

Violation Risk Factor and Violation Severity Level

Justifications

Project 2021-07 Extreme Cold Weather Grid Operations, Preparedness, and Coordination

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 Project 2021-07 Extreme Cold Weather Grid Operations, Preparedness, and Coordination. Each requirement is assigned a VRF and a 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 Electric Reliability Organization's (ERO) Sanctions Guidelines. The SDT applied the following NERC criteria and FERC Guidelines when developing the VRFs and VSLs for the requirements.

NERC Criteria for Violation Risk Factors

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.

FERC Guidelines for Violation Risk Factors

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

FERC 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

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

Guideline (3) – Consistency among Reliability Standards

FERC 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 Violation Risk Factor 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.

NERC Criteria for 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.

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

Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
The performance or product measured almost meets the full intent of the requirement.	The performance or product measured meets the majority of the intent of the requirement.	The performance or product measured does not meet the majority of the intent of the requirement, but does meet some of the intent.	The performance or product measured does not substantively meet the intent of the requirement.

FERC Order of Violation Severity Levels

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

EOP-012-2

VRF Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R1	
Proposed VRF	Lower
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of Lower is appropriate due to the fact that calculating the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature and identifying generating unit cold weather data 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. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Lower VRF.
FERC VRF G1 Discussion Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.
FERC VRF G2 Discussion Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Lower VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
FERC VRF G3 Discussion Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
FERC VRF G4 Discussion Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC	This VRF is in line with the definition of a Lower VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO’s Sanctions Guidelines.

VRF Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R1

Proposed VRF	Lower
Definitions of VRFs	
FERC VRF G5 Discussion Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

VSLs for EOP-012-2, Requirement R1

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
The Generator Owner did not calculate the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature and identify generating unit(s) cold weather data in accordance with Requirement R1 for 5% or less of its applicable units.	The Generator Owner did not calculate the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature and identify generating unit(s) cold weather data in accordance with Requirement R1 for more than 5%, but less than or equal to 10% of its applicable units.	The Generator Owner did not calculate the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature and identify generating unit(s) cold weather data in accordance with Requirement R1 for more than 10%, but less than or equal to 20% of its applicable units.	The Generator Owner did not calculate the Extreme Cold Weather Temperature and identify generating unit(s) cold weather data in accordance with Requirement R1 for more 20% of its applicable units.

VSL Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R1

FERC VSL G1 Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance	The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.
FERC VSL G2 Violation Severity Level Assignments	The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.

VSL Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R1

<p>Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	
<p>FERC VSL G3</p> <p>Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs use the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and are, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p>FERC VSL G4</p> <p>Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>

VRF Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R2

The VRF did not change from the corresponding requirement in the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard (Requirement R1).

VSL Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R2

The VSL had minor changes from the corresponding requirement in the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard (Requirement R1) due to changes in the standard language and reorganization of requirements.

VSLs for EOP-012-2, Requirement R2

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
<p>The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s) <u>for its applicable unit(s)</u> meeting the criteria in Requirement R1R2 for 5% or less of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not explain in develop a declaration any technical, commercial, or operational constraints that preclude the ability <u>Corrective Action Plan</u> to implement appropriate freeze protection measures for 5% or less of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>	<p>The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s) <u>for its applicable unit(s)</u> meeting the criteria in Requirement R1R2 for more than 5%, but less than or equal to 10% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not explain in develop a declaration any technical, commercial, or operational constraints that preclude the ability to implement appropriate freeze protection measures <u>Corrective Action Plan</u> for more than 5%, but less than or equal to 10% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>	<p>The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s) meeting the criteria in Requirement R1R2 for more than 10%, but less than or equal to 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not explain in develop a declaration any technical, commercial, or operational constraints that preclude the ability to implement appropriate freeze protection measures <u>Corrective Action Plan</u> for more than 10%, but less than or equal to 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>	<p>The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s) meeting the criteria in Requirement R1R2 for more than 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not explain in develop a declaration any technical, commercial, or operational constraints that preclude the ability to implement appropriate freeze protection measures <u>Corrective Action Plan</u> for more than 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>

VRF Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R3	
Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of medium is appropriate due to the fact generating units that are not capable of operating at its Extreme Cold Weather Temperature 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. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.
FERC VRF G1 Discussion	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.

VRF Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R3

Proposed VRF	Medium
Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report	
FERC VRF G2 Discussion Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
FERC VRF G3 Discussion Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
FERC VRF G4 Discussion Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	This VRF is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO’s Sanctions Guidelines.
FERC VRF G5 Discussion Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

VSL Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R3

The VSL had minor changes due to changes in the standard language from the corresponding requirement in the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard (Requirement R2).

VSLs for EOP-012-2, Requirement R3

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s)	The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s)	The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s)	The Generator Owner did not have freeze protection measure(s) meeting

<p>meeting the criteria in Requirement R2R3 for 5% or less of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not develop a <u>CAPCorrective Action Plan</u> as required by Requirement R2R3 for 5% or less of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>	<p>meeting the criteria in Requirement R2R3 for more than 5%, but less than or equal to 10% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not develop a <u>CAPCorrective Action Plan</u> as required by Requirement R2R3 for more than 5%, but less than or equal to 10% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>	<p>meeting the criteria in Requirement R2R3 for more than 10%, but less than or equal to 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not develop a <u>CAPCorrective Action Plan</u> as required by Requirement R2R3 for more than 10%, but less than or equal to 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>	<p>the criteria in Requirement R2R3 for more than 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Generator Owner did not develop a <u>CAPCorrective Action Plan</u> as required by Requirement R2R3 for more than 20% of its <u>applicable</u> units.</p>
---	---	---	---

VSL Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R3

<p>FERC VSL G1</p> <p>Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p>FERC VSL G2</p> <p>Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>

VSL Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R3

Ambiguous Language	
FERC VSL G3 Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement	The proposed VSLs use the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and are, therefore, consistent with the requirement.
FERC VSL G4 Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations	Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.

VRF Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R4

The VRF did not change from the corresponding requirement in the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard (Requirement R3).

VSL Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R2

The VSL did not change from the corresponding requirement in the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard (Requirement R3).

VRF Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R5

The VRF did not change from the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard.

VSL Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R5

The VSL did not change from the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard.

VRF Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R6

The VRF did not change from the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard.

VSL Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R6

VSL had minor changes due to minor revisions in the standard language.

VRF Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R7

The VRF did not change from the previous EOP-012-1 Reliability Standard.

VSL Justification for EOP-012-2, Requirement R7

VSL had changes due to revisions in the standard language.

VSLs for EOP-012-2, Requirement R7			
Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
The Generator Owner implemented a CAP or explained in a declaration why corrective actions are not being implemented <u>Corrective Action Plan</u> , but failed to update the CAP <u>Corrective Action Plan</u> when actions or timetables <u>corrective action(s)</u> changed, in accordance with Requirement R7.	<u>The Generator Owner implemented a Corrective Action Plan, but failed to include a timetable for implementing the selected corrective actions meeting the criteria of Requirement R7 Part 7.1.</u>	<u>The Generator Owner implemented a Corrective Action Plan, but failed to implement the Corrective Action Plan within the specified timetable or failed to update the Corrective Action Plan, with justification, when timetable(s) exceeded the timelines in Requirement R7 Part 7.1.</u>	The Generator Owner failed to implement a CAP <u>Corrective Action Plan</u> or explain <u>failed to document</u> in a declaration why corrective actions are not being implemented in accordance with Requirement R7.

VRF Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R8	
Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of Medium is appropriate due to the fact that not updating Generator Cold Weather Constraint declarations and updating operating limitations associated with capability and availability 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. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.
FERC VRF G1 Discussion Guideline 1- Consistency with	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.

VRF Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R8

Proposed VRF	Medium
Blackout Report	
FERC VRF G2 Discussion Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
FERC VRF G3 Discussion Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
FERC VRF G4 Discussion Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	This VRF is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO's Sanctions Guidelines.
FERC VRF G5 Discussion Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

VSLs for EOP-012-2, Requirement R8

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
N/A	N/A	The Generator Owner failed to comply with one of the elements in Requirement R8, Parts 8.1 through 8.2.	The Generator Owner failed to comply with all of the elements in Requirement R8, Parts 8.1 through 8.2.

VSL Justifications for EOP-012-2, Requirement R8

<p>FERC VSL G1 Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the 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>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p>FERC VSL G3 Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs use the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and are, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p>FERC VSL G4 Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>