified minimum voltage limit is by definition an SOL which must be studied in proposed TOP-002-3, Requirement R1. *Approved NUC-001-2, Requirements R3 & R4.1 require the transmission entity to incorporate NPIRs in their planning and operating analyses.* Approved FAC-011-2 and approved FAC-014-2, Requirement R2 require the Transmission Operator to incorporate SOLs into their analyses. All data required for Operational Planning Analyses is stipulated in proposed TOP-003-2. *Approved NUC-001-2, Requirements R3 & R8 cover the information flowing back to the nuclear plant operator.*
- (S- Ref 10374): Directive applicable to TOP-002 is covered in NUC-001-1, which requires one to “[i]nform the nuclear plant operator in real-time if the auxiliary power bus voltages cannot be maintained.”
- (S- Ref 10391 - Para 1671): NRC has raised some significant issues regarding the consideration of nuclear power plants voltage requirements. Consider the NRCs comments on voltage requirements as part of the standards development process. Next day analysis is required in proposed TOP-002-3, R1. A specified minimum voltage limit is by definition an SOL which must be studied in proposed TOP-002-3, Requirement R1. *Approved NUC-001-2, Requirements R3 & R4.1 require the transmission entity to incorporate NPIRs in their planning and operating analyses.* Approved FAC-011-2 and approved FAC-014-2, Requirement R2 require the Transmission Operator to incorporate SOLs into their analyses. All data required for Operational Planning Analyses is stipulated in proposed TOP-003-2. *Approved NUC-001-2, Requirements R3 & R8 covers the information flowing back to the nuclear plant operator.*

2. Have stakeholders requested clarity on the Reliability Standard in the form of an Interpretation (outstanding, in progress, or approved), Compliance Application Notice (CAN) (outstanding, in progress, or approved), or an outstanding submission to NERC’s Issues Database? (If there are,

NERC staff will include a list of the Interpretation(s), CAN(s), or stakeholder-identified issue(s) contained in the NERC Issues Database that apply to the Reliability Standard.)

Yes

No

3. Is the Reliability Standard one of the most violated Reliability Standards? If so, does the root cause of the frequent violation appear to be a lack of clarity in the language?

Yes

No

Please explain: Based on NERC staff's review of violations and possible violations over the past three years, the NUC Reliability Standard is one of the least-violated Reliability Standards.

4. Does the Reliability Standard need to be converted to the results-based standard (RBS) format as outlined in *Attachment 1: Results-Based Standards*? (Note that the intent of this question is to ensure that, as Reliability Standards are reviewed, the formatting is changed to be consistent with the current format of a Reliability Standard. If the answer is yes, the formatting should be updated when the Reliability Standard is revised.)

Yes

No

Note: The NUC FYRT reviewed NUC-001-2.1 and determined that each requirement identifies a clear and measurable expected outcome, such as: (1) a stated level of reliability performance; (2) a reduction in a specified reliability risk; or (3) a necessary competency. Therefore, no requirements require conversion to the RBS format with regard to substance. However, the standard will be reformatted to comply with the standard RBS format as part of NERC's standard RBS template, but those changes will be limited to formatting changes and not require substantive revision to the text of the standard.

### Additional Questions Considered by the NUC FYRT

If NERC staff answered “Yes” to any of the questions above, the Reliability Standard probably requires revision. The questions below are intended to further guide your review. Some of the questions reference documents provided by NERC staff as indicated in the Background questions above.

1. **Paragraph 81:** Does one or more of the requirements in the Reliability Standard meet criteria for retirement or modification based on Paragraph 81 concepts? Use *Attachment 2: Paragraph 81 Criteria* to make this determination.

Yes

No

**Please summarize your application of Paragraph 81 Criteria, if any:** R9.1 has been retired under Paragraph 81 principles, pending applicable regulatory approval. The review team applied the criteria specified in *Attachment 2: Paragraph 81 Criteria* in reviewing the remainder of the NUC standard and determined that no additional requirements should be retired under Paragraph 81 principles.

2. **Clarity:** If the Reliability Standard has an Interpretation, CAN, or issue associated with it, or is frequently violated because of ambiguity, it probably needs to be revised for clarity. Beyond these indicators, is there any reason to believe that the Reliability Standard should be modified to address a lack of clarity? Consider:
  - a. Is this a Version 0 Reliability Standard?
  - b. Does the Reliability Standard have obviously ambiguous language or language that requires performance that is not measurable?
  - c. Are the requirements consistent with the purpose of the Reliability Standard?

Yes

No

**Please summarize your assessment:** The NUC FYRT recommends the following sections of NUC-001-2.1 be revised to improve the clarity of the standard:

- 1) Applicability Section 4.1: Add plural to "Nuclear Plant Generator Operator"
- 2) Effective Date Section 5: Revise language to account for jurisdictional differences in Canadian provinces.
- 3) Requirement R1: Add a missing period.

- 4) Requirement R5: Revise for consistency with R4 and to clarify that nuclear plants must be operated to meet the Nuclear Plant Interface Requirements.
- 5) Requirement R7 and R8: Delete "Protection Systems" in requirements R7 and R8 since it is a subset of the "nuclear plant design" and "electric system design" elements currently contained in R7 and R8 respectively. Add parenthetical clause (e.g. protective relay setpoints) to R7 following "nuclear plant design" and to R8 following "electric system design."
- 6) Requirement R9: Revise to clarify that all agreements do not have to discuss each of the elements in R9, but that the sum total of the agreements need to address the elements.
- 7) Requirement R9.2.1" Capitalize "agreement."
- 8) Requirement R9.3.5: Delete duplicative period.
- 9) Requirement R9.4.1: Insert "affecting the NPIRs" following "Provisions for communications" and insert "applicable unique" following "definitions of."
- 10) Section D. Compliance, 1.4: Capitalize "agreement."
- 11) Section E. Regional Differences: Revise to remove reference to specific Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations and to clarify that there are no Canadian Regulatory requirements for electrical power from the electric network to permit safe shutdown. Revise definition of "NPLR" to remove the potential conflict with a NERC Glossary of Terms definition.

Please reference the Standard Authorization Request (SAR) and proposed redlined changes to NUC-001-2.1 developed by the NUC FYRT for additional information regarding the above recommended revisions.

3. **Definitions:** Do any of the defined terms used within the Reliability Standard need to be refined?

Yes

No

**Please explain:** The NUC FYRT recommends that the defined term "Protection Systems" not be used in Requirements R7 and R8 since the definition is overly broad in application here, and has other NERC compliance implications. The original SDT use of "protection systems" was focused on the attributes that could impact the NPIRs such as frequency or voltage setpoints (i.e. relay settings) and not the expanded five elements of "Protection Systems" as defined in the NERC Glossary of Terms. The NUC FYRT concurs with the original intent of applying the term "protection systems" and therefore recommends deleting the defined term "Protection Systems." Please see the attached Five-Year Review Position Paper on NUC-001-2 R7 and R8 for further details.

4. **Compliance Elements:** Are the compliance elements associated with the requirements (Measures, Data Retention, VRFs, and VSLs) consistent with the direction of the Reliability Assurance Initiative and FERC and NERC guidelines? If you answered "No," please identify which elements require revision, and why:

Yes No

Compliance Elements will be addressed by the standard drafting team.

5. **Consistency with Other Reliability Standards:** Does the Reliability Standard need to be revised for formatting and language consistency among requirements within the Reliability Standard or consistency with other Reliability Standards? If you answered “Yes,” please describe the changes needed to achieve formatting and language consistency:

 Yes No

6. **Changes in Technology, System Conditions, or other Factors:** Does the Reliability Standard need to be revised to account for changes in technology, system conditions, or other factors? If you answered “Yes,” please describe the changes and specifically what the potential impact is to reliability if the Reliability Standard is not revised:

 Yes No

7. **Consideration of Generator Interconnection Facilities:** Is responsibility for generator interconnection Facilities appropriately accounted for in the Reliability Standard?

 Yes No

*Guiding Questions:*

If the Reliability Standard is applicable to GOs/GOPs, is there any ambiguity about the inclusion of generator interconnection Facilities? (If generation interconnection Facilities could be perceived to be excluded, specific language referencing the Facilities should be introduced in the Reliability Standard.)

The NUC FYRT did not identify any ambiguity.

If the Reliability Standard is not applicable to GOs/GOPs, is there a reliability-related need for treating generator interconnection Facilities as transmission lines for the purposes of this Reliability Standard? (If so, GOs and GOPs that own or operate relevant generator interconnection Facilities should be explicit in the applicability section of the Reliability Standard.)

This standard is applicable to GOs/GOPs; therefore, this guiding question was not considered.

### Recommendation

The answers to the questions above, along with a preliminary recommendation of the SMEs conducting the review of the Reliability Standard, will be posted for a 45-day informal comment period, and the comments publicly posted. The SMEs will review the comments to evaluate whether to modify their initial recommendation, and will document the final recommendation which will be presented to the Standards Committee.

**Preliminary Recommendation (to be completed by the SME team after its review and prior to posting the results of the review for industry comment):**

- AFFIRM
- REVISE
- RETIRE

Technical Justification: See attached SAR.

**Preliminary Recommendation posted for industry comment (date):** July 23, 2013

---

**Final Recommendation (to be completed by the SME team after it has reviewed industry comments on the preliminary recommendation):**

- AFFIRM *(This should only be checked if there are no outstanding directives, interpretations or issues identified by stakeholders.)*
- REVISE
- RETIRE

Technical Justification: See attached SAR.

**Date submitted to NERC Staff:** October 1, 2013.



## Attachment 1: Results-Based Standards

The fourth question for NERC staff asks if the Reliability Standard needs to be converted to the results-based standards (RBS) format. The information below will be used by NERC staff in making this determination, and is included here as a reference for the SME team and other stakeholders.

RBS standards employ a defense-in-depth strategy for Reliability Standards development where each requirement has a role in preventing system failures and the roles are complementary and reinforcing. Reliability Standards should be viewed as a portfolio of requirements designed to achieve an overall defense-in-depth strategy and comply with the quality objectives identified in the resource document titled, "[Acceptance Criteria of a Reliability Standard](#)."

A Reliability Standard that adheres to the RBS format should strive to achieve a portfolio of performance-, risk-, and competency-based mandatory reliability requirements that support an effective defense-in-depth strategy. Each requirement should identify a clear and measurable expected outcome, such as: a) a stated level of reliability performance, b) a reduction in a specified reliability risk, or c) a necessary competency.

- a. **Performance-Based**—defines a particular reliability objective or outcome to be achieved. In its simplest form, a results-based requirement has four components: who, under what conditions (if any), shall perform what action, to achieve what particular result or outcome?
- b. **Risk-Based**—preventive requirements to reduce the risks of failure to acceptable tolerance levels. A risk-based reliability requirement should be framed as: who, under what conditions (if any), shall perform what action, to achieve what particular result or outcome that reduces a stated risk to the reliability of the bulk power system?
- c. **Competency-Based**—defines a minimum set of capabilities an entity needs to have to demonstrate it is able to perform its designated reliability functions. A competency-based reliability requirement should be framed as: who, under what conditions (if any), shall have what capability, to achieve what particular result or outcome to perform an action to achieve a result or outcome or to reduce a risk to the reliability of the bulk power system?

Additionally, each RBS-adherent Reliability Standard should enable or support one or more of the eight reliability principles listed below. Each Reliability Standard should also be consistent with all of the reliability principles.

1. Interconnected bulk power systems shall be planned and operated in a coordinated manner to perform reliably under normal and abnormal conditions as defined in the NERC Standards.

2. The frequency and voltage of interconnected bulk power systems shall be controlled within defined limits through the balancing of real and reactive power supply and demand.
3. Information necessary for the planning and operation of interconnected bulk power systems shall be made available to those entities responsible for planning and operating the systems reliably.
4. Plans for emergency operation and system restoration of interconnected bulk power systems shall be developed, coordinated, maintained, and implemented.
5. Facilities for communication, monitoring, and control shall be provided, used, and maintained for the reliability of interconnected bulk power systems.
6. Personnel responsible for planning and operating interconnected bulk power systems shall be trained, qualified, and have the responsibility and authority to implement actions.
7. The reliability of the interconnected bulk power systems shall be assessed, monitored, and maintained on a wide-area basis.
8. Bulk power systems shall be protected from malicious physical or cyber attacks.

If the Reliability Standard does not provide for a portfolio of performance-, risk-, and competency-based requirements or consistency with NERC's reliability principles, NERC staff should recommend that the Reliability Standard be reformatted in accordance with RBS format.

## Attachment 2: Paragraph 81 Criteria

The first question for the SME Review Team asks if one or more of the requirements in the Reliability Standard meet(s) criteria for retirement or modification based on Paragraph 81 concepts.<sup>3</sup> Use the Paragraph 81 criteria explained below to make this determination. Document the justification for the decisions throughout and provide them in the final assessment in the Five-Year Review worksheet.

For a Reliability Standard requirement to be proposed for retirement or modification based on Paragraph 81 concepts, it must satisfy **both**: (i) Criterion A (the overarching criterion) and (ii) at least one of the Criteria B listed below (identifying criteria). In addition, for each Reliability Standard requirement proposed for retirement or modification, the data and reference points set forth below in Criteria C should be considered for making a more informed decision.

### *Criterion A (Overarching Criterion)*

The Reliability Standard requirement requires responsible entities (“entities”) to conduct an activity or task that does little, if anything, to benefit or protect the reliable operation of the BES.

Section 215(a) (4) of the United States Federal Power Act defines “reliable operation” as: “... operating the elements of the bulk-power system within equipment and electric system thermal, voltage, and stability limits so that instability, uncontrolled separation, or cascading failures of such system will not occur as a result of a sudden disturbance, including a cybersecurity incident, or unanticipated failure of system elements.”

### *Criteria B (Identifying Criteria)*

#### **B1. Administrative**

The Reliability Standard requirement requires responsible entities to perform a function that is administrative in nature, does not support reliability and is needlessly burdensome.

This criterion is designed to identify requirements that can be retired or modified with little effect on reliability and whose retirement or modification will result in an increase in the efficiency of the ERO compliance program. Administrative functions may include a task that is related to developing procedures or plans, such as establishing communication contacts. Thus, for certain requirements, Criterion B1 is closely related to Criteria B2, B3 and B4. Strictly administrative functions do not inherently negatively impact reliability directly and, where possible, should be eliminated or modified for purposes of efficiency and to allow the ERO and entities to appropriately allocate resources.

<sup>3</sup> In most cases, satisfaction of the Paragraph 81 criteria will result in the retirement of a requirement. In some cases, however, there may be a way to modify a requirement so that it no longer satisfies Paragraph 81 criteria. Recognizing that, this document refers to both options.

**B2. Data Collection/Data Retention**

These are requirements that obligate responsible entities to produce and retain data which document prior events or activities, and should be collected via some other method under NERC's rules and processes.

This criterion is designed to identify requirements that can be retired or modified with little effect on reliability. The collection and/or retention of data do not necessarily have a reliability benefit and yet are often required to demonstrate compliance. Where data collection and/or data retention is unnecessary for reliability purposes, such requirements should be retired or modified in order to increase the efficiency of the ERO compliance program.

**B3. Documentation**

The Reliability Standard requirement requires responsible entities to develop a document (*e.g.*, plan, policy or procedure) which is not necessary to protect BES reliability.

This criterion is designed to identify requirements that require the development of a document that is unrelated to reliability or has no performance or results-based function. In other words, the document is required, but no execution of a reliability activity or task is associated with or required by the document.

**B4. Reporting**

The Reliability Standard requirement obligates responsible entities to report to a Regional Entity, NERC or another party or entity. These are requirements that obligate responsible entities to report to a Regional Entity on activities which have no discernible impact on promoting the reliable operation of the BES and if the entity failed to meet this requirement there would be little reliability impact.

**B5. Periodic Updates**

The Reliability Standard requirement requires responsible entities to periodically update (*e.g.*, annually) documentation, such as a plan, procedure or policy without an operational benefit to reliability.

This criterion is designed to identify requirements that impose an updating requirement that is out of sync with the actual operations of the BES, unnecessary, or duplicative.

**B6. Commercial or Business Practice**

The Reliability Standard requirement is a commercial or business practice, or implicates commercial rather than reliability issues.

This criterion is designed to identify those requirements that require: (i) implementing a best or outdated business practice or (ii) implicating the exchange of or debate on commercially sensitive information while doing little, if anything, to promote the reliable operation of the BES.

### **B7. Redundant**

The Reliability Standard requirement is redundant with: (i) another FERC-approved Reliability Standard requirement(s); (ii) the ERO compliance and monitoring program; or (iii) a governmental regulation (e.g., Open Access Transmission Tariff, North American Energy Standards Board (“NAESB”), etc.).

This criterion is designed to identify requirements that are redundant with other requirements and are, therefore, unnecessary. Unlike the other criteria listed in Criterion B, in the case of redundancy, the task or activity itself may contribute to a reliable BES, but it is not necessary to have two duplicative requirements on the same or similar task or activity. Such requirements can be retired or modified with little or no effect on reliability and removal will result in an increase in efficiency of the ERO compliance program.

### *Criteria C (Additional data and reference points)*

Use the following data and reference points to assist in the determination of (and justification for) whether to proceed with retirement or modification of a Reliability Standard requirement that satisfies both Criteria A and B:

#### **C1. Was the Reliability Standard requirement part of a FFT filing?**

The application of this criterion involves determining whether the requirement was included in a FFT filing.

#### **C2. Is the Reliability Standard requirement being reviewed in an ongoing Standards Development Project?**

The application of this criterion involves determining whether the requirement proposed for retirement or modification is part of an active Standards Development Project, with consideration for the status of the project. If the requirement has been approved by Registered Ballot Body and is scheduled to be presented to the NERC Board of Trustees, in most cases it will not need to be addressed in the five-year review. The exception would be a requirement, such as the Critical Information Protection (“CIP”) requirements for Version 3 and 4, that is not due to be retired for an extended period of time. Also, for informational purposes, whether the requirement is included in a future or pending Standards Development Project should be identified and discussed.

#### **C3. What is the VRF of the Reliability Standard requirement?**

The application of this criterion involves identifying the VRF of the requirement proposed for retirement or modification, with particular consideration of any requirement that has been assigned as having a Medium or High VRF. Also, the fact that a requirement has a Lower VRF is not dispositive that

it qualifies for retirement or modification. In this regard, Criterion C3 is considered in light of Criterion C5 (Reliability Principles) and C6 (Defense in Depth) to ensure that no reliability gap would be created by the retirement or modification of the Lower VRF requirement. For example, no requirement, including a Lower VRF requirement, should be retired or modified if doing so would harm the effectiveness of a larger scheme of requirements that are purposely designed to protect the reliable operation of the BES.

**C4. In which tier of the most recent Actively Monitored List (AML) does the Reliability Standard requirement fall?**

The application of this criterion involves identifying whether the requirement proposed for retirement or modification is on the most recent AML, with particular consideration for any requirement in the first tier of the AML.

**C5. Is there a possible negative impact on NERC's published and posted reliability principles?**

The application of this criterion involves consideration of the eight following reliability principles published on the NERC webpage.

**Reliability Principles**

NERC Reliability Standards are based on certain reliability principles that define the foundation of reliability for North American bulk power systems. Each reliability standard shall enable or support one or more of the reliability principles, thereby ensuring that each standard serves a purpose in support of reliability of the North American bulk power systems. Each reliability standard shall also be consistent with all of the reliability principles, thereby ensuring that no standard undermines reliability through an unintended consequence.

Principle 1. Interconnected bulk power systems shall be planned and operated in a coordinated manner to perform reliably under normal and abnormal conditions as defined in the NERC Standards.

Principle 2. The frequency and voltage of interconnected bulk power systems shall be controlled within defined limits through the balancing of real and reactive power supply and demand.

Principle 3. Information necessary for the planning and operation of interconnected bulk power systems shall be made available to those entities responsible for planning and operating the systems reliably.

Principle 4. Plans for emergency operation and system restoration of interconnected bulk power systems shall be developed, coordinated, maintained, and implemented.

Principle 5. Facilities for communication, monitoring, and control shall be provided, used, and maintained for the reliability of interconnected bulk power systems.

Principle 6. Personnel responsible for planning and operating interconnected bulk power systems shall be trained, qualified, and have the responsibility and authority to implement actions.

Principle 7. The reliability of the interconnected bulk power systems shall be assessed, monitored, and maintained on a wide-area basis.

Principle 8. Bulk power systems shall be protected from malicious physical or cyber attacks. (footnote omitted).

**C6. Is there any negative impact on the defense in depth protection of the BES?**

The application of this criterion considers whether the requirement proposed for retirement or modification is part of a defense in depth protection strategy. In other words, the assessment is to verify whether other requirements rely on the requirement proposed for retirement or modification to protect the BES.

**C7. Does the retirement or modification promote results or performance based Reliability Standards?**

The application of this criterion considers whether the requirement, if retired or modified, will promote the initiative to implement results- and/or performance-based Reliability Standards.