

Violation Risk Factor and Violation Severity Level Justifications

Project 2016-04 Modifications to PRC-025-2 — Generator Relay Loadability

~~Violation Risk Factor and Violation Severity Level Justifications~~

This document provides the ~~standard~~ drafting team's (SDT's) justification for assignment of violation risk factors (VRFs) and violation severity levels (VSLs) for each requirement in: ~~PRC-025 — Generator Relay Loadability. Note that no Requirement, Measure, [Project Number and Name or VRF/VSL changes have been made in this proposed PRC-025-2 Reliability Standard.~~

~~Number]. Each primary requirement is assigned a VRF and a set of one or more VSLs/VSL. 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 Electric Reliability Organizations (ERO) Sanction Guidelines. The SDT applied the following NERC criteria and FERC Guidelines when developing the VRFs and VSLs for the requirements.~~

~~The Reliability Coordination Standard Drafting Team (SDT) applied the following NERC criteria and FERC Guidelines when proposing VRFs and VSL for the requirements under this project.~~

NERC Criteria ~~for~~ Violation Risk Factors

High Risk Requirement

A requirement that, if violated, could directly cause or contribute to ~~bulk electric system~~ Bulk Electric System instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the ~~bulk electric system~~ 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~~[Bulk Electric System](#) instability, separation, or a cascading sequence of failures, or could place the ~~bulk electric system~~[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~~[Bulk Electric System](#), or the ability to effectively monitor and control the ~~bulk electric system~~[Bulk Electric System](#). However, violation of a medium risk requirement is unlikely to lead to ~~bulk electric system~~[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~~[Bulk Electric System](#), or the ability to effectively monitor, control, or restore the ~~bulk electric system~~[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~~[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~~[Bulk Electric System](#), or the ability to effectively monitor and control the ~~bulk electric system~~[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~~[Bulk Electric System](#), or the ability to effectively monitor, control, or restore the ~~bulk electric system~~. ~~A planning requirement that is administrative in nature.~~[Bulk Electric System](#).

FERC ~~Violation Risk Factor Guidelines~~

The SDT also considered consistency with the ~~FERC Violation Risk Factor~~ **Guidelines for** ~~setting VRFs:~~¹[Violation Risk Factors](#)

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

The Commission ~~FERC~~ seeks to ensure that ~~Violation Risk Factors~~[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:²

- 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

¹North American Electric Reliability Corp., 119 FERC ¶ 61,145, order on reh'g and compliance filing, 120 FERC ¶ 61,145 (2007) (“VRF Rehearing Order”).

²Id. at footnote 15.

- Appropriate use of transmission loading relief.

Guideline (2) – Consistency within a Reliability Standard

The Commission FERC expects a rational connection between the sub-Requirement [Violation Risk Factor VRF](#) assignments and the main Requirement [Violation Risk Factor VRF](#) assignment.

Guideline (3) – Consistency among Reliability Standards

The Commission FERC expects the assignment of [Violation Risk Factors 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 Violation Risk Factor Level

Guideline (4) was developed to evaluate whether the assignment of a particular [Violation Risk Factor 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.

NERC Criteria –for Violation Severity Levels

Violation Severity Levels (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.

Violation severity levels VSLs should be based on the guidelines NERC’s overarching criteria shown in the table below:

Lower <u>VSL</u>	Moderate <u>VSL</u>	High <u>VSL</u>	Severe <u>VSL</u>
<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 <u>meets the majority of the</u> 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 <u>measured does not meet the majority of the</u> intent of the requirement, <u>but does meet some of the intent.</u></p>	<p>Missing most or all of the significant elements (or a significant percentage) of the required performance.</p> <p>The performance <u>or product</u> measured does not <u>substantively</u> meet the intent of the requirement or the product delivered cannot be used in meeting the intent of the requirement.</p>

FERC Order of Violation Severity Levels

FERC’s The FERC VSL guidelines are presented below, followed by an analysis of whether the VSLs proposed for each requirement in the standard meet the FERC Guidelines for assessing VSLs:

Guideline (1) – Violation Severity Level 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) – Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties

A violation of a “binary” type requirement must be a “Severe” VSL.

Do not use ambiguous terms such as “minor” and “significant” to describe noncompliant performance.

Guideline (3) – Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement
VSLs should not expand on what is required in the requirement.

Guideline (4) – Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations

...unless/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 Justifications for PRC-025-21, R1	
Proposed VRF	High
NERC VRF Discussion	<p>A Violation Risk Factor of High is consistent with the NERC VRF definition. Failure by an entity to apply load-responsive protective relay settings in accordance with PRC-025-2, Attachment 1; Relay Settings, 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.</p> <p>The unnecessary tripping of protective relays on generators has often been determined to have expanded the scope and/or extended the duration of disturbances of the past 25 years. This was also noted to be a serious issue in the August 2003 “blackout” in the northeastern North American continent.</p>
<p>FERC VRF G1 Discussion Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report</p>	<p>Guideline 1- Consistency w/ Blackout Report: The blackout report and subsequent technical analysis noted that generators tripped for the conditions being addressed by this standard, increasing the severity of the blackout.</p>
<p>FERC VRF G2 Discussion Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard</p>	<p>Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard: Only one requirement is provided and is proposed for a “High” VRF.</p>
<p>FERC VRF G3 Discussion Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards</p>	<p>Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards: Requirement R1, criterion 6 of PRC-023-2 – Transmission Relay Loadability addresses similar concerns regarding Transmission lines and is also a “High” VRF.</p>

VRF Justifications ~~for~~ PRC-025-21, R1

Proposed VRF	High
FERC VRF G4 Discussion Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs: The results of the reports into the August 2003 blackout, as well as the subsequent analysis, clearly demonstrate that violating this requirement, under abnormal or emergency conditions, could cause or contribute to cascading failures on the Bulk Electric System.
FERC VRF G5 Discussion Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation: This requirement does not co-mingle more than one obligation.

~~Proposed~~ VSLs for PRC-025-2, R1

R1	Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
R1	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Generator Owner, Transmission Owner, or Distribution Provider did not apply settings in accordance with PRC-025-2 – Attachment 1: Relay Settings, on an applied load-responsive protective relay.

Deleted Cells

VSL Justifications ~~for~~ PRC-025-2, R1

NERC VSL Guidelines

The NERC VSL guidelines are satisfied by identifying noncompliance based on “pass-fail” or a binary condition. The entity either “applied” or “did not apply” the setting(s) in accordance with Attachment 1: Relay Settings; therefore, the Violation Severity Level must be designated Severe.

VSL Justifications ~~for~~ PRC-025-2, R1

<p>FERC VSL G1 Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The VSL is not changing from the current approved version; therefore, there is no lowering the current level of compliance.</p>
<p>FERC VSL G2 Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties <u>Guideline 2a:</u> The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent <u>Guideline 2b:</u> Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>Guideline 2a: The single proposed VSL is a binary VSL (pass-fail). The entity either "applied" or "did not apply" the setting(s) in accordance with Attachment 1: Relay Settings; therefore, the VSL is proposed to be "Severe" in accordance with the criteria for binary VSLs. Guideline 2b: The proposed VSL is clear and unambiguous.</p>
<p>FERC VSL G3 Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSL is consistent with the corresponding requirement.</p>

VSL Justifications ~~for~~ PRC-025-2, R1

FERC VSL G4

Violation Severity Level
Assignment Should Be Based
on A Single Violation, Not on
A Cumulative Number of
Violations

The proposed VSL addresses each individual instance of violations by basing the violations on failing to apply the setting(s) on “an applied load-responsive protective relay” in accordance with Attachment 1: Relay Settings.