

# Violation Risk Factor and Violation Severity Level Justifications

## Project 2022-03 Energy Assurance with Energy-Constrained Resources

This document provides the drafting team's (DT's) justification for assignment of violation risk factors (VRFs) and violation severity levels (VSLs) for each requirement in Project 2022-03 Energy Assurance with Energy-Constrained Resources. Each requirement is assigned a VRF and a VSL. These elements support the determination of an initial value range for the Base Penalty Amount regarding violations of requirements in FERC-approved Reliability Standards, as defined in the Electric Reliability Organizations (ERO) Sanction Guidelines. The DT applied the following NERC criteria and FERC Guidelines when developing the VRFs and VSLs for the requirements.

### NERC Criteria for Violation Risk Factors

#### High Risk Requirement

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

#### Medium Risk Requirement

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

## **Lower Risk Requirement**

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

## **FERC Guidelines for Violation Risk Factors**

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

FERC seeks to ensure that VRFs assigned to Requirements of Reliability Standards in these identified areas appropriately reflect their historical critical impact on the reliability of the Bulk-Power System. In the VSL Order, FERC listed critical areas (from the Final Blackout Report) where violations could severely affect the reliability of the Bulk-Power System:

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

**Guideline (2) – Consistency within a Reliability Standard**

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

**Guideline (3) – Consistency among Reliability Standards**

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

**Guideline (4) – Consistency with NERC’s Definition of the Violation Risk Factor Level**

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

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

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

## NERC Criteria for Violation Severity Levels

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

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

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

## FERC Order of Violation Severity Levels

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

### Guideline (1) – Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance

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

### Guideline (2) – Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties

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

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

### Guideline (3) – Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement

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

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

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

**VRF Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R1**

Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of Medium is appropriate due to the fact that by not documenting and maintaining the process for conducting Energy Reliability Assessments for the near-term time horizon which are required in defining the minimum standards by which Energy Reliability Assessments will be performed could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system. In addition, a violation of this requirement is unlikely, under emergency, abnormal, or restoration conditions anticipated by the preparations, to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures, nor to hinder restoration to a normal condition. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.
<b>FERC VRF G1 Discussion</b> Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.
<b>FERC VRF G2 Discussion</b> Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
<b>FERC VRF G3 Discussion</b> Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
<b>FERC VRF G4 Discussion</b> Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	This VRF is in line with the definition of a medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO’s Sanctions Guidelines.
<b>FERC VRF G5 Discussion</b> Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

**VSLs for BAL-007-1, Requirement R1**

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
N/A	<p>The Balancing Authority documented an Energy Reliability Assessment process for the Near-Term ERAs but did not account for the elements in Requirement R1 Part 1.1 or Part 1.2.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority documented an Energy Reliability Assessment process for the Near-Term ERAs but did not account for the elements in Requirement R1 Part 1.1 through Part 1.2.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Balancing Authority documented an Energy Reliability Assessment process for the Near-Term ERAs but did not account for one of the elements in Requirement R1 Part 1.3.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority failed to document an Energy Reliability Assessment process for the Near-Term ERAs.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Balancing Authority documented an Energy Reliability Assessment process for the Near-Term ERAs but did not account for any of the elements in Requirement R1 Part 1.3.</p>

**VSL Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R1**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs use the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and are, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>



**VRF Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R2**

Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of Medium is appropriate due to the fact that by not documenting and maintaining a set of scenarios or a method of Scenario creation which are required in defining the minimum standards by which near-term Energy Reliability Assessments will be performed could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system. In addition, a violation of this requirement is unlikely, under emergency, abnormal, or restoration conditions anticipated by the preparations, to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures, nor to hinder restoration to a normal condition. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.
<b>FERC VRF G1 Discussion</b> Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.
<b>FERC VRF G2 Discussion</b> Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
<b>FERC VRF G3 Discussion</b> Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
<b>FERC VRF G4 Discussion</b> Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	This VRF is in line with the definition of a medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO’s Sanctions Guidelines.
<b>FERC VRF G5 Discussion</b> Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

**VSLs for BAL-007-1, Requirement R2**

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
<p>The Balancing Authority documented a set of Scenarios or a method of Scenario creation but did not include one of the conditions listed in Requirement R2 Part 2.1.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority documented a set of Scenarios or a method of Scenario creation but did not include two of the conditions listed in Requirement R2 Part 2.1.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority documented a set of Scenarios or a method of Scenario creation but did not include three of the conditions listed in Requirement R2 Part 2.1.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority documented a set of Scenarios or a method of Scenario creation but did not include any of the conditions listed in Requirement R2 Part 2.1.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Balancing Authority failed to document a set of Scenarios or a method of Scenario creation for use in performing Near-Term ERAs.</p>

**VSL Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R2**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs use the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and are, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>

**VRF Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R3**

Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of Medium is appropriate due to the fact that by not documenting and maintaining the Operating Plan(s) to minimize forecasted Energy Emergencies as identified in the near-term Energy Reliability Assessment, including provisions for notifying the Reliability Coordinator of the forecasted Energy Emergency and the Operating Plan(s) could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system. In addition, a violation of this requirement is unlikely, under emergency, abnormal, or restoration conditions anticipated by the preparations, to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures, nor to hinder restoration to a normal condition. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.
<b>FERC VRF G1 Discussion</b> Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.
<b>FERC VRF G2 Discussion</b> Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
<b>FERC VRF G3 Discussion</b> Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
<b>FERC VRF G4 Discussion</b> Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	This VRF is in line with the definition of a medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO’s Sanctions Guidelines.
<b>FERC VRF G5 Discussion</b> Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

**VSLs for BAL-007-1, Requirement R3**

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority documented an Operating Plan(s) to implement in response to forecasted Energy Emergencies as identified in the Near-Term ERAs but failed to include provisions for notification to the Reliability Coordinator.	The Balancing Authority failed to document an Operating Plan(s) to implement in response to forecasted Energy Emergencies as identified in the Near-Term ERAs.

**VSL Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R3**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b> Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b> Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b> Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSL uses the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and is, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b> Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>

**VRF Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R4**

Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of Medium is appropriate due to the fact that near-term Energy Reliability Assessments were not performed according to the process documented in Requirement R1 using the scenarios or methods documented in Requirement R2 could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system. In addition, a violation of this requirement is unlikely, under emergency, abnormal, or restoration conditions anticipated by the preparations, to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures, nor to hinder restoration to a normal condition. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.
<b>FERC VRF G1 Discussion</b> Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.
<b>FERC VRF G2 Discussion</b> Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
<b>FERC VRF G3 Discussion</b> Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
<b>FERC VRF G4 Discussion</b> Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	This VRF is in line with the definition of a medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO’s Sanctions Guidelines.
<b>FERC VRF G5 Discussion</b> Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

**VSLs for BAL-007-1, Requirement R4**

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority failed to perform a Near-Term ERA in accordance with its process documented in Requirement R1 using the Scenarios or methods documented in Requirement R2.



**VSL Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R4**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSL is Severe, as any degree of noncompliant performance would result in totally or mostly missing the reliability intent of the requirement. The proposed VSL does not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSL uses the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and is, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>

**VRF Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R5**

Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	A VRF of Medium is appropriate due to the fact that if an Operating Plan(s) was not implemented once a near-term Energy Reliability Assessment identified one or more forecasted Energy Emergencies it could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system. In addition, a violation of this requirement is unlikely, under emergency, abnormal, or restoration conditions anticipated by the preparations, to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures, nor to hinder restoration to a normal condition. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.
<b>FERC VRF G1 Discussion</b> Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report	This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.
<b>FERC VRF G2 Discussion</b> Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard	The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.
<b>FERC VRF G3 Discussion</b> Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards	This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.
<b>FERC VRF G4 Discussion</b> Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs	This VRF is in line with the definition of a medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO's Sanctions Guidelines.
<b>FERC VRF G5 Discussion</b> Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation	This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.

**VSLs for BAL-007-1, Requirement R5**

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
N/A	N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority failed to implement an Operating Plan(s) when a Near-Term ERA identified any of the forecasted conditions in Requirement R5.

**VSL Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R5**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSL is Severe, as any degree of noncompliant performance would result in totally or mostly missing the reliability intent of the requirement. The proposed VSL does not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSL uses the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and is, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>

**VRF Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R6**

Proposed VRF	Medium
NERC VRF Discussion	<p>A VRF of Medium is appropriate due to the fact that each if a Reliability Coordinator did not notify other Balancing Authorities and Transmission Operators in its Reliability Coordinator Area, and neighboring Reliability Coordinators of the forecasted condition(s) and the Balancing Authority’s Operating Plan(s) could directly affect the electrical state or the capability of the bulk electric system. In addition, a violation of this requirement is unlikely, under emergency, abnormal, or restoration conditions anticipated by the preparations, to lead to bulk electric system instability, separation, or cascading failures, nor to hinder restoration to a normal condition. Therefore, it is in line with the definition of a Medium VRF.</p>
<p><b>FERC VRF G1 Discussion</b> Guideline 1- Consistency with Blackout Report</p>	<p>This VRF is in line with the identified areas from the FERC list of critical areas in the Final Blackout Report.</p>
<p><b>FERC VRF G2 Discussion</b> Guideline 2- Consistency within a Reliability Standard</p>	<p>The assignment of Medium VRF is consistent with the VRF assignments for other requirements in the proposed Reliability Standard. This requirement has only a main VRF and no different sub-requirement VRFs.</p>
<p><b>FERC VRF G3 Discussion</b> Guideline 3- Consistency among Reliability Standards</p>	<p>This VRF is in line with other VRFs that address similar reliability goals in different Reliability Standards.</p>
<p><b>FERC VRF G4 Discussion</b> Guideline 4- Consistency with NERC Definitions of VRFs</p>	<p>This VRF is in line with the definition of a medium VRF requirement per the criteria filed with FERC as part of the ERO’s Sanctions Guidelines.</p>
<p><b>FERC VRF G5 Discussion</b> Guideline 5- Treatment of Requirements that Co-mingle More than One Obligation</p>	<p>This requirement does not mingle a higher risk reliability objective and a lesser risk reliability objective. Therefore, the VRF reflects the risk of the whole requirement.</p>

**VSLs for BAL-007-1, Requirement R6**

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
N/A	N/A	The Balancing Authority reviewed information that contained the Near-Term ERAs process, the ERA Scenarios or methods, and Operating Plan(s) but failed to update within 24 months.	The Balancing Authority failed to review and update information that contained the Near-Term ERAs process, the ERA Scenarios or methods, and Operating Plan(s) to the Reliability Coordinator.

**VSL Justifications for BAL-007-1, Requirement R6**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement is new. Therefore, the proposed VSLs do not have the unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSL uses the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and is, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>

**TOP-003-6**

**VRF Justification for TOP-003-7, Requirement R2**

The VRF did not change from the previously FERC approved TOP-003-6 Reliability Standard. The modifications made to R2 are similar in content to the previous draft and therefore the VRF remained low.

**VSL Justification for TOP-003-7, Requirement R2**

Please refer to the VSL table located below.

**VRF Justification for TOP-003-7, Requirement R4**

The VRF did not change from the previously FERC approved TOP-003-6 Reliability Standard. The modifications made to R4 are similar in content to the previous draft and therefore the VRF remained low.

**VSL Justification for TOP-003-7, Requirement R4**

Please refer to the VSL table located below.

VSLs for TOP-003-7, Requirement R2			
Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
The Balancing Authority did not include two or fewer of the parts (Part 2.1 through Part 2.5) of the documented specification(s) for the data and information necessary for it to perform its analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.	The Balancing Authority did not include three of the parts (Part 2.1 through Part 2.5) of the documented specification(s) for the data and information necessary for it to perform its analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.	The Balancing Authority did not include four of the parts (Part 2.1 through Part 2.5) of the documented specification(s) for the data and information necessary for it to perform its analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.	The Balancing Authority did not include any of the parts (Part 2.1 through Part 2.5) of the documented specification(s) for the data and information necessary for it to perform its analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments. OR, The Balancing Authority did not have a documented



			specification(s) for the data and information necessary for it to perform its analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.
--	--	--	---

**VSL Justifications for TOP-003-7, Requirement R2**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement was modified by adding an additional assessment to Requirement R2. The proposed VSL was modified to reflect the additional assessment. It does not have unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSL uses the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and is, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>

**VSL Justifications for TOP-003-7, Requirement R2**

<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b> Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>
---	---

**VSLs for TOP-003-7, Requirement R4**

Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
<p>The Balancing Authority did not distribute its Specification(s) to one entity, or 5% or less of the entities, whichever is greater, that have data and information required by the Balancing Authority’s analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority did not distribute its Specification(s) to two entities, or more than 5% and less than or equal to 10% of the entities, whichever is greater, that have data and information required by the Balancing Authority’s analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority did not distribute its Specification(s) to three entities, or more than 10% and less than or equal to 15% of the entities, whichever is greater, that have data and information required by the Balancing Authority’s analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.</p>	<p>The Balancing Authority did not distribute its Specification(s) to four or more entities, or more than 15% of the entities that have data and information required by the Balancing Authority’s analysis functions, Real-time monitoring, and Near-Term Energy Reliability Assessments.</p>

**VSL Justifications for TOP-003-7, Requirement R4**

<p><b>FERC VSL G1</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Not Have the Unintended Consequence of Lowering the Current Level of Compliance</p>	<p>The requirement was modified by adding an additional assessment to Requirement R4. The proposed VSL was modified to reflect the additional assessment. It does not have unintended consequence of lowering the level of compliance.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G2</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignments Should Ensure Uniformity and Consistency in the Determination of Penalties</p> <p><u>Guideline 2a</u>: The Single Violation Severity Level Assignment Category for "Binary" Requirements Is Not Consistent</p> <p><u>Guideline 2b</u>: Violation Severity Level Assignments that Contain Ambiguous Language</p>	<p>The proposed VSLs are not binary and do not use any ambiguous terminology, thereby supporting uniformity and consistency in the determination of similar penalties for similar violations.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G3</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Consistent with the Corresponding Requirement</p>	<p>The proposed VSL uses the same terminology as used in the associated requirement and is, therefore, consistent with the requirement.</p>
<p><b>FERC VSL G4</b>          Violation Severity Level Assignment Should Be Based on A Single Violation, Not on A Cumulative Number of Violations</p>	<p>Each VSL is based on a single violation and not cumulative violations.</p>