

Violation Risk Factor and Violation Severity Level Justifications

Project 2007-17.2 PRC-005-3

Protection System and Automatic Reclosing Maintenance

Violation Risk Factor and Violation Severity Level Justifications

This document provides the drafting team's justification for assignment of violation risk factors (VRFs) and violation severity levels (VSLs) for each requirement in PRC-005-2 - Protection System Maintenance.

Each primary requirement is assigned a VRF and a set of one or more VSLs. These elements support the determination of an initial value range for the Base Penalty Amount regarding violations of requirements in FERC-approved Reliability Standards, as defined in the ERO Sanction Guidelines.

The Protection System Maintenance and Testing Standard Drafting Team applied the following NERC criteria and FERC Guidelines when proposing VRFs and VSLs for the requirements under this project:

NERC Criteria – VRFs

High Risk Requirement

A requirement that, if violated, could directly cause or contribute to bulk electric system instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the bulk electric system at an unacceptable risk of instability, separation, or cascading failures; or, a requirement in a planning time frame that, if violated, could, under emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, directly cause or contribute to bulk electric system instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the bulk electric system at an unacceptable risk of instability, separation, or cascading failures, or could hinder restoration to a normal condition.

Medium Risk Requirement

A requirement that, if violated, could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor and control the bulk electric system. However, violation of a medium risk requirement is unlikely to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures; or, a requirement in a planning time frame that, if violated, could, under emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, directly and adversely affect the electrical state or capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor, control, or restore the bulk electric system. However, violation of a medium risk requirement is unlikely, under emergency, abnormal, or restoration conditions anticipated by the preparations, to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures, nor to hinder restoration to a normal condition.

Lower Risk Requirement

A requirement that is administrative in nature and a requirement that, if violated, would not be expected to adversely affect the electrical state or capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor and control the bulk electric system; or, a requirement that is administrative in nature and a requirement in a planning time frame that, if violated, would not, under the emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, be expected to adversely affect the electrical state or capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor, control, or restore the bulk electric system. A planning requirement that is administrative in nature.

FERC VRF Guidelines

Guideline (1) — Consistency with the Conclusions of the Final Blackout Report

The Commission seeks to ensure that VRFs assigned to Requirements of Reliability Standards in these identified areas appropriately reflect their historical critical impact on the reliability of the Bulk-Power System.

In the VSL Order, FERC listed critical areas (from the Final Blackout Report) where violations could severely affect the reliability of the Bulk-Power System:

- Emergency operations
- Vegetation management
- Operator personnel training
- Protection systems and their coordination
- Operating tools and backup facilities
- Reactive power and voltage control
- System modeling and data exchange
- Communication protocol and facilities
- Requirements to determine equipment ratings
- Synchronized data recorders
- Clearer criteria for operationally critical facilities
- Appropriate use of transmission loading relief

Guideline (2) — Consistency within a Reliability Standard

The Commission expects a rational connection between the sub-Requirement VRF assignments and the main Requirement VRF assignment.

Guideline (3) — Consistency among Reliability Standards

The Commission expects the assignment of VRFs corresponding to Requirements that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards would be treated comparably.

Guideline (4) — Consistency with NERC's Definition of the VRF Level

Guideline (4) was developed to evaluate whether the assignment of a particular VRF level conforms to NERC's definition of that risk level.

Guideline (5) — Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More Than One Obligation

Where a single Requirement co-mingles a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective, the VRF assignment for such Requirements must not be watered down to reflect the lower risk level associated with the less important objective of the Reliability Standard.

The following discussion addresses how the SDT considered FERC's VRF Guidelines 2 through 5. The team did not address Guideline 1 directly because of an apparent conflict between Guidelines 1 and 4. Whereas Guideline 1 identifies a list of topics that encompass nearly all topics within NERC's Reliability Standards and implies that these requirements should be assigned a "High" VRF, Guideline 4 directs assignment of VRFs based on the impact of a specific requirement to the reliability of the system. The SDT believes that Guideline 4 is reflective of the intent of VRFs in the first instance and therefore concentrated its approach on the reliability impact of the requirements.

PRC-005-3 Protection System and Automatic Reclosing Maintenance is a revision of PRC-005-2 Protection System Maintenance with the stated purpose: To document and implement programs for the maintenance of all Protection Systems and Automatic Reclosing affecting the reliability of the Bulk Electric System (BES) so that they are kept in working order.

PRC-005-3 has five (5) requirements that address the inclusion of Automatic Reclosing. A Table of minimum maintenance activities and maximum maintenance intervals has been added to PRC-005-2 to address FERC's directives from Order 758. The revised standard requires that entities develop an appropriate Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP), that they implement their PSMP, and that, in the event they are unable to restore Automatic Reclosing Components to proper working order while performing maintenance, they initiate the follow-up activities necessary to resolve those maintenance issues.

The requirements of PRC-005-3 map one-to-one with the requirements of PRC-005-2. The drafting team did not revise the VRFs for the requirements of PRC-005-3.

PRC-005-3 Requirements R1 and R2 are related to developing and documenting a Protection System Maintenance Program. The Standard Drafting Team determined that the assignment of a VRF of Medium was consistent with the NERC criteria that violations of these requirements could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor and control the bulk electric system but are unlikely to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures. Additionally, a review of the body of existing NERC Standards with approved VRFs revealed that requirements with similar reliability objectives in other standards are largely assigned a VRF of Medium.

PRC-005-3 Requirements R3 and R4 are related to implementation of the Protection System Maintenance Program. The SDT determined that the assignment of a VRF of High was consistent with the NERC criteria that that violation of these requirements could directly cause or contribute to bulk electric system instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the bulk electric system at an unacceptable risk of instability, separation, or cascading failures. Additionally, a review of the body of existing NERC Standards with approved VRFs revealed that requirements with similar reliability objectives in other standards are assigned a VRF of High.

PRC-005-3 Requirement R5 relates to the initiation of resolution of unresolved maintenance issues, which describe situations where an entity was unable to restore a Component to proper working order during the performance of the maintenance activity. The Standard Drafting Team determined that the assignment of a VRF of Medium was consistent with the NERC criteria that violation of this requirements could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor and control the bulk electric system but are unlikely to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures. Additionally, a review of the body of existing NERC Standards with approved VRFs revealed that requirements with similar reliability objectives in other standards are largely assigned a VRF of Medium.

NERC Criteria - VSLs

VSLs define the degree to which compliance with a requirement was not achieved. Each requirement must have at least one VSL. While it is preferable to have four VSLs for each requirement, some requirements do not have multiple “degrees” of noncompliant performance and may have only one, two, or three VSLs.

VSLs should be based on the guidelines shown in the table below:

| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Missing a minor element (or a small percentage) of the required performance</p> <p>The performance or product measured has significant value as it almost meets the full intent of the requirement.</p> | <p>Missing at least one significant element (or a moderate percentage) of the required performance.</p> <p>The performance or product measured still has significant value in meeting the intent of the requirement.</p> | <p>Missing more than one significant element (or is missing a high percentage) of the required performance or is missing a single vital Component.</p> <p>The performance or product has limited value in meeting the intent of the requirement.</p> | <p>Missing most or all of the significant elements (or a significant percentage) of the required performance.</p> <p>The performance measured does not meet the intent of the requirement or the product delivered cannot be used in meeting the intent of the requirement.</p> |

FERC Order on VSLs

In its June 19, 2008 Order on VSLs, FERC indicated it would use the following four guidelines for determining whether to approve VSLs:

Guideline 1: VSL Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance

- Compare the VSLs to any prior Levels of Non-compliance and avoid significant changes that may encourage a lower level of compliance than was required when Levels of Non-compliance were used.

Guideline 2: VSL Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties

- Guideline 2a: A violation of a “binary” type requirement must be a “Severe” VSL.
- Guideline 2b: Do not use ambiguous terms such as “minor” and “significant” to describe noncompliant performance.

Guideline 3: VSL Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement

- VSLs should not expand on what is required in the requirement.

Guideline 4: VSL Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations

- . . . unless otherwise stated in the requirement, each instance of non-compliance with a requirement is a separate violation. Section 4 of the Sanction Guidelines states that assessing penalties on a per violation per day basis is the “default” for penalty calculations.

VRF and VSL Justifications

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R1 | |
|--|--|
| Proposed VRF | Medium |
| NERC VRF Discussion | Failure to establish a Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for Protection Systems designed to provide protection for BES Element(s) could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk power system. However, violation of this requirement is unlikely to lead to bulk power system instability, separation, or cascading failures. The applicable entities are always responsible for maintaining the reliability of the bulk power system regardless of the situation. This VRF emphasizes the risk to system performance that results from mal-performing Protection System Components. Failure to establish a Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for Protection Systems will not, by itself, lead to instability, separation, or cascading failures. Thus, the requirement meets NERC’s criteria for a Medium VRF. |
| FERC VRF G1 Discussion | Guideline 1- Consistency w/ Blackout Report: N/A |
| FERC VRF G2 Discussion | Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard: The requirement has no sub-requirements so only one VRF was assigned. The requirement utilizes Parts to identify the items to be included within a Protection System Maintenance Program. The VRF for this requirement is consistent with others in the standard with regard to relative risk; therefore, there is no conflict. |
| FERC VRF G3 Discussion | Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards: The SDT has determined that there is no consistency among existing approved Standards relative to requirements of this nature. The SDT has assigned a MEDIUM VRF, which is consistent with recent FERC guidance on FAC-008-3 Requirement R2 and FAC-013-2 Requirement R1, which are similar in nature to PRC-005-2 Requirement R1. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R1 | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Proposed VRF | Medium | | |
| FERC VRF G4 Discussion | <p>Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs:</p> <p>Failure to establish a Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for Protection Systems designed to provide protection for BES Element(s) could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk power system. However, violation of this requirement is unlikely to lead to bulk power system instability, separation, or cascading failures. The applicable entities are always responsible for maintaining the reliability of the bulk power system regardless of the situation. This VRF emphasizes the risk to system performance that results from mal-performing Protection System Components. Failure to establish a Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for Protection Systems will not, by itself, lead to instability, separation, or cascading failures. Thus, the requirement meets NERC’s criteria for a Medium VRF.</p> | | |
| FERC VRF G5 Discussion | <p>Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation:</p> <p>This requirement establishes a single risk-level, and the assigned VRF is consistent with that risk level.</p> | | |
| Proposed VSL – PRC-005-3, R1 | | | |
| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
| <p>The responsible entity’s PSMP failed to specify whether one Component Type is being addressed by time-based or performance-based maintenance, or a combination of both. (Part 1.1)</p> <p>OR</p> | <p>The responsible entity’s PSMP failed to specify whether two Component Types are being addressed by time-based or performance-based maintenance, or a combination of both. (Part 1.1)</p> | <p>The responsible entity’s PSMP failed to specify whether three Component Types are being addressed by time-based or performance-based maintenance, or a combination of both. (Part 1.1).</p> <p>OR</p> | <p>The responsible entity failed to establish a PSMP.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The responsible entity’s PSMP failed to specify whether four or more Component Types are being addressed by time-based or performance-based maintenance, or a combination of both. (Part 1.1).</p> |

| Proposed VSL – PRC-005-3, R1 | | | |
|---|----------|--|--------|
| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
| The responsible entity's PSMP failed to include applicable station batteries in a time-based program (Part 1.1) | | The responsible entity's PSMP failed to include the applicable monitoring attributes applied to each Component Type consistent with the maintenance intervals specified in Tables 1-1 through 1-5, Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4-1 through 4-2 where monitoring is used to extend the maintenance intervals beyond those specified for unmonitored Components. (Part 1.2). | |

VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R1

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>NERC VSL Guidelines</p> | <p>Meets NERC’s VSL Guidelines—There is an incremental aspect to the violation and the VSLs follow the guidelines for incremental violations.</p> |
| <p>FERC VSL G1 VSL Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p> | <p>This VSL is consistent with the current VSLs associated with the existing requirements of the standards being replaced by this proposed standard.</p> |
| <p>FERC VSL G2 VSL Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties Guideline 2a: The Single VSL Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent Guideline 2b: VSL Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p> | <p>Guideline 2a: N/A</p> <p>Guideline 2b: The proposed VSL does not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p> |

VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R1

| | |
|---|---|
| FERC VSL G3 VSL Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement | The proposed VSL uses similar terminology to that used in the associated requirement, and is therefore consistent with the requirement. |
| FERC VSL G4 VSL Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations | The VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R2 | |
|--|--|
| Proposed VRF | Medium |
| NERC VRF Discussion | Failure to properly establish a performance-based Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for Protection Systems designed to provide protection for BES Element(s) could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk power system. However, violation of this requirement is unlikely to lead to bulk power system instability, separation, or cascading failures. The applicable entities are always responsible for maintaining the reliability of the bulk power system regardless of the situation. This VRF emphasizes the risk to system performance that results from mal-performing Protection System Components. Failure to properly establish a performance-based Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for Protection Systems will not, by itself, lead to instability, separation, or cascading failures. Thus, the requirement meets NERC’s criteria for a Medium VRF. |
| FERC VRF G1 Discussion | Guideline 1- Consistency w/ Blackout Report: N/A |
| FERC VRF G2 Discussion | Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard: The requirement has no subpart(s); therefore, only one VRF was assigned and no conflict(s) exist. |
| FERC VRF G3 Discussion | Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards: The SDT has determined that there is no consistency among existing approved Standards relative to requirements of this nature. The SDT has assigned a MEDIUM VRF, which is consistent with recent FERC guidance on FAC-008-3 Requirement R2 and FAC-013-2 Requirement R1, which are similar in nature to PRC-005-2 Requirement R1. |
| FERC VRF G4 Discussion | Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs: Failure to properly establish a performance-based Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R2 | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| Proposed VRF | Medium | | |
| | Protection Systems designed to provide protection for BES Element(s) could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk power system. However, violation of this requirement is unlikely to lead to bulk power system instability, separation, or cascading failures. The applicable entities are always responsible for maintaining the reliability of the bulk power system regardless of the situation. This VRF emphasizes the risk to system performance that results from mal-performing Protection System Components. Failure to properly establish a performance-based Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) for Protection Systems will not, by itself, lead to instability, separation, or cascading failures. Thus, the requirement meets NERC’s criteria for a Medium VRF. | | |
| FERC VRF G5 Discussion | Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation: This requirement establishes a single risk-level, and the assigned VRF is consistent with that risk level. | | |
| Proposed VSL – PRC-005-3, R2 | | | |
| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
| The responsible entity uses performance-based maintenance intervals in its PSMP but failed to reduce Countable Events to no more than 4% within three years. | N/A | The responsible entity uses performance-based maintenance intervals in its PSMP but failed to reduce Countable Events to no more than 4% within four years. | The responsible entity uses performance-based maintenance intervals in its PSMP but: 1) Failed to establish the technical justification described within Requirement R2 for the initial use of the performance-based PSMP |

| Proposed VSL – PRC-005-3, R2 | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|------|--|
| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
| | | | <p>OR</p> <p>2) Failed to reduce countable events to no more than 4% within five years</p> <p>OR</p> <p>3) Maintained a Segment with less than 60 Components</p> <p>OR</p> <p>4) Failed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually update the list of Components, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually perform maintenance on the greater of 5% of the Segment population or 3 Components, <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annually analyze the program activities and results for each Segment. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R2 | |
|---|---|
| NERC VSL Guidelines | Meets NERC’s VSL Guidelines—There is an incremental aspect to the violation and the VSLs follow the guidelines for incremental violations. |
| FERC VSL G1 VSL Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance | This VSL is consistent with the current VSLs associated with the existing requirements of the standards being replaced by this proposed standard. |
| FERC VSL G2 VSL Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties Guideline 2a: The Single VSL Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent | Guideline 2a: N/A Guideline 2b: The proposed VSL does not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations. |

VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R2

| | |
|---|---|
| Guideline 2b: VSL Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language | |
| FERC VSL G3 VSL Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement | The proposed VSL uses similar terminology to that used in the associated requirement, and is therefore consistent with the requirement. |
| FERC VSL G4 VSL Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations | The VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R3 | |
|--|---|
| Proposed VRF | High |
| NERC VRF Discussion | Failure to implement and follow its Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) could, under emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, directly cause or contribute to bulk electric system instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the bulk electric system at an unacceptable risk of instability, separation, or cascading failures, or could hinder restoration to a normal condition. Thus, this requirement meets the criteria for a High VRF. |
| FERC VRF G1 Discussion | Guideline 1- Consistency w/ Blackout Report: N/A |
| FERC VRF G2 Discussion | Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard: The requirement has no subpart(s); therefore, only one VRF was assigned and no conflict(s) exist. |
| FERC VRF G3 Discussion | Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards: The only Reliability Standards with similar goals are those being replaced by this standard, and the High VRF assignment for this requirement is consistent with the assigned VRFs for companion requirements in those existing standards. |
| FERC VRF G4 Discussion | Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs: Failure to implement and follow its Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) could, under emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, directly cause or contribute to bulk electric system instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the bulk electric system at an unacceptable risk of instability, separation, or cascading failures, or could hinder restoration to a normal condition. Thus, this requirement meets the criteria for a High VRF. |
| FERC VRF G5 Discussion | Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation: This requirement establishes a single risk-level, and the assigned VRF is consistent with that risk level. |

| Proposed VSL – PRC-005-3, R3 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
| For Components included within a time-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain 5% or less of the total Components included within a specific Component Type, in accordance with the minimum maintenance activities and maximum maintenance intervals prescribed within Tables 1-1 through 1-5, Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4-1 through 4-2. | For Components included within a time-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain more than 5% but 10% or less of the total Components included within a specific Component Type, in accordance with the minimum maintenance activities and maximum maintenance intervals prescribed within Tables 1-1 through 1-5, Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4-1 through 4-2. | For Components included within a time-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain more than 10% but 15% or less of the total Components included within a specific Component Type, in accordance with the minimum maintenance activities and maximum maintenance intervals prescribed within Tables 1-1 through 1-5, Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4-1 through 4-2. | For Components included within a time-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain more than 15% of the total Components included within a specific Component Type, in accordance with the minimum maintenance activities and maximum maintenance intervals prescribed within Tables 1-1 through 1-5, Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4-1 through 4-2. |

VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R3

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>NERC VSL Guidelines</p> | <p>Meets NERC’s VSL Guidelines—There is an incremental aspect to the violation and the VSLs follow the guidelines for incremental violations.</p> |
| <p>FERC VSL G1 VSL Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p> | <p>This VSL is consistent with the current VSLs associated with the existing requirements of the standards being replaced by this proposed standard.</p> |
| <p>FERC VSL G2 VSL Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties Guideline 2a: The Single VSL Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent Guideline 2b: VSL Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p> | <p>Guideline 2a: N/A</p> <p>Guideline 2b: The proposed VSL does not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p> |

VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R3

| | |
|---|---|
| FERC VSL G3 VSL Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement | The proposed VSL uses similar terminology to that used in the associated requirement, and is therefore consistent with the requirement. |
| FERC VSL G4 VSL Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations | The VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R4 | |
|--|---|
| Proposed VRF | High |
| NERC VRF Discussion | Failure to implement and follow its Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) could, under emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, directly cause or contribute to bulk electric system instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the bulk electric system at an unacceptable risk of instability, separation, or cascading failures, or could hinder restoration to a normal condition. Thus, this requirement meets the criteria for a High VRF. |
| FERC VRF G1 Discussion | Guideline 1- Consistency w/ Blackout Report: N/A |
| FERC VRF G2 Discussion | Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard: The requirement has no subpart(s); therefore, only one VRF was assigned and no conflict(s) exist. |
| FERC VRF G3 Discussion | Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards: The only Reliability Standards with similar goals are those being replaced by this standard, and the High VRF assignment for this requirement is consistent with the assigned VRFs for companion requirements in those existing standards. |
| FERC VRF G4 Discussion | Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs: Failure to implement and follow its Protection System Maintenance Program (PSMP) could, under emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, directly cause or contribute to bulk electric system instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the bulk electric system at an unacceptable risk of instability, separation, or cascading failures, or could hinder restoration to a normal condition. Thus, this requirement meets the criteria for a High VRF. |
| FERC VRF G5 Discussion | Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation: This requirement establishes a single risk-level, and the assigned VRF is consistent with that risk level. |

| Proposed VSL – PRC-005-3, R4 | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
| For Components included within a performance-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain 5% or less of the annual scheduled maintenance for a specific Component Type in accordance with their performance-based PSMP. | For Components included within a performance-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain more than 5% but 10% or less of the annual scheduled maintenance for a specific Component Type in accordance with their performance-based PSMP. | For Components included within a performance-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain more than 10% but 15% or less of the annual scheduled maintenance for a specific Component Type in accordance with their performance-based PSMP. | For Components included within a performance-based maintenance program, the responsible entity failed to maintain more than 15% of the annual scheduled maintenance for a specific Component Type in accordance with their performance-based PSMP. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R4 | |
|--|---|
| NERC VSL Guidelines | Meets NERC’s VSL Guidelines—There is an incremental aspect to the violation and the VSLs follow the guidelines for incremental violations. |
| FERC VSL G1 VSL Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance | This VSL is consistent with the current VSLs associated with the existing requirements of the standards being replaced by this proposed standard. |
| FERC VSL G2 VSL Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties Guideline 2a: The Single VSL Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent Guideline 2b: VSL Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language | Guideline 2a: N/A Guideline 2b: The proposed VSL does not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations. |

VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R4

| | |
|---|---|
| FERC VSL G3 VSL Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement | The proposed VSL uses similar terminology to that used in the associated requirement, and is therefore consistent with the requirement. |
| FERC VSL G4 VSL Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations | The VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R5 | |
|--|--|
| Proposed VRF | Medium |
| NERC VRF Discussion | Failure to initiate resolution of an unresolved maintenance issue for a Protection System Component could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk power system. However, violation of this requirement is unlikely to lead to bulk power system instability, separation, or cascading failures. The applicable entities are always responsible for maintaining the reliability of the bulk power system regardless of the situation. This VRF emphasizes the risk to system performance that results from mal-performing Protection System Components. Failure to initiate resolution of an unresolved maintenance issue for a Protection System Component will not, by itself, lead to instability, separation, or cascading failures. Thus, the requirement meets NERC’s criteria for a Medium VRF. |
| FERC VRF G1 Discussion | Guideline 1- Consistency w/ Blackout Report: N/A |
| FERC VRF G2 Discussion | Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard: The requirement has no subpart(s); therefore, only one VRF was assigned and no conflict(s) exist. |
| FERC VRF G3 Discussion | Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards: The only requirement within approved Standards, PRC-004-2a Requirements R1 and R2 contain a similar requirement and is assigned a HIGH VRF. However, these requirements contain several subparts, and the VRF must address the most egregious risk related to these subparts, and a comparison to these requirements may be irrelevant. PRC-022-1 Requirement R1.5 contains only a similar requirement, and is assigned a MEDIUM VRF. FAC-003-2 Requirement R5 contains only a similar requirement, and is assigned a MEDIUM VRF. |
| FERC VRF G4 Discussion | Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs: Failure to initiate resolution of an unresolved maintenance issue for a Protection System Component could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk power system. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R5 | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Proposed VRF | Medium | | |
| | <p>However, violation of this requirement is unlikely to lead to bulk power system instability, separation, or cascading failures. The applicable entities are always responsible for maintaining the reliability of the bulk power system regardless of the situation. This VRF emphasizes the risk to system performance that results from mal-performing Protection System Components. Failure to initiate resolution of an unresolved maintenance issue for a Protection System Component will not, by itself, lead to instability, separation, or cascading failures. Thus, the requirement meets NERC’s criteria for a Medium VRF.</p> | | |
| FERC VRF G5 Discussion | <p>Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation: This requirement establishes a single risk-level, and the assigned VRF is consistent with that risk level.</p> | | |
| Proposed VSL – PRC-005-3, R5 | | | |
| Lower | Moderate | High | Severe |
| The responsible entity failed to undertake efforts to correct 5 or fewer identified Unresolved Maintenance Issues. | The responsible entity failed to undertake efforts to correct greater than 5, but less than or equal to 10 identified Unresolved Maintenance Issues. | The responsible entity failed to undertake efforts to correct greater than 10, but less than or equal to 15 identified Unresolved Maintenance Issues. | The responsible entity failed to undertake efforts to correct greater than 15 identified Unresolved Maintenance Issues. |

| VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R5 | |
|--|---|
| NERC VSL Guidelines | Meets NERC’s VSL Guidelines—There is an incremental aspect to the violation and the VSLs follow the guidelines for incremental violations. |
| FERC VSL G1 VSL Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance | The Requirement in PRC-005-2 has not been implemented; consequently, there is no prior level of compliance. |
| FERC VSL G2 VSL Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties Guideline 2a: The Single VSL Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent Guideline 2b: VSL Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language | Guideline 2a: N/A Guideline 2b: The proposed VSL does not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations. |

VRF and VSL Justifications – PRC-005-3, R5

| | |
|---|---|
| FERC VSL G3 VSL Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement | The proposed VSL uses similar terminology to that used in the associated requirement, and is therefore consistent with the requirement. |
| FERC VSL G4 VSL Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations | The VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations. |