

## Comment Report

**Project Name:** SERC Regional Reliability Standards Development Procedure  
Comment Period Start Date: 10/7/2020  
Comment Period End Date: 11/20/2020  
Associated Ballots:

There was 1 set of responses, including comments from approximately 4 different people from 1 company representing 4 of the Industry Segments as shown in the table on the following pages.

## Questions

1. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Open” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.
2. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Inclusive” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.
3. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Balanced” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.
4. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Due Process” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.
5. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Transparent” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.

<b>Organization Name</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Segment(s)</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Group Member Name</b>	<b>Group Member Organization</b>	<b>Group Member Segment(s)</b>	<b>Group Member Region</b>
Duke Energy	Kim Thomas	1,3,5,6	FRCC,RF,SERC	Duke Energy	Laura Lee	Duke Energy	1	SERC
					Dale Goodwine	Duke Energy	5	SERC
					Greg Cecil	Duke Energy	6	RF

1. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Open” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.

Kim Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF, Group Name Duke Energy

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

2. Do you agree the revised **SERC RSDP** continues to meet the “Inclusive” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.

Kim Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF, Group Name Duke Energy

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Duke Energy is uncertain whether SERC has applied the use of **SERC Board of Directors** and **SERC Board Executive Committee** consistently throughout the RSDP. Please consider the following comments and reconcile appropriately as needed:

- On p. 4 of the redline document, Section **3.0 Review and Re-approval Requirements**:

Should *SERC Board of Directors* be changed to *SERC Board Executive Committee*?

Also, the footer on each page of the procedure has been changed to SERC Board Executive Committee which contradicts Section 3.0.

- On p. 5 of the redline document, Section **5.0 Process Roles**:

Throughout the procedure, it appears SERC has changed *SERC Board of Directors* to *SERC Board Executive Committee* - is this appropriate?

Does *SERC Board Executive Committee* need to be added to Section **5.0 Process Roles**?

- On p. 21 of the redline document, Section **iii. Maintenance of the SERC Regional Reliability Standards Development Procedure**:

Should *SERC Board of Directors* be changed to *SERC Board Executive Committee*? (third paragraph)

- On p. 32 of the redline document, **Interpretations**:

Should this be changed back to *SERC Board Executive Committee*? (third paragraph)

- On pp. 39-41 of the redline document, **Appendix H Roles and Responsibilities Chart**:

Consider modifying the header from *SERC Board of Directors* to *SERC Board Executive Committee*.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

**Response** “SERC appreciates Duke Energy’s (“Duke”) comments. Due to the FERC approved changes to SERC’s Bylaws and Governance structure, which are effective January 1, 2021, SERC’s Board of Directors will no longer include a Board Executive Committee (“BEC”). As a result, the revised procedure has removed all references to the BEC and replaced them with SERC Board of Directors. Thus, in the sections Duke noted in its comment, Review and Re-approval Requirements, Process Roles, Maintenance of the SERC Regional Reliability Standards Development Procedure, Interpretations, and Appendix H Roles and Responsibilities Chart, correctly reference SERC Board of Directors and not the BEC.

Additionally, the reference to the BEC in the footnote correctly refers to its approval of the revised procedure on behalf of SERC’s Board of Directors, which occurred on September 9, 2020 (see Section 7 Revision History, Page 15). For additional clarification, the date of January 1, 2021, in the footnote refers to the proposed effective date of the revised procedure to align with the Governance changes, which also take affect January 1, 2021.”

3. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Balanced” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.

Kim Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF, Group Name Duke Energy

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

4. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Due Process” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.

Kim Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF, Group Name Duke Energy

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

5. Do you agree the revised *SERC RSDP* continues to meet the “Transparent” criteria as outlined above? If “No”, please explain in the comment area below.

Kim Thomas - Duke Energy - 1,3,5,6 - SERC,RF, Group Name Duke Energy

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response