

Frequently Asked Questions

Enhanced Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading

The following questions and answers are intended to facilitate understanding about the Enhanced Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading process. Please contact [Mat Bunch](#) (via email) or at (404) 446-9785 with any additional questions you may have.

Enhanced Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading process FAQs

Q1: Why are standards being graded?

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

The EPRST has completed its initial grading, which is posted for a 30-day industry comment period. The EPRST has sought input from stakeholders prior to finalizing the grading. The finalized grading will be appended to the Reliability Standards Development Plan (RSDP), which has been endorsed by the SC.

Q2: Who comprises the Standing Review Team (SRT)?

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

Q3: What are the grades used for?

A3: The final grade will be an early input to future EPRs, along with additional information collected, as required under the [EPR Template](#). If an EPR team recommends revising standard requirements that were graded in 2016, the SRT will re-grade those standard requirements based on the recommended revision. The re-graded requirements will also be posted for additional stakeholder comment prior to final SRT grading.

Q4: What is the grading tool?

A4: The grading tool is based on the grading tool from the 2013 [Standards Independent Experts Review Project](#). The SC endorsed using the same decisions-tree and grading criteria, with the addition of one quality question on cost effectiveness. For purposes of the 2016 standards grading, the cost-effectiveness quality question does not contribute to the final numeric grade for quality. The grading tool completed by the EPRSRT is available on the [project web page](#).

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

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

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

For example, in some cases, the EPRSRT is grading a standard that is subject to future enforcement, but that is because it is a revised version of a standard that covers materially the same or similar topics. In the case of an entirely new standard, for example, PRC-026-1 regarding stable power swings, the subject matter has not been directly covered by a previous standard and is not being graded at this time.

Q6: How did the EPRSRT determine the grades that are posted?

A6: Each EPRSRT member used the posted standards grading tool to develop initial grades, which the team discussed at the June 23, 2016 public meeting in Atlanta. The EPRSRT focused its discussions on developing consensus grades on standards where individual grading variances equaled or exceeded one point for content or three points for quality. The EPRSRT requested comments from industry on specific standards grades where the EPRSRT was unable to reach strong consensus or desired specific stakeholder input before finalizing a consensus position. In those instances the EPRSRT believes that additional input from an industry perspective would assist the team’s final grading.