COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name: Th	omas	J Bradish
Organization: Re	eliant E	Energy
Telephone: 72	4-597	-8593
Email: tbradish@reliant.com		@reliant.com
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
		1 - Transmission Owners
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
	\boxtimes	5 - Electric Generators
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
NA - Not Applicable		
	÷	

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

If we do not develop a focused training standard we are destined to repeat August 14.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Owner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Market Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Comments

I have checked all of the above because all will need to have some level of knowledge around the operation of the grid. The key phrase is "some level of knowledge'. A one size fits all approach would be over kill and doomed to failure. The training requirements should fit the knowledge requirement of the position.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please explain.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes	Yes
-----	-----

No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Comments

I believe that regional differences should be handled in the content and design of the entities training program.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

My guess is that it will increase our staffing requirement in order to send dispatchers to training. It will certainly mean additional record keeping.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Can this reporting be handled similar to the CEU tracking for NERC certification? It will have to be tracked annually since most of the requirements will be annual requirements.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments None

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name: K	arl A B	ryan
Organization: U	S Army	/ Corps of Engineers
Telephone: 5	03-808	-3894
Email: ka	arl.a.br	yan@usace.army.mil
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
		1 - Transmission Owners
🗌 ECAR		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
	\square	5 - Electric Generators
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
☐ NA - Not Applicable		

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

I don't think you are going far enough with the requirement for training. I am constantly amazed at how generation operators do not understand where they fit into the big picture as far as system reliability issues are concerned. Even the little task of voltage support is poorly understood by our operators.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	Yes No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Operator	Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	Yes No
Market Operator	Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	Yes 🗌 No

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

\boxtimes	Yes

No

If yes, please explain.

I feel that various levels of certification should be developed, similar to engineer in training to registered professional engineer.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Comments

In order for national certification to mean anything, there should be no region specific differences for earning certification.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

🛛 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

It takes manpower off of the workbench in order to go through a certification training process. I would suspect that there will be some staff that require more remedial training than others. With the present shortage of staff at most facilities, it will be dificult to accomplish all of the required training in a timely manner without increasing staffing.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

The training programs should be accredited in the same manner and frequency as utilized in higher education. Nationally recognized auditting and once every 4 or 5 year recertification.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information			
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)			
Name: John Neagle			
Organization: Associated Electric Cooperative Inc.			
Telephone: (41	Telephone: (417) 885-9233		
Email: jne	agle@	2aeci.org	
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
	\square	1 - Transmission Owners	
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
		3 - Load-serving Entities	
MAAC 4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities			
MAIN 5 - Electric Generators			
	\boxtimes	6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
☐ NA - Not Applicable			

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. agrees with the general concept of a training standard for the purpose of promoting reliability. The SAR does not contain sufficient detail to determine whether or not Associated would agree with a standard based on this SAR.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🛛 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🗌 Yes 🛛 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No

Comments

Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. suggests it is inappropriate and unnecessary for a training standard resulting from this SAR to apply to electric utility industry individuals other than those directly responsible for the operation of the interconnected system, i.e. control center personnel.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

\boxtimes Yes	\boxtimes	Yes
-----------------	-------------	-----

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. suggests a training standard should address the desired outcomes and should not specify the methods to achieve those outcomes. The SAR does not contain sufficient detail to determine the SAR drafting team's intent, but it appears the resulting standard would be quite prescriptive in many areas. Any elements currently included in the SAR that prescribe facilities, tools, materials, funding, staffing levels, methods, etc. should be deleted. These details are best determined by and should be left to the descretion of the individual company.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Comments

Given the limited detail in the SAR, Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. does not see a need for regional differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

🛛 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. responds to this question with a qualified no. As stated above, the SAR does not contain sufficient detail to positively determine required staffing.

Comments

If the standard developed from this SAR is applicable to all the entities indicated on Page SAR-2, a 15 - 20% staff increase in affected areas could conceivably be necessary for Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. to comply. It is unlikely Associated's customers would appreciate or understand rate increases to fund such a training program that would do nothing to decrease the number of blackouts they have experienced (0).

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. suggests an annual self-certification to the appropriate Regional Reliability Council.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. reiterates its comments above that a training standard should address the desired outcomes and should not detail the methods to achieve those outcomes. Prescriptive requirements for facilities, tools, materials, funding, staffing levels, methods, etc. should not be included. These details are best determined by and should be left to the descretion of the individual company.

Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. respectfully requests the Standards Drafting Team fully and carefully consider the industry's comments submitted in response to publication of the System Operator Certification Program Administrative Guidelines. Special attention should be given to the comments regarding the number of training hours (CEH) required.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information			
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)			
Name: Howard F. Rulf			
Organization: W	e Enei	rgies	
Telephone: 26	2-574	-6046	
Email: Ho	ward.	Rulf@we-energies.com	
NERC Region Registered Ballot Body Segment			
		1 - Transmission Owners	
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
	\boxtimes	3 - Load-serving Entities	
MAAC 4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities			
$\square MAIN \qquad \square 5 - Electric Generators$			
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
NA - Not Applicable			

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?

Yes 🗌 No

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🛛 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Market Operator	Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes	

🛛 No

If yes, please explain.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Xes Yes

🗌 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Every three years.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

All training should not be required to be in the NERC CEH program.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information			
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)			
Name: Jan	Name: James Stanton		
Organization: Ca	lpine	Midwest Power	
Telephone: 83	2-476	-4453	
Email: jstanton@calpine.com			
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
ERCOT		1 - Transmission Owners	
🖾 ECAR		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
	\boxtimes	3 - Load-serving Entities	
	\square	4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities	
	I		
MAPP	\square	6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
☐ NA - Not Applicable			

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

I believe there is a reliability need for a training standard, though not necessarily the one being proposed.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Balancing Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Interchange Authority	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Operator	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🖂 No

Comments

The proposed Standard is overly broad and ambiguous, and should not uniformly apply to anyone.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

Yes

🔀 No

If yes, please explain.

The content is inadequate not because of a lack of elements but because of the ambiguity of what it is intended to do. A Training Standard cannot be a "one size fits all" approach for functions as disparate as Relaibility Authorities and Purchasing and Selling entities.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

🗌 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

ERCOT's system, for example, does not easily fit into the NERC proposed functional model and the training standard should recognize the unique regional differences found in the ERCOT Region.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes Yes	
---------	--

🗌 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

It might be doable if as many control areas as possible were consolidated, which would mean fewer people to train. If existing control areas continue to exist in their current number, then no, a training standard could not be implemented at current staffing levels.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Comments

The training program should be reviewed often enough to insure it remains aligned with current markets /regional design and adjust, if needed, to capture future market and reliability training needs.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

The statement, Any person with access to a control room should be trained, from the blackout report, should be clarified. What kind of control room? Is this a control area? An RTO control room? A power plant control room?

Also, there are essential pieces missing from the proposal, such as what are the goals of the training program? It is quite exhaustive in the elements of a training program but fails to explain what objectives are to be met. Beyond the broad goal of promoting the reliability of the Interconnections, what subject matter is envisioned to fall into the recommended elements that would be applicable to all the Reliability Functions to which it is intended to apply? A good example is simulator training. Simulator training on what?

The current proposal is so overly broad as to be unworkable. More explantion of the goals of the training program and the applicability to the Reliability Functions must be presented. This is too important a subject to apply the broad brush of a one-size-fits-all Training Standard.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: Do not insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information			
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)			
Name:			
Organization:			
Telephone:			
Email:			
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
		1 - Transmission Owners	
	\boxtimes	2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
		3 - Load-serving Entities	
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities	
	5 - Electric Generators		
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
NA - Not			
Applicable			

Group Comments (Co	mplete this page i	f comments are from a group.)		
Group Name:	CP9			
Lead Contact:	Guy Zito			
Contact Organization	: Northeast Pow	er Coordination Council		
Contact Segment:	2			
Contact Telephone:	212-840-1070			
Contact Email:	gzito@npcc.or	g		
Additional Men	nber Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
Kathleen Goodman		ISO-New England	NPCC	2
Ralph Rufrano		New York Power Authority	NPCC	1
Greg Campoli		NYISO	NPCC	2
Pete Lebro		National Grid US	NPCC	1
Roger Champagne		TransEnergie, Quebec	NPCC	1
Khaqan Khan		IESO, Ontario	NPCC	2
AI Adamsom		New York State Reliability Coun.	NPCC	2
David Kiguel		Hydro One	NPCC	1
Robert Pelligrini		United Illuminating	NPCC	1
David Little		Nova Scotia Power	NPCC	1
Brian Hogue		NPCC	NPCC	2
Jerry Mosier		NPCC	NPCC	2
Guy Zito		NPCC	NPCC	2

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

There needs to be flexibility to tailor the training to the individual involved.

Requirements should be limited to Certification Standards. NERC is being overly descriptive of "how to" conduct training rather than achieving specific results. NERC Standards should be "object oriented", that is, specify what the final requirements are. Prescribing how each entity goes about to achieve these objectives is beyond NERC's mandate.

Limit this to only Control Room Operating staff that actually "operate" the system.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🖂 No

Comments

NPCC believes that anyone engaged in direct operating/control activity for the Bulk Power System should be properly qualified/certified.

An alternative approach to the above also discussed might also involve only requiring NERC Certifiable Functions..i.e. Reliability Authority(RC), Balancing Authority, Interchange Authority, Transmission Operator to adhere to the resultant standard.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

X Y	es
-----	----

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Certification is a control room operator issue.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

	Yes
\boxtimes	No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Administrative duties related to audit. Additional Operating Room personnel due to out of control room activities.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

NPCC believes the training programs should be reviewed internally and self certified for compliance as required or at least yearly, with audits being conducted at least once every three years.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

		Individual Commenter Information	
(Co	mplet	e this page for comments from one organization or individual.)	
Name: Ken Goldsmith			
Organization: Alliant Energy			
Telephone: 31	9-786	-4167	
Email: kengoldsmith@alliantenergy.com			
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
	\square	1 - Transmission Owners	
🗌 ECAR		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
		3 - Load-serving Entities	
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities	
		5 - Electric Generators	
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
NA - Not Applicable			

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?

Yes 🗌 No

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes	

🛛 No

If yes, please explain.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

I believe it will require more personnel dedicated for the training function alone, which may be difficult for the smaller organizations.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

Somewhere the standard should encourage/recommend that the Regions should form Training Groups to promote uniform training throughout the regions. This will help promote a better understanding of operations, by all the parties.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: Do not insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

		Individual Commenter Information	
(Co	mplet	e this page for comments from one organization or individual.)	
Name: Anthony M. Giasi			
Organization: Consolidated Edison Co. of NY, System Operation Department			
Telephone: 212-580-6772			
Email: gia	Email: giasia@coned.com		
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
		1 - Transmission Owners	
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
		3 - Load-serving Entities	
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities	
		5 - Electric Generators	
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
⊠ NPCC □ SERC		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
☐ NA - Not Applicable			

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

However, the training standard must be reasonable and explicit, it must be specific as to which personnel in each entity require training, it must be specific as to the different training protocols not only for the personnel within each entity, but also for the different entities, it must be achievable in a reasonable time frame for a reasonable cost, and not subject to compliance for a reasonable period of time, say three years to allow for formation and implementation.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	Yes No
Generator Owner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Market Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Comments

Do the proposed training standards apply to non-registered entities to whom actions or operations are delegated by a registered entity? If yes, why. If not, then do any training standards apply?

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain.

Qualification testing; Real-time assessments to verify training carried over to the job; Missing the link to competency of existing system operators; Needs to identify the qualifications for the system operator to first sit in the chair; Needs to address resources needed to accomplish the training;Need a training shift for system operators (adequate time dedicated to training)

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Companies should have plans in place to take a system operator from an initial competency level up to an expert level, however this is not NERC's responsibility.

Comments

What is written is 'process-oriented' and is not sufficient in detail for all system personnel positions – the scope is too broad (covering too many positions) and the level is too high level (doesn't identify what positions are included in the category called 'system personnel')– a SAR targeted for the individual types of positions (such as a SAR just for the operating authority positions) would be more helpful.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

	Yes
\square	No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

A reasonable standard is needed, however, additional training personnel, training infrastructure, training documentation, training funding, etc would be required to train all "system personnel" as indicated in the SAR.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Bi-annual basis.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

Match the definitions on the SAR with the definitions in the Glossary posted with Version 0. The standard needs to be written so the rules are objective, clear and well-understood by all end-users as well as auditors; Need to define what is meant by 'system personnel'; Need to define terms used such as 'job task analysis' and 'competency-based'.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information			
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)			
Name: Ka	thleer	Davis	
Organization: Tel	nness	ee Valley Authority	
Telephone: 75 ⁻	1-617	2	
Email: kao	davis@	@tva.gov	
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
	\boxtimes	1 - Transmission Owners	
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
		3 - Load-serving Entities	
	MAIN 5 - Electric Generators		
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
☐ NA - Not Applicable			

Group Comments (Con	nplete this page if	comments are from a group.)		
Group Name:	Electric System	Operations		
Lead Contact:	Kathy Davis			
Contact Organization:	: Compliance &	Standards		
Contact Segment:	1			
Contact Telephone:	423-751-6172			
Contact Email:	kadavis@tva.ge	νν		
Additional Mem	ber Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
Jeff Newsome		TVA, Electric System Ops	SERC	1
Rick King		TVAEmployee Technical Training	SERC	1

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

A training standard is needed to ensure we have competent personnel who can safely and reliably operate, maintain, and improve the performance of the electric power system.

Training for the system operators is critical to the industry as a whole. We are at the beginning stages of where we must go in the future to reassure ourselves and the public at large that the events of August 14th 2003 will not be repeated. For the NERC organization this should be at a minimum, in it's top three priorities..

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	Yes No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	Yes No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	Yes No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Owner	Yes No
Generator Operator	Yes No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	Yes No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🗌 No

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

\boxtimes	Yes

No No

If yes, please explain.

One basic tenet or requirement that should be stated is the use of a systematic approach (SAT), based on job performance requirements, to guide the training of system personnel.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

You should not specify job and task analysis under 1.b. A needs assessment can be satisfied in several ways from a simple needs or job analysis up to a full blown job and task analysis.

There should only be a requirement for documentation and record keeping under 1.i. Administration. A learning management system is one means to document and track training.

If hours are specified under initial training requirements they should reflect only the minimum acceptable number of hours for training. If a company does a needs analysis to determine job requirements the time to conduct the initial training program will vary based on the components of the job and the necessary elements to be trained on.

Progression training and cross training are not consistent with the intent of a continuing training program. A continuing training program is intended to refresh and improve the application of knowledge and job-related skills for the job the trainee works or is qualified to work.

Simulation training is a platform or method to provide initial and continuing training. I don't feel that it should be addressed separately.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

\boxtimes	Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

From an overall framework the standard should be the same however we must recognize the special needs and the special circumstance of individual regions. One size does not always fit all.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

	Yes
\boxtimes	No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

When you consider the additional training requirements that will probably come out of the standard I foresee a need for additional staffing in both the system personnel side of the business and on the training side of the business.

We need an industry standard for staffing levels that applies across the board for the functional responsibility.

Comments

It would be prudent to develop a training standard that stipulates the minimum requirements to satisfy training for system personnel, versus taking the approach to identify the best approach. This will minimize the impact on the staffing levels for both training and staff personnel.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Every 4 years

Comments

A mandatory compliance type review should be conducted every 4 years. This approach is consistent with similar utility training requirements. Each utility/entity should conduct self-assessments on a more frequent time frame. This approach will minimize the impact on NERC and the industry when trying to audit training for compliance.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name: Ge	erald F	Rheault
Organization: Ma	anitoba	a Hydro
Telephone: 20	4-487	-5423
Email: gr	rheau	lt@hydro.mb.ca
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
	\square	1 - Transmission Owners
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
	\boxtimes	3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
	IN 5 - Electric Generators	
⊠ MAPP □ NPCC	\square	6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
NA - Not Applicable		

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?

Yes 🗌 No

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Resource Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Load-Serving Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Comments

For the Generator Operator category, Manitoba Hydro believes that this Standard should apply for a generator operator at the generation company operations or dispatch center but not to an operator at the thermal or hydraulic plant.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please explain.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

🛛 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Manitoba Hydro foresees requiring at least 2 additional staff; one administrative representative to help maintain the documentation and for record keeping and at least one instructional designer to create/revise the training courses. This is an estimate only and is based on a control centre perspective only. The total impact on Manitoba Hydro may be more extensive depending on the finalized training requirements and what options exist to develop and target the requisite training

Comments

Program planning and training development is both time and staff intensive. Manitoba Hydro currently has difficulty maintaining its trainee program and ongoing staff training with the existing staff. Additional staff will be required to implement any new requirements to the existing training program.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

every three years.

Comments

Each entity training program should be reviewed as part of the entity operational audit which is presently part of the NERC Compliance program. In the MAPP /MRO region this presently occurs every three years. Any program which was judged satisfactory at the last operational audit should not deteriorate to such a degree that the system is a threat to reliability in any three year window.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: Do not insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
Email:		
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
		1 - Transmission Owners
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
		5 - Electric Generators
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
NA - Not Applicable		

Pepco Holdinas			
	Pepco Holdings, Inc Affiliates		
Richard Kafka			
: Potomac Elect	ric Power Company		
3			
(301) 469-5274			
rjkafka@pepco.com			
iber Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
	Conectiv Power Delivery	MAAC	1
	Conectiv Power Delivery	MAAC	1
	Potomac Electric Power Co.	MAAC	1
	Conectiv Power Delivery	MAAC	1
	Potomac Electric Power Co	MAAC	1
			<u> </u>
	3 (301) 469-5274 rjkafka@pepco	(301) 469-5274 rjkafka@pepco.com hber Name Additional Member Organization Conectiv Power Delivery Conectiv Power Delivery Potomac Electric Power Co. Conectiv Power Delivery	3 (301) 469-5274 rjkafka@pepco.com ber Name Additional Member Organization Region* Conectiv Power Delivery MAAC Conectiv Power Delivery MAAC Potomac Electric Power Co. MAAC Conectiv Power Delivery MAAC

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?

Yes 🗌 No

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	Yes No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Market Operator	Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Comments

Those entities operating in real time should have training requirements.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

Xes Yes

No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

\boxtimes	Yes
	100

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Under Item 1, i. Administration, a Learning Management System is a "how" rather than a "what" and should be eliminated. Item 3, Continuous training requiremnts, is poorly defined. It mixes topics, categories and methods of training, and many are subsets of others. The list is not propely defined or organized. Item 4, Simulation training: Should identify types, but not prescribe any specific method of simulation or simulator. Item 7, Training resources and staff, f. Funding: funding should not be part of the standard.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

🖂 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

At a minimum, we would need additional training personnel. It is also possible that training requirements would be so great as to require additional operating personnel.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Self report via comprehensive questionnaire annually or every two years. Training audit team visit every 5 years.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name: Peter Henderson		
Organization: IE	SO	
Telephone: 90	5 855	6258
Email: pe	ter.he	nderson@ieso.ca
NERC Region Registered Ballot Body Segment		Registered Ballot Body Segment
		1 - Transmission Owners
	\boxtimes	2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
		5 - Electric Generators
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
☐ NA - Not Applicable		

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

There is a need for a training standard and we applaud the intent. Such a standard should be the place for all training requirements (presently, training requirements are found in several locations), for the appropriate functions. However, the proposed standard appears to apply a "one size fits all" approach to every authority and function. If this is the case, then this approach is likely to be unrealistic. It should be clear as to which functions should be certified versus having taken accredited courses. Also, clarity is needed that there will be different types of certification, rather than just NERC Operator Certification.

NERC needs to better define the Scope of this standard. Is the intent of the standard to measure compliance of the the training of (reliability entity) personnel regarding NERC Reliability Standards, or is the standard meant to measure compliance of all Training Programs? If the intent is the former, then the question would be , is there enough material to really test ?, since some of the NERC standards applying to owners for example only require communications of data. If the intent is the latter, then the question would be , is NERC the right organization to evaluate in-house training programs?, given the diversity of operating approaches used in North America. In this case, some programs are probably better evaluated by those closer to the needs and responsibilities of the individual organization.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🛛 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No

Comments

Where we indicated "No" above, does not imply that there should not be training. Support staff and other staff (PA, RP, TSP, GOp, etc) or operators not required to be certified should be able to meet their obligations by participating in NERC continuing education. Others (DPs, PSE, LSE, etc) may be trained on a localized basis.

TSP is listed twice. Was there supposed to be some other entity or is it a duplication?

The industry needs a little more definition and clarity on who is the functional entity (IA, RA, PA, etc.)

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

Xes Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please explain.

There are two conflicting questions. The training program requirements are more than adequate (and may not be necessary for some training programs).

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Again, if the approach is "one size fits all", this will cause problems. What type of emergency (or situational awareness, or simulator) training should PSE, IA or PA participate in? On the other hand, if the intention is to have different courses/certification streamlined for each involved function, then we can understand the approach. However, not all of the functions listed in Q2 should be part of this standard. See comments on Q2.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Comments

There will be site-to-site differences. There would be some regional differences in content and topics, but there should be no regional differences in general training requirements. Some of the NERC functional definitions need more details (who is the TO, IA, RA, etc.).

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

🛛 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Each organization would have different requirements. In general, there would likely be additional staff required in many of the organizations to meet this standard (to maintain the program, to coordinate training, and to provide relief for staff to participate in training, etc.) In addition, each organization, subject to this standard, would incur start-up costs associated with developing the process. A simulator requirement would add workload (setup, maintenance and running scenarios), etc. The extent of increased resourcing can not be determined until the details of the standard are available.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

The training programs should be reviewed internally and self certified for compliance as required or at least yearly, with audits being conducted at least once every three years.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

Again, the "one-size-fits-all" approach does not appear to be justified. If an operator or authority does not need to be certified, their training requirements should be reduced. A continuing education with some focus on recommended topics (that could be tailored locally) would be more appropriate and would relieve much of the administrative burden for non-certified entities.

It might be better if this standard applies (for now) only to those entities that must be certified.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name: William J. Smith		
Organization: All	egher	y Power
Telephone: (72	24) 83	8-6552
Email: ws	mith1	@alleghenypower.com
NERC Region	NERC Region Registered Ballot Body Segment	
	\boxtimes	1 - Transmission Owners
🖾 ECAR		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
		5 - Electric Generators
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
☐ NA - Not Applicable		

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?

Yes 🗌 No

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	Yes No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Owner	Yes No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Market Operator	Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

\boxtimes	Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

In item 3 - Continuous trianng requirements (topics and hours), parts b. Progression training and c. Cross training goes beyond training requirements. These two parts could infringe on Corporate Policy. Part i. Team training should be a desire or suggestion rather than a requirement. In item 1, part c should be excluded since it is just the physical representation of parts a and b.

Comments

Parts f, g, h, and j should be included in 3.a. as part of the Annual training requirements.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

🗌 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Comments

Staffing levels can not be predicted until the requirements are specified. If this proposed standard mandates the hours required, this question can't be answered until we know the required hours.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Comments

Training Programs should be reviewed annually by the responsible staff. Entities should be required to Self-Certify annually. Every two to three years, the entity should undergo an on-site audit.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name: Michael C. Calimano		
Organization: Ne	w Yor	k Independent System Operator
Telephone: 518	8-356	-6129
Email: mc	alima	no@nyiso.com
NERC Region	NERC Region Registered Ballot Body Segment	
		1 - Transmission Owners
	\boxtimes	2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
		5 - Electric Generators
☐ MAPP ⊠ NPCC		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
☐ NA - Not Applicable		

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region*	Segment*
			1

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?

Yes 🗌 No

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes No
Resource Planner	Yes No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	Yes No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Operator	Yes No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	Yes No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🗌 No

Comments

The standard should be initially developed to support only those personel who are required to be NERC certified. Once the standards have been established and fully implemented at that level, expansion of the target audience should be examined.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

\boxtimes	Yes
\bowtie	Ye

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Several items need clarification:

The distinction between job related OJT, Cross training, and progression training. The distincition between situational awarness and system awarenesss. The distinction between "learning management system" and Training Plan/Training Schedule/Progress Assessment/Documentation/Record Retention. Item 7f should be deleted as redundant. It is included in 6 and 7 a-c. Item 8b should be deleted as redundant. It is part or 8a. It would make more sense to more explicitly link item 1f "program design" with item 8a "Adheres to the NERC Contining Education program criteria".

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

🛛 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

In the case of most organizations there will be a substantial operating staff increase required to provide operators with sufficent training time (6 crew shift rotations in place of 4 and 5 crew shift rotations). There will be an amost universal need to create or increase the size of training staffs to to conduct continual Job Task Analysis, develop training modules for all tasks, continually validate and verify of individual training modules, and maintain of the "learning management system" (training plans/training schedules/progress assessment/documentation/records retention - all on an individual basis).

Comments

This standard is is being created to rectify the absence of existing staff levels sufficient to meet the in the training needs of system operators. If there were sufficient staffing, there would not be need for this standard.

Operating or training staffing levels should be be dictated as part of the standard. The individual entity should have the flexibility to deterime the most effective mechanism to meet their particular training needs. Face-to-face training options require different staffing levels than a full e-learning approach.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Full training audit compliance should be included in the normal sequence of NERC functional organization audits.

Complaince should be phased in due to the magnitude of the staffing and progam development needs.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: Do not insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Cor	nplet	e this page for comments from one organization or individual.)
Name:		
Organization:		
Telephone:		
Email:		
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
		1 - Transmission Owners
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
		5 - Electric Generators
MAPP 6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers		
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
NA - Not Applicable		

RTO/ISO Stand	lards Review Committee		
Karl Tammar			
: NYISO			
2			
518-356-6205			
ktammar@nyis	so.com		
ber Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*
	AESO		2
	CAISO		2
	ERCOT		2
	IESO		2
	ISO-NE		2
	MISO		2
	NYISO		2
	РЈМ		2
	SPP		2
	: NYISO 2 518-356-6205 ktammar@nyis ber Name	: NYISO 2 518-356-6205 ktammar@nyiso.com ber Name Additional Member Organization AESO CAISO CAISO ERCOT IESO ISO-NE ISO-NE NYISO PJM	: NYISO 2 518-356-6205 ktammar@nyiso.com ber Name Additional Member Organization Region* AESO CAISO CAISO ERCOT IESO ISO-NE ISO-NE NYISO PJM SPP I SPP

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

There is a need for a training standard and we applaud the intent. Such a standard should be the single location for all training requirements (presently training requirements are found in several locations) for the appropriate functions. However, the proposed standard appears to apply a "one size fits all" approach to every authority and function. If this is the case, then this approach is likely to be unrealistic. It should be clear as to which functions should be certuified versus having taken accredited courses. Also, clarity is needed that there will be different types of certification rather than just NERC Operator Certification.

NERC needs to better define the Scope of this standard. Is the intent of the standard to measure compliance of the the training of (reliability entity) personnel regarding NERC Reliability Standards, or is the standard meant to measure compliance of all Training Programs? If the intent is the former, then the question is , is there enough material to really test ?, since some of the NERC standards applying to owners for example only require communications of data. If the intent is the latter, then the question is, is NERC the right organization to evaluate in-house training programs? given the diversity of operating approaches used in North America. In this case, the some programs are probably better evaluated by those closer to the needs and responsibilities of the individual organization.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No

Comments

Support staff and other operators not required to be certified should be able to meet their obligations by participating in NERC continuing eduction.

TSP is listed twice. Was there supposed to be some other entity?

The industry needs a little more definition and clarity on who is the functional entity (IA, RA, PA, etc.)

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

Yes Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please explain.

There are two conflicting questions. The training program requirements are more than adequate (and may not be necessary for some training programs).

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Again, the one size fits all causes problems. What type of emergency (or situational awareness or simulator) training should PSE, IA or Planning Authority participate? As another example, why do all these entities need to perform independent JTAs when it's likely something will need to be created at the NERC level to review the JTAs (unless the intent is to check compliance by seeing if there is a document called "JTA" as opposed to a thoughtful analysis).

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Comments

There will be site-to-site differences. There would be some regional differences in content and topics, but there should be no regional differences in general training requirements. Some of the NERC functional definitions need more detail (who is the transmission operator, interchange authority, reliability authority, etc.).

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

🛛 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Each location would have different requirements. In general, there would likely be an additional person needed for every 5-10 people subject to this standard (to maintain the program, coordination training and provide relief for workers to participate in training, etc.). In addition, each organization subject to this standard would need a person for each occupation (for perhaps a year) to develop the program and get it started. A simulator requirement would add workload (setup, maintenance and running scenarios).

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Comments

Every 3-5 years as part of normal compliance review. The organization's ability to meet the other NERC standards is a measure of the success of their training program.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

Again, the one-size-fits-all approach does not appear to be justified. If an operator or authority does not need to be certified, their training requirements should be less. Continuing eduction with some focus on recommended topics that could be tailored locally would be valuable and would relieve much of the administrative burden.

It might be better if this standard applied (for now) only to those entities that must be certified. Training of everyone is important and necessary, but consider the administration if NERC required that each RRC check every generator operator and purchasing selling entity training records versus this standard. If the industry agrees that Generator Operators and others need to be certified then apply the standard. Again, training programs are probably better evaluated locally.

A continuing eduction requirement with some in a set of approved topics may be more appropriate for non-certified entities.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information			
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)			
Name: Ra	Name: Raj Rana - Coordinator		
Organization: AE	Organization: AEP		
Telephone: 61	4-716	-2359	
Email: raj_rana@AEP.com			
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
	\square	1 - Transmission Owners	
ECAR		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
	\boxtimes	3 - Load-serving Entities	
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities	
		5 - Electric Generators	
	\square	6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
NA - Not Applicable			

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?

Yes 🗌 No

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	Yes No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	Yes No
Transmission Service Provider	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	Yes No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	Yes No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Operator	Yes No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	Yes No
Market Operator	🗌 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🗌 No

Comments

There should be a baseline competency for each Functional model entity listed above. However, recognizing that the baseline competency varies by entity class, therefore it can't be a "one size fits all" concept. The Standard should consider this factor and be flexible to the varying needs of the intended entity class

The training needs and requirements for a RA/RC and TOP differ from that of a BA or IA. The standard should be clear on that point and have different requiements for each of the entities. An IA should not have to have staff with the same knowledge and expertise as a RA/RC.

The Standard should only include the entites checked above. Additionally, the Standard should not cover management.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

Xes Yes

No No

If yes, please explain.

The Standard needs to define the baseline competencies of the training program individually for each Functional model entity listed above, as they have different needs and requirements. Also, the Standard needs to define the essential elements of a training program idividually for the RA/RC, BA, IA, and TOP, as they each have different needs and requirements.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

5.a.i: The Standard should target just the RA/RC, BA, IA, and TOP and their support staff. The standard should not apply to all functional entities in the Fucntional Model nor to management.

6.a and 6.b: Delete all of 6.a and 6.b. The Standard should not dictate staffing levels. This is a business decision. The standard may influence staffing levels via the requirement for the amount of annual training, which is OK, but it should not dictate staffing levels by saying you need x staff for a system operator shift, etc. An entity may need no training staff if they decide to outsource 100% of their training needs.

7.a: Facilities. We question the wisdom of a NERC Standard dictating facility requirements for training, other then to state that adequate facilities need to be provided. Depending upon how an entity decides to provide the required training, they may not need much in the way of physical training facilities, i.e. if they decide to outsource all their training and send their staff to a vendor's training facilities. We would agree that it is appropriate for inclusion in a Standard to specify some boundaries/requirements inregard to how training should be facilitated or proctored, but we are not sure if that is what is meant by this bullet point on "Facilities."

7.f: Delete Funding. It is inappropriate for a NERC Reliability Standard to dictate a certain level of funding. Funding is not a proper measure of a Standard, performance is.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Comments

However, some of the Regions and RTOs have separate training requirements for their members, which may or may not go beyond those proposed by this Standard. It is our belief that Regions and/or RTOs should be allowed to have more stringent requirements if they so choose, but should not be allowed or granted exceptions from this proposed NERC Standard if they desire weaker requirements. Further, we encourage the Regions and RTOs that have additional training requirements, to structure their requirements such that credit hours counted towards meeting their requirements could also count toward meeting the proposed NERC Standard requirements. However, we would be oppossed to diluting the proposed NERC Standard in order to meet a Region's or RTO's lesser requirements. To clarify by example, if the proposed NERC Standard required 32 hours of emergency training and a Region or RTO required their members to have 50 hours of emergency training, we would want the Region and RTO to structure their requirements such that once completeing the Region/RTO's 50 hours of emergency training, that 32 hours of that training also met the requirements of the proposed NERC Standard regarding emergency training. That is, the method of determing what is required in order to officially count an hour as a credit towards meeting the Region/RTO requirement needs to be at least as strict as the NERC requirement for what counts as an hour of training.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes

🗌 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Comments

For AEP, yes, I believe we can implement the proposed standard with our existing staffing levels. However, that is because we have already increased our staffing since the August 2003 Blackout, specifically to allow for more training. It would be inappropriate for us to speculate for the rest of the industry.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Comments

It should be similar to policies today. Specifically, annual self-certification and then as part of onsite audits every three years. Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: Do not insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information		
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)		
Name: Theodore G. Pappas		
Organization: Ne	w Yor	k State Reliability Council
Telephone: 51	6-545	-4011
Email: tpappas@service.lipower.org		
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment
		1 - Transmission Owners
	\boxtimes	2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
		3 - Load-serving Entities
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
		5 - Electric Generators
MAPP		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
		7 - Large Electricity End Users
		8 - Small Electricity End Users
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
☐ NA - Not Applicable		

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

The training should be broken into three segments. The first should be certification training or that training needed to maintain certification. This would be applicable to the RA, BA, IA, Transmission Operator and possibly the Market Operator In other words control room oerator training. The second segment should be for those not directly involved in the operation of the power system. This would apply to the Planning Authority, Resource Planner and Transmission Planner. The third segment should be for generator operators and would cover items susch as interconnections, VAR flow, relaying, etc sothat these operators can develop an understanding of the working of the power system and their impact on it.

The standard should define the training subjects, total hours and, for continued education, the frequency. Flexibility is key so defining specific hours to each subject is not appropriate.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Market Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🗌 Yes 🔀 No

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

\boxtimes	Yes

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Much of the training is inappropriate for people not directly involved in operations or planning such as certain levels of management or support staff.

Comments

The training program should not be so rigid that a training group is required. Senior staff should be capable of providing the training.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

Yes	
-----	--

🗌 No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

Comments

The response depends on the final product. If it is a very formal and rigid plan, similar to the nuclear industry, additional staff will be required.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

The program should be self certified for compliance with audits on a biannual basis.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

		Individual Commenter Information	
(Co	mplet	e this page for comments from one organization or individual.)	
Name: Al	Name: Alan Gale		
Organization: City of Tallahassee			
Telephone: (850) 891-3025			
Email: galea@talgov.com			
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment	
		1 - Transmission Owners	
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils	
		3 - Load-serving Entities	
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities	
	\boxtimes	5 - Electric Generators	
		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers	
		7 - Large Electricity End Users	
		8 - Small Electricity End Users	
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities	
☐ NA - Not Applicable			

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

Although the industry has survived without one for several years, the investigation of the August 14th blackout has pretty much dictated that this be yes.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🗌 Yes 🖾 No
Generator Owner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Market Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	🛛 Yes 🗌 No

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

<u>کا</u> کا	les
--------------	-----

🗌 No

If yes, please explain.

Certification preparation Progression Training Learning management system (LMS) Number of hours Advanced system operations training

Comments

Certification Preparation - Each candidate must prepare for the exam and the measure is passing the test. A formal program to say what needs to be trained on before you can take the test is unnecessary. Would this preclude an individual from taking the test on his own, being hired, and then be non-compliant because he did not complete the "certification preparation" training but yet is certified?

Progression Training - The training requirements for a company to advance an employee should be dictated by that company. The reliability of the grid should address the position, not the advancement to that position. If the "higher" position has additional training requirements, address those requirements, not what is needed to move up to that position.

LMS - What is this intended to be? I do not recall seeing this in a list of definitions. Is this a "buzz word" that a particular vendor uses in describing their system? What would be in it that would not fall under Documentation or Record Retention?

Number of hours - This contradicts the "Competency-based" objectives. Is the goal competent operators or having enough hours. You can have one with or without the other. Since this SAR does not address CEH's or Certification maintenance a specific number of hours would be easier to budget for, but may not yield the intended reliable operations.

Advanced system operations training - How advanced is this intended to be? How much greater than basic? How much more "reliable" than "reliable"? The Detailed Description states "The goal would be to promote the reliability of the Interconnection through the setting of appropriate MINIMUM training requirements for system personnel." Having advanced training sounds like more than the minimum requirements.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes

🛛 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

Minimum standards should be minimum standards. If a region needs something beyond that, it should become a regional requirement.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

	Yes
\boxtimes	No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

- We anticipate that at least 2 additional "trainers" will be needed. In addition to the additional work load to support the training, and the research, and the administration required to become a NERC Certified CEH provider, the qualifications of these personnel is not yet known. There is no clarification as to what "competent in both knowledge of the subject and instructional capabilities" really means.

These words seem to lead to the conclusion that we will have to hire outside agencies of ex-utility workers that have become trainers.

- Additional System Operators will be needed to adequately support the targeted hours and still be able to cover minimum vacation and sick time.

- Additional trainers and Operators will be needed each year to satisfy Item 6 "Staffing level adequacy needed to improve the quality and quantity of training." This statement also seems to go beyond the goal of setting minimum standards. It also goes beyond the Purpose/Industry need of "adequate". We will need more and more every year?

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Reviews should be consistant with other standards.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

5a. "support staff" needs to be clarified. If the position does not need to be certified, why do they need to fall under this requirement. Are we saying that the training requirements of their respective professional certification (i.e. PE) is inadequate? The same can be said of "management".

8a. Why does a companies training plan have to adhere to the CE program? There is no discussion here of how to maintain certification. In fact it is patently obvious that it was intentionally avoided. Is the goal of this to have quality training or further the CE programs viability? Why can't all the training requirements be in one place?

8b. Approval and revocation processes for what? Being a CEH provider or certifying my training program? Compliance monitoring should be sufficient. Why is a separate process neeeded? The CEH process already contains a system for approval and revocation, it's duplication here will increase administrative work load unnecessarily.

COMMENT FORM Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

This form is to be used to submit comments on the proposed System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. Comments must be submitted by **January 07, 2005**. You may submit the completed form by emailing it to: sarcomm@nerc.com with the words "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" in the subject line. If you have questions please contact Mark Ladrow at mark.ladrow@nerc.net on 609-452-8060.

ALL DATA ON THIS FORM WILL BE TRANSFERRED AUTOMATICALLY TO A DATABASE.

- DO: <u>Do</u> enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 <u>Do</u> use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 <u>Do</u> use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 <u>Do</u> submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.
- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field. **Do not** use numbering or bullets in any data field. **Do not** use quotation marks in any data field. **Do not** submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information						
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)						
Name: Mark Heimbach						
Organization: PPL Generation						
Telephone: 610-774-4571						
Email: maheimbach@pplweb.com						
NERC Region		Registered Ballot Body Segment				
		1 - Transmission Owners				
		2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils				
		3 - Load-serving Entities				
		4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities				
	\square	5 - Electric Generators				
MAPP		6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers				
		7 - Large Electricity End Users				
		8 - Small Electricity End Users				
		9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities				
☐ NA - Not Applicable						

(Complete this page if comments are from a group.)	

Group Name:

Lead Contact:

Contact Organization:

Contact Segment:

Contact Telephone:

Contact Email:

Additional Member Name	Additional Member Organization	Region *	Segment*
			1

* If more than one Region or Segment applies, indicate the best fit for the purpose of these comments. Regional acronyms and segment numbers are shown on prior page.

Background Information:

Posted for comments is the first posting of the System Personnel Training Standard Authorization Request. The US-Canada Power System Outage Task Force identified training as one of several initiatives that should be undertaken to enhance the reliability of the bulk interconnected grid. In their report on the August 14, 2003, outage the task force stated "Any person with access to a control room should be trained so that he or she understands the basic functions of the control room ... under any conditions." This Standard Authorization Request was initiated, in part, to address this recommendation.

The requestor would like to gauge the level of consensus regarding the scope of this SAR and to obtain the input of the industry prior to determining the final scope and requirements of the SAR. Accordingly, your comments included on this form, emailed with the subject "System Personnel Training SAR Comments" by January 07, 2005, would be appreciated.

Question 1: Do you agree there is a reliability need for the proposed training standard?



Comments

All real-time market participants must have some level of training dependent upon the potential effects they may have on system reliability.

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

Indicate which of the following you believe the proposed standard should apply:

Reliability Authority/Coordinator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Balancing Authority	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Interchange Authority	Yes 🗌 No
Planning Authority	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Resource Planner	🗌 Yes 🔀 No
Transmission Service Provider	Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Planner	🗌 Yes 🖂 No
Transmission Service Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Owner	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Transmission Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Distribution Provider	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Generator Owner	Yes 🗌 No
Generator Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Purchasing-Selling Entity	Yes 🗌 No
Market Operator	🛛 Yes 🗌 No
Load-Serving Entity	Yes 🗌 No

Comments

It should apply to all entities that can affect real-time operations. However, the training requirements for each entity should be different dependent on the way they can affect the system.

Question 3: Do you believe the content as outlined in the Standard Authorization Request is adequate?

Are additional elements that should be included in this proposed standard?

☐ Yes ⊠ No

If yes, please explain.

Are there existing elements that should be excluded in this proposal?

Yes	

🛛 No

If yes, please explain.

Question 4: Do you believe there are any regional differences that should exist in the proposed standard?

Yes Yes	
---------	--

🗌 No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

My perspective is one of a Generator Operator which operates in four different Reliability Councils (centralized dispatch generation control center with control of multiple generation assets in multiple regions). Each Council has unique differences that must be accomodated.

Question 5: Do you believe it is practical to implement the proposed standard with the existing staffing levels?

No

If no, please explain what staffing changes might be needed.

I have no training staff so it would be impossible to design/implement formal training just for my group without additional staffing/expenditures. However, we do participate in all "pool wide" system operator training that is offered in MAAC and MAIN (via PJM) and applicable to Generation Operators. This is the type of training I would depend on to meet the requirements.

Question 6: How and how often should training programs be reviewed for compliance with the standard?

Every five years.

Question 7: Please enter any additional comments you have regarding the proposed SAR below.

Comments

Some random thoughts: Although we do operate in several Reliability Councils and I admit there are clearly regional differences, the minimum standard should be global so I don't have to meet different minimum standards. The training should be web/computer based so it is available during back shifts. The training needs to be geared towards the responsibilities. For example, the minimum level for Generator Operators need not be at the same level as that of Reliability Coordinators. The costs should be spread across all market participants because the entire market benefits from reliability.