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## NERC'S Proposed Budget by Program ${ }^{1}$



## Proposed Budget for Statutory Activities of NERC, Each Regional Entity and WIRAB ${ }^{1}$

|  | 2018 Budget for <br> Statutory Functions | 2019 Budget for <br> Statutory Functions |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| NERC | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $73,135,156$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ |
| FRCC | $7,514,112$ | $80,049,655$ |  |
| MRO | $11,726,736$ | $6,695,787$ |  |
| NPCC | $15,106,967$ | $15,980,354$ |  |
| ReliabilityFirst | $21,393,899$ | $15,803,891$ |  |
| SERC | $17,182,868$ | $22,648,458$ |  |
| SPP RE | $10,793,195$ | $18,144,948$ |  |
| Texas RE | $12,656,953$ | - |  |
| WECC | $27,097,344$ | $13,069,599$ |  |
| WIRAB | $1,067,785$ | $26,950,566$ |  |
| Total Budget |  | $197,675, \mathbf{0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$}$ |

[^0]Proposed Assessments for Statutory Activities of NERC and Each Regional Entity and WIRAB

|  | Assessments for Statutory Functions 2018 |  | Allocation to Canada 2018 |  | Assessments for Statutory Functions 2019 |  |  Allocation to Canada <br> 2019 Budget $v$ <br> Allocation to 2018 Budget <br> Canada 2019 Over (Under) |  |  |  | \% Over <br> (Under) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NERC | \$ | 62,936,968 | \$ | 5,778,945 | \$ | 68,883,995 | \$ | 6,205,577 | \$ | 426,632 | 7.38\% |
| Regional Entities | \$ | 115,366,505 | \$ | 10,385,989 | \$ | 113,461,051 | \$ | 10,201,225 | \$ | $(184,764)$ | -1.78\% |
| FRCC |  | 6,660,518 |  |  |  | 5,827,925 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MRO |  | 10,730,106 |  | 1,789,219 |  | 15,471,669 |  | 1,557,423 |  |  |  |
| NPCC |  | 14,341,787 |  | 5,592,327 |  | 15,003,411 |  | 5,834,155 |  |  |  |
| ReliabilityFirst |  | 20,147,707 |  | - |  | 21,255,831 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SERC |  | 17,205,136 |  | - |  | 17,372,215 |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPP RE |  | 9,727,265 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Texas RE |  | 11,271,986 |  | - |  | 13,248,000 |  | - |  |  |  |
| WECC |  | 25,282,000 |  | 3,004,443 |  | 25,282,000 |  | 2,809,647 |  |  |  |
| WIRAB | \$ | 711,026 | \$ | 101,234 | \$ | 750,000 | \$ | 109,030 | \$ | 7,796 | 7.70\% |
| Total Budget | \$ | 179,014,499 | \$ | 16,266,168 | \$ | 183,095,046 | \$ | 16,515,832 | \$ | 249,664 | 1.53\% |
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## Overview

The North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) is a not-for-profit entity organized under the New Jersey Nonprofit Corporation Act. NERC's mission is to assure the effective and efficient reduction of risks to the reliability and security of the Bulk Power System (BPS) ${ }^{1}$. NERC's area of responsibility spans the continental U.S. and portions of Canada and Mexico. Entities under NERC's jurisdiction are the users, owners, and operators of the BPS - a system that serves the needs of over 340 million people, includes installed electricity production capacity of approximately 1,200 gigawatts, operates 475,000 miles of highvoltage transmission ( 100 kV and above), and is comprised of assets worth more than one trillion dollars.

## Electric Reliability Organization

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) certifies and has oversight of NERC as the electric reliability organization (ERO) within the U.S. to establish and enforce NERC Reliability Standards for the U.S. portion of the BPS, pursuant to Section 215 (§215) of the Federal Power Act (FPA). As of June 18, 2007, FERC granted NERC the legal authority to enforce Reliability Standards with all U.S. users, owners, and operators of the BPS and made compliance with those standards mandatory and enforceable. Section 215 also requires that the organization certified by FERC as the ERO seek recognition with relevant authorities in Canada and Mexico, and in 2005, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and Canadian federal and provincial governments agreed to bilateral principles for a consistent, continent-wide reliability regulatory framework under a non-governmental institution (the ERO) designed to function on an international basis. To date, eight Canadian provinces ${ }^{2}$ and the National Energy Board of Canada have adopted such a framework, and Mexico is in the process of implementing such a framework after a historic restructuring of Mexico's electricity industry and reforms of the country's regulatory framework were enacted in 2013 and 2014. NERC and WECC are working with the Mexican regulator, Comísion Reguladora de Energía (CRE) and the Mexican system and market operator, CENACE, under a memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed in 2017, to ensure that, as Mexico implements its new authorities, they will be consistent with the framework in Canada and the United States and support continent-wide reliability and security.

## Membership and Governance

An 11-member Board, comprised of 10 independent trustees and NERC's president and chief executive officer (CEO) serving as the management trustee, governs NERC. The Board has formed several committees to facilitate oversight of the organization in the areas of finance and audit, governance and human resources, compliance, technology and security, nominations and enterprise-wide risk.

Membership in NERC is open to any person or entity that has an interest in the reliability of the North American BPS. Membership is voluntary and affords participants the opportunity to engage in the governance of the organization through election to the Member Representatives Committee (MRC). ${ }^{3}$ More than 600 entities and individuals are members of NERC.

[^1]
## Scope of Oversight

As the international, multijurisdictional ERO in North America, NERC:

- Proposes, supports the development of, monitors compliance with, and enforces mandatory Reliability Standards for the North American BES, subject to regulatory oversight and approvals from FERC in the U.S. and applicable authorities in Canada
- Conducts near-term and long-term reliability assessments of the North American BPS
- Certifies BPS operators as having and maintaining the necessary knowledge and skills to perform their reliability responsibilities
- Maintains situational awareness of events and conditions that may threaten BPS reliability
- Coordinates efforts to improve physical and cyber security for the BPS of North America
- Conducts detailed analyses and investigations of system disturbances and unusual events as well as measuring ongoing system trends to determine root causes, uncovering lessons learned, and issuing relevant findings as advisories, recommendations, guidelines, and essential actions to the industry to mitigate and control risks to reliability
- Identifies and prioritizes risks to reliability and uses a broad toolkit to mitigate and control risks to reliability, including the potential need for new or modified Reliability Standards, improved compliance monitoring and enforcement methods, or other initiatives


## Delegated Authorities

In executing its responsibility, NERC delegates certain authorities to regional reliability entities (Regional Entities or the Regions) to perform aspects of the ERO functions described through delegation agreements. FERC has approved delegation agreements between NERC and seven Regional Entities: the Florida Reliability Coordinating Council (FRCC), Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO), Northeast Power Coordinating Council, Inc. (NPCC), ReliabilityFirst (RF), SERC Reliability Corporation (SERC), Texas Reliability Entity, Inc. (Texas RE), and Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC). These agreements describe the authorities delegated and responsibilities assigned to the Regional Entities in the U.S. to address, among other things: (1) developing regional Reliability Standards; (2) monitoring compliance with and enforcement of Reliability Standards (both North American-wide and regional); (3) registering owners, operators, and users of the BES and certifying reliability entities (Reliability Coordinators [RCs], Balancing Authorities [BAs], and Transmission Operators [TOPs]); (4) assessing reliability and analyzing performance; (5) training and education; (6) event analysis and reliability improvement; and (7) situational awareness and infrastructure security. NERC expects Regional Entities whose territories and geographic footprints extend into Canadian provinces and Mexico to perform equivalent functions in those jurisdictions.

## ERO Enterprise Operating Model

The collective network of leadership, experience, judgment, skills, and technologies shared among NERC and the Regional Entities is referred to as the ERO Enterprise. In 2014, a common operating model, Improving Coordinated Operations across the ERO Enterprise, ${ }^{4}$ was developed to define how NERC and the Regional Entities achieve excellence in the oversight and execution of statutory functions by collaborating to mitigate reliability risks. The model also defines the division of the roles and responsibilities for NERC and the Regional Entities to efficiently and effectively execute services performed as the collective ERO Enterprise.

[^2]NERC has unique responsibilities within the ERO Enterprise to design the oversight of program areas, develop operational oversight and leadership, set qualifications and expectations for the performance of delegated activities, and assess, train, and give feedback to corresponding Regional Entity programs. Implementation of the operating model progressed with NERC's finalization of documented oversight plans for all statutory program areas for which the Regional Entities' have delegated activities. Further, NERC and the Regional Entities have deepened their coordination activities to identify, prioritize, and address risks to reliability. NERC also reviews and provides input to the annual Regional Entity business plans and budgets (BP\&Bs), including but not limited to review of resource allocations, staffing capacity assessments, and program performance assessments. NERC input and review occurs before Regional Entity board approval.

Similarly, the Regional Entities have a mirrored set of responsibilities that include being responsive to the design of the operational model, providing input into the overall development of each ERO program area, providing training and development to meet ERO qualifications, being receptive to feedback from the ERO, and making responsive adjustments. Regional Entities also have an obligation to meet professional standards of independence and objectivity and provide the best available expertise for addressing risks.

With due recognition and awareness of the distinction between individual roles, responsibilities, and corporate status, NERC and the Regional Entities are continually refining their individual and collective operating and governance practices in support of an agreed-upon set of strategic and operational goals and objectives that are designed to ensure the ERO fulfills its statutory obligations.

## Statutory and Regulatory Background

NERC's authority as the ERO in the U.S. is based on §215 of the FPA, as added by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 , $^{5}$ and FERC's regulations and orders issued pursuant to $\S 215$. In Canada, NERC's authorities are established by the memoranda of understanding and regulations previously mentioned.

## Funding

Section 215 of the FPA and FERC's regulations specify procedures for NERC's funding in the U.S. NERC's annual BP\&B is subject to FERC approval in the U.S and, once approved, NERC's annual funding is provided primarily through assessments to load-serving entities. These assessments are allocated on a net-energy-for-load (NEL) basis. Equivalent funding mechanisms are provided in Canada, subject to the specific laws and regulations of each province.

The Regional Entities' funding requirements are addressed separately in their respective BP\&Bs, which must be reviewed and approved by NERC and FERC. The U.S. assessments for the Regional Entity budgets are included in the overall NERC assessments to load-serving entities.

[^3]
## Introduction and Executive Summary



## Strategic and Operational Planning

The ERO Enterprise's strategic and operational planning process is informed by ongoing activities to identify (1) BPS reliability risks, particularly informed by the Reliability Issues Steering Committee's (RISC's) biennial reliability leadership summit and ERO Reliability Risk Priorities Report ${ }^{6}$ (RISC report), and (2) opportunities to improve ERO Enterprise effectiveness and efficiency. The transparent and collaborative process includes input from stakeholders ${ }^{7}$, the Board, and Regional Entity boards. These inputs are used by ERO Enterprise leadership to inform the following strategic and operational planning components:

- ERO Enterprise Long-Term Strategy ${ }^{8}$ - The long-term strategy discusses key challenges and strategic focus areas for the ERO Enterprise over the next five to seven years. The long-term strategy is reviewed on a periodic basis to identify any needed adjustments.
- ERO Enterprise Operating Plan ${ }^{9}$ - Guided by the long-term strategy, the operating plan identifies the ERO Enterprise's vision, mission, core principals, and goals, and provides a list of key contributing activities ${ }^{10}$ by the combined ERO Enterprise, NERC, and the Regional Entities as applicable to inform a rolling three-year operational planning horizon. The operating plan is reviewed biennially ${ }^{11}$ and updated as needed.
- ERO Enterprise BP\&Bs - BP\&Bs set the specific annual activities, resources, and resource allocation in support of the goals and objectives in the operating plan. BP\&Bs are prepared, reviewed, and approved annually for NERC and each of the Regional Entities.
- ERO Enterprise Metrics ${ }^{12}$ - The metrics include measures, thresholds, and targets to provide indicators of BPS reliability and security as well as ERO Enterprise effectiveness and efficiency. The metrics are reviewed annually and updated as needed to ensure they meaningfully inform near and long-term priorities. ${ }^{13}$


## Evolving Reliability Risks

Over the past several years, NERC has transformed its activities towards being more risk-based, ensuring that the right activities are focused on the most pertinent risks to the reliable operation of the BPS. The RISC is an advisory committee to the Board, providing key insights, priorities, and high-level leadership for issues of strategic importance to BPS reliability. The latest RISC report, which was accepted by the Board on February 8, 2018, presents the results of its continued work to define and prioritize risks and to offer recommendations to the Board to inform the development of NERC's risk strategy. The RISC report recommendations are considered as the operating plan's goals and contributing activities are updated for the coming years. In the latest report, the RISC recommended a high level of focus and priority on the following areas that have been identified as having a higher likelihood of BPS-wide occurrence and higher impact to BPS reliability.

[^4]
## Cybersecurity Vulnerabilities

Cyber threats are becoming more sophisticated and increasing in number. Exploitation of cybersecurity vulnerabilities can cause loss of control or damage to BPS-related voice communications, data, monitoring, protection and control systems, or tools. A cyber-attack can result in equipment damage, degradation of reliable operations, uncontrolled cascading of the BPS, and loss of load. Further, cybersecurity vulnerabilities can come from several sources, both internal and external, and in some instances the utility may have its cybersecurity fully tested.

## Changing Resource Mix

The rapid rate at which fuel costs, subsidies, and federal, state, and provincial policies are affecting the resource mix are creating a new paradigm in which planners, balancing authorities, and system operators are reacting to resource additions and retirements. Further, the integration of new technologies and distributed energy resources are affecting the ability of operators to see and control resources within their area.

## BPS Planning

BPS planning is a risk closely tied to the changing resource mix because planners currently lack the ability to update or create system models and scenarios of potential future states to identify system needs based on the dynamic nature of the system. This changing system makes it increasingly difficult to evaluate BPS stability, including inertia and frequency response, voltage support (adequate dynamic and static reactive compensation), and ramping constraints.

## Resource Adequacy

Changes in the generation resource mix and new technologies are altering the operational characteristics of the grid and will challenge system planners and operators to maintain reliability in real time. Failure to take into account these changing characteristics and capabilities can lead to insufficient capacity and essential reliability services to meet customer demands.

## ERO Enterprise Goals

As part of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan discussed above, the ERO Enterprise has six goals enabling the ERO Enterprise to successfully carry out its mission. A description of each goal is provided below, followed by additional information about the allocation of NERC's and the full ERO Enterprise's resources toward achievement of each goal.

## Goal 1: Risk-Responsive Reliability Standards

Reliability Standards establish threshold requirements for assuring the BES is planned, operated, and maintained to minimize risks of cascading failures, avoid damage to major equipment, or limit interruptions of the BPS. Reliability Standards are clear, timely, effective in mitigating risks to reliability, and consider cost-effectiveness/impact.

## Goal 2: Objective, Risk-Informed Compliance Monitoring, Mitigation, Enforcement, and Entity Registration

The ERO Enterprise is a strong enforcement authority that is objective, fair, and promotes a culture of reliability excellence through risk-informed compliance monitoring, mitigation, enforcement, and registration.

## Goal 3: Reduction of Known Reliability Risks

The ERO Enterprise recognizes significant known risks to reliability, assures those risks are reduced, and promotes a culture of reliability excellence.

## Goal 4: Identification and Assessment of Emerging Reliability

The ERO Enterprise identifies, objectively assesses, and prioritizes emerging risks to reliability to inform stakeholders and enable effective actions to reduce these risks to reliability.

## Goal 5: Identification and Reduction of Cyber and Physical Security Risks

The ERO Enterprise identifies and evaluates cyber and physical security risks to the BPS and assures those risks are reduced through active stakeholder engagement and information sharing of current threats and vulnerabilities, security workshops, and development of good industry practice guides. The ERO Enterprise supports the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center (E-ISAC), the Cybersecurity Risk Information Sharing Program (CRISP), technical protective programs, and physical and cybersecurity preparedness exercises, and engages with government partners to de-classify sensitive security information needed to protect BPS devices and assets. The ERO Enterprise works with stakeholders to develop and share information to foster BPS resiliency in connection with both traditional and emerging risks.

## Goal 6: Effective and Efficient Operations

The ERO Enterprise embraces transparency, collaboration, consistency, quality, efficiency, and timeliness of results and operates as a coordinated and collaborative enterprise.

## Allocation of NERC Resources to ERO Enterprise Goals and Risk Priorities

The charts below provide an overview of the allocation of both NERC and the ERO Enterprise's 2019 resources associated with each goal in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan and the related contributing activities discussed above. Using surveys, funding sources, and FTEs as a guide, the charts reflect the relative amount of total resources (people and dollars) focused on supporting each of the six goals noted above. Since many departments work on multiple activities that further multiple goals, forecasting all activities supporting each goal is not precise. However, these charts provide a general picture regarding how resources are allocated.

NERC Resource Allocation to Operating Plan Goals


# ERO Enterprise Resource Allocation to Operating Plan Goals 



## Ongoing Focus on Effectiveness and Efficiency

NERC and the Regional Entities continue to collaborate to improve effectiveness and efficiency, evaluate resources, and leverage combined skillsets to improve ERO Enterprise activities and control costs. This collaboration and resulting efficiencies can be found in a number of areas, including but not limited to:

- ERO Enterprise IT investments - NERC and the Regional Entities, under the oversight of the Board Technology and Security Committee (TSC), have developed a long-term ERO Enterprise IT program resulting in a number of enterprise tools to enhance operations, improve efficiency, and reduce costs at the NERC, regional, and registered entity levels. For example, these tools will facilitate efficiency of data submittals, consistency in compliance resources, and overall reliability through information sharing related to event analysis, misoperations, and situational awareness.
- Enforcement - NERC has worked closely with Regional Entities to streamline enforcement processes, and therefore required resources, in connection with the development of more efficient and risk-based enforcement mechanisms.
- Standards - As standards development has matured, NERC management has reallocated Standards staff towards more critical activities like cyber security and analytical capabilities.
- Forums - As further described in the quarterly forum reports to the Board, NERC and the Regional Entities continue to leverage the transmission and generation forums to jointly address risks to reliability to mitigate their impacts on the reliable operation of the BES.
- Industry - The ERO Enterprise continues to collaborate with and rely on industry resources and expertise through the various standing and technical committees, working groups, and task forces that are critical to both identifying and supporting key initiatives and priorities.

Additional information on long-term and ongoing effectiveness and efficiency goals can be found in Focus Area 2 of the ERO Enterprise Long-Term Strategy, Goal 6 of the draft ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, and Metric 7d of the 2018 ERO Enterprise Metrics. Current efforts in support of these goals are detailed in a draft framework for improving ERO Enterprise effectiveness and efficiency that was presented and discussed at the May 9, 2018 MRC meeting. ${ }^{14}$

[^5]
## 2019 Key Business Planning Assumptions

NERC and the Regional Entities use the goals and contributing activities in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan as a guide to support the development of their respective BP\&Bs. NERC and the Regional Entities use this planning information to evaluate their projected workloads and determine resource levels and allocation required to complete necessary tasks and meet their statutory obligations.

## Application of Section 215 Criteria

In its order approving NERC's 2013 Business Plan and Budget, FERC required NERC to establish criteria for determining whether its proposed activities are eligible for funding under §215. In an order dated April 19, 2013, FERC approved NERC's proposed criteria, with certain modifications. ${ }^{15}$ Exhibit A - Application of NERC Section 215 Criteria summarizes the major activities NERC proposes to undertake in 2019 and the approved $\S 215$ criteria applicable to such activities.

## Overview of 2019 Budget and Funding Requirements

NERC's 2019 combined expense and fixed asset (capital) budget is approximately $\$ 80.0 \mathrm{M}$, which represents an increase of approximately $\$ 6.9 \mathrm{M}$ (9.5\%) from the 2018 budget. Total expenses are increasing approximately $\$ 7.9 \mathrm{M}$ (11.1\%) over 2018. The total fixed asset (capital) budget, excluding depreciation, ${ }^{16}$ is approximately $\$ 4.8 \mathrm{M}$, an increase of $\$ 904 \mathrm{k}$ ( $23.3 \%$ ) from 2018. Approximately $\$ 9.0 \mathrm{M}$ (11.2\%) of NERC's 2019 budget is related to CRISP, with the majority of the CRISP budget funded by participating utilities, with a small portion funded through assessments.

NERC's proposed 2019 assessment is approximately $\$ 68.9 \mathrm{M}$, which represents an increase of $\$ 6.0 \mathrm{M}$ (9.5\%) from 2018 and reflects the proposed release of $\$ 550 \mathrm{k}$ of funds from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve to reduce 2019 assessments. Further, NERC proposes to deposit \$500k of penalty collections during the 12 months ended June 30, 2018 into the Assessment Stabilization Reserve. Without the proposed release of funds from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve to offset assessments (as further discussed below), NERC's total assessments would increase $\$ 6.5 \mathrm{M}$ (10.3\%) over 2018. Factors contributing to the difference between the proposed budget increase and the proposed assessment increase include debt (capital financing) assumptions and other funding from CRISP, workshop fees, etc.

In order to stabilize assessments and align budget and assessment increases more closely, NERC has undertaken a multi-year strategy to manage assessment increases. NERC's policy Accounting, Financial Statement and Budgetary Treatment of Penalties Imposed and Received for Violations of Reliability Standards ${ }^{17}$ and NERC Rules of Procedure (ROP) §1107.2 specify that penalties received during the period July 1 through the following June 30 are to be used in the subsequent budget period to offset U.S. assessment billings. However, ROP §1107.4 provides for exceptions or alternatives to this treatment if approved by FERC. In February 2015, the Board approved an amendment to the company's Working Capital and Operating Reserve Policy. ${ }^{18}$ Among the approved changes was the creation of an Assessment

[^6]Stabilization Reserve. ${ }^{19}$ This reserve was established to implement the strategic goal of more closely aligning annual budget and U.S. assessment increases and to better manage year-to-year assessment increases. The eventual goal is to narrow the gap between annual percentage changes in NERC's budget and annual percentage changes in assessments that result from year-to-year variations in penalty collections.

Subject to FERC approval, NERC will deposit the $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$ of penalty funds collected during the period July 1 , 2017-June 30, 2018 into the Assessment Stabilization Reserve and release $\$ 550 \mathrm{k}$ from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve to reduce 2019 assessments, resulting in a matching 2019 budget and assessment increase of $9.5 \%$. The allocation of assessments to Canadian entities will reflect the final determination and allocation of certain compliance and enforcement costs to Canadian entities pursuant to NERC's policy on the allocation of compliance costs. ${ }^{20}$

The following table provides a high-level year-over-year comparison of the major categories of expenses, total budget, and full-time equivalents (FTEs).

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 and 2019 Budgets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATUTORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $2018$ <br> Budget |  |  Variance <br>  2018 Projection <br> 2018 v 2018 Budget <br> Orojection Over(Under) |  |  |  | $2019$ <br> Budget |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget Over(Under) |  |  |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 62,936,968 | \$ | 62,936,968 | \$ | - | \$ | 68,883,995 | \$ | 5,947,027 | 9.5\% |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | - |  | 550,000 |  | $(50,000)$ |  |
| Third-Party Funding (CRISP) |  | 7,324,253 |  | 7,219,381 |  | $(104,872)$ |  | 7,486,353 |  | 162,101 |  |
| Testing Fees |  | 1,790,000 |  | 1,689,757 |  | $(100,243)$ |  | 1,790,000 |  | - |  |
| Services \& Software |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | - |  | 40,000 |  | $(10,000)$ |  |
| Workshops |  | 185,000 |  | 301,380 |  | 116,380 |  | 195,000 |  | 10,000 |  |
| Interest |  | 95,000 |  | 268,413 |  | 173,413 |  | 185,000 |  | 90,000 |  |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total Funding | \$ | 72,981,221 | \$ | 73,065,900 | \$ | 84,678 | \$ | 79,130,349 | \$ | 6,149,128 | 8.4\% |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses | \$ | 40,969,105 | \$ | 41,131,865 | \$ | 162,760 | \$ | 43,952,190 | \$ | 2,983,085 | 7.3\% |
| Meeting Expenses |  | 3,395,100 |  | 3,484,028 |  | 88,928 |  | 3,380,400 |  | $(14,700)$ | -0.4\% |
| Operating Expenses |  | 26,352,371 |  | 28,572,330 |  | 2,219,959 |  | 31,170,916 |  | 4,818,544 | 18.3\% |
| Other Non-Operating |  | 138,878 |  | 165,048 |  | 26,170 |  | 214,171 |  | 75,293 | 54.2\% |
| Total Expenses | \$ | 70,855,455 | \$ | 73,353,271 | \$ | 2,497,816 | \$ | 78,717,677 | \$ | 7,862,222 | 11.1\% |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(1,594,299)$ | \$ | $(3,042,075)$ | \$ | $(1,447,776)$ | \$ | $(3,446,022)$ | \$ | $(1,851,724)$ |  |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 2,549,000 |  | 2,549,000 |  | - |  | 3,488,000 |  | 939,000 |  |
| Equipment CapEx |  | 1,175,000 |  | 565,559 |  | $(609,441)$ |  | 890,000 |  | $(285,000)$ |  |
| Leasehold Imrovements |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | - |  | 400,000 |  | 250,000 |  |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets | \$ | 2,279,701 | \$ | 222,484 | \$ | $(2,057,218)$ | \$ | 1,331,978 | \$ | $(947,724)$ | -41.6\% |
| Total Budget | \$ | 73,135,156 | \$ | 73,575,755 | \$ | 440,599 | \$ | 80,049,655 | \$ | 6,914,499 | 9.5\% |
| FTEs |  | 199.28 |  | 187.63 |  | (11.65) |  | 204.92 |  | 5.64 | 2.8\% |

[^7]NERC's 2019 budget and funding requirements reflect the resources necessary to support achievement of the goals and objectives set forth in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan. The 2019 budget is comprised of both operating and fixed asset (capital) costs. Operating costs generally include personnel, consulting, office space, software licensing, third-party data management, communications, and other customary services to support office operations. Fixed asset (capital) costs primarily reflect investments in equipment and software to support operations, including investments in the development of software applications and infrastructure to facilitate improved business processes and efficiency.

## Key Budget Assumptions

Key assumptions used in the development of NERC's 2019 budget include the following:

- A net increase to headcount by 6 ( 5.64 FTEs). This reflects an increase of 11 positions ( 10.34 FTEs) in support of the long-term strategy for the E-ISAC, as outlined in the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center section of Section A, and a decrease of 5 positions (4.70 FTEs) in the rest of NERC operations. A 6.0\% reduction to FTEs (vacancy rate) is applied to account for attrition and hiring delays, which is the same as 2018.
- Investment for the second year of the E-ISAC long-term strategy. In addition to the headcount (FTE) increase for the E-ISAC discussed above, the strategy calls for investment in additional grid security exercise (GridEx) support, E-ISAC portal enhancements, and office facilities to support growth. Additional information can be found in Exhibit E - E-ISAC Long-Term Strategy.
- Investments in technology and tools. This includes a planned funding for the Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program (CMEP) tool, with investment in complementary solutions for entity registration and standards data, as described in Exhibit F - CMEP Technology Project, as well as an upgrade to the SAFNR situational awareness tool, as outlined in Exhibit $G$ - Situation Awareness for FERC, NERC, and the Regional Entities (SAFNR).
- Market-based compensation for personnel. Executive and staff compensation and benefits are established based on guidelines established by the Board's Corporate Governance and Human Resources Committee (CGHRC) and the results of market compensation and benefit studies, most recently completed in 2017.
- Anticipated market increases in medical and dental benefit plan costs. Medical and dental premium cost estimates are based on market data provided by the company's benefits consultant. No other changes to retirement or other benefit plans have been assumed for 2019.
- Slight decrease to meeting and travel expenses. The company has undertaken a number of significant efforts over the past several years to reduce travel and meeting expenses. For example, the company has worked closely with Regional Entities to share meeting space where possible, which has helped reduce meeting costs.


## Fixed Asset (Capital) Budget and Capital Financing

NERC's 2019 capital budget is approximately $\$ 4.8 \mathrm{M}$ (excluding depreciation), which represents an increase of $\$ 904 \mathrm{k}$ from 2018. This increase is primarily due to additional ERO Enterprise software project spending and leasehold improvements for the E-ISAC. The table below provides a summary of the major capital budget components.

| NERC Capital Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  |  Variance <br>  2019 Budget <br> Budget v 2018 <br> 2019 Budget |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ERO Application Development | \$ | 2,148,000 | \$ | 3,268,000 |  | 1,120,000 | 52.1\% |
| Hardware (storage, servers) |  | 805,000 |  | 565,000 |  | $(240,000)$ | -29.8\% |
| Other Equipment |  | 370,000 |  | 425,000 |  | 55,000 | 14.9\% |
| Disaster Recovery |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | $(100,000)$ | -100.0\% |
| NERC Software Licenses |  | 301,000 |  | 120,000 |  | $(181,000)$ | -60.1\% |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | 150,000 |  | 400,000 |  | 250,000 | 166.7\% |
| Total | \$ | 3,874,000 | \$ | 4,778,000 | \$ | 904,000 | 23.3\% |

NERC has budgeted approximately $\$ 4.6 \mathrm{M}$ (both operating expenses and capital expenditures) in 2019 for services related to the planning, design, and implementation of software applications supporting ERO Enterprise tools for common NERC and Regional Entity operations. These related costs include approximately $\$ 3.3 \mathrm{M}$ in capital expenditures and $\$ 1.3 \mathrm{M}$ in other IT operating costs. Additional information regarding the ERO Enterprise IT strategy, the current status of the development of ERO Enterprise IT applications, and projects that will be under development in 2019 can be found in the Information Technology section of Section A. The 2019 capital budget also includes ongoing funding for IT security, data storage, servers, hardware, and software license costs.

## CMEP Technology Project and Standards Data and Entity Registration Solutions

Starting in 2017, NERC has been working closely with the Regional Entities to evaluate and implement strategic investments in tools that replace the current three CMEP applications used among NERC and the Regional Entities with a single, common CMEP application. The scope of the project includes how Reliability Standards and entity registration data will be integrated with the tool, as well as how best to support the various parts of the compliance and enforcement process (e.g., analysis of risk, development of implementation plans and audit schedules, actual compliance monitoring, and enforcement processing).

Of the $\$ 3.3 \mathrm{M}$ in fixed asset (capital) expenditures for ERO Enterprise applications in 2019, approximately $\$ 1.8 \mathrm{M}$ relates to the new CMEP tool. Additional investments include development of separate applications for entity registration ( $\$ 600 \mathrm{k}$ ) and standards data ( $\$ 300 \mathrm{k}$ ), which are planned projects that have been accelerated to 2019 to smoothly integrate with the new CMEP solution. The capital expenditure for the CMEP tool is expected to be approximately $\$ 5.0-6.0 \mathrm{M}$ in total, with work spanning through 2020. Funding for this work will be subject to review and approval as part of the BP\&B process each year. For additional information on the CMEP Technology Project and entity registration and standards solutions, please see the Information Technology section of Section A, as well as Exhibit F - CMEP Technology Project.

## SAFNR

The remaining 2019 capital expenditure of $\$ 600 \mathrm{k}$ for ERO Enterprise applications relates to enhancing the functionality of SAFNR to improve the ability to accurately understand current conditions on the BPS, and to incorporate functionality elements piloted during GridEx IV that will provide the E-ISAC with more timely and understandable common operating picture information. Because the tool benefits both the situation awareness and E-ISAC teams, approximately one-third of the costs for the SAFNR upgrade are budgeted to the E-ISAC with the rest under the Situation Awareness program. This allocation is subject to change as the benefits of the upgrade are realized. The SAFNR upgrade project will undergo the same business case and approval process as other enterprise IT investments. For additional information on

SAFNR, please see the Situation Awareness section of Section A and Exhibit G - Situation Awareness for FERC, NERC, and the Regional Entities (SAFNR).

The 2019 budget assumes that approximately $\$ 3.3 \mathrm{M}$ of the total $\$ 4.6 \mathrm{M}$ capital budget for ERO Enterprise applications will be financed through the capital financing program described and put in place as part of NERC's 2014 Business Plan and Budget. Further information regarding capital financing can be found in Exhibit C - Capital Financing.

## Working Capital and Operating Reserves

Under the company's Working Capital and Operating Reserve Policy, NERC is proposing an overall reserve budget of $\$ 8.6 \mathrm{M}$ for Working Capital (i.e., the amount of funds necessary to satisfy the company's projected cash flow needs during the budget year), the four categories of Operating Reserves, and the Assessment Stabilization Reserve. This represents an increase of $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{M}(14.7 \%)$ from the total reserve amounts included in NERC's 2018 budget. The reserve categories are broken down as follows:

- Future Obligation Reserve - Includes funding that has been received to satisfy future obligations under lease, credit, loan, or other agreements to which the company is a party. This reserve is comprised primarily of existing funds and is budgeted to be \$2.0M for 2019.
- System Operator Certification Reserve - Includes surplus funding from operator certification and testing fees that are above incurred expenses and shall be used solely to support operator testing and certification needs. The 2019 System Operator Certification Reserve is budgeted at $\$ 676 \mathrm{k}$ and comprised primarily of existing funds.
- CRISP Reserve - Represents funds dedicated to support CRISP. These reserves are established pursuant to a CRISP budget agreed to and funded entirely by utilities participating in CRISP. These reserves have no impact on assessments and they are segregated from other reserves pursuant to the terms of the CRISP agreements. The CRISP reserves are projected to be \$500k in the 2019 budget.
- Operating Contingency Reserve - Includes funds for contingencies that were not anticipated, assumed to be likely, or the timing of which was uncertain, at the time of preparation and approval of the company's BP\&B. NERC's current policy on Operating Contingency Reserves requires a reserve target of $3.5-7.0 \%$, except as otherwise approved by the Board after review and recommendation by the Board Finance and Audit Committee (FAC). This percentage is calculated against NERC's total budget for operating and capital expenditures, less those costs related to CRISP and System Operator Certification, each of which has a separate reserve category. For the 2019 budget, management is recommending an Operating Contingency Reserve of approximately $\$ 3.8 \mathrm{M}$, or $5.5 \%$ of total budgeted operating and fixed asset (capital) costs.
- Assessment Stabilization Reserve - To date, this reserve has been funded entirely by previously received penalties and is projected to have a balance of $\$ 2.1 \mathrm{M}$ as of January 1,2019 . For purposes of the company's 2019 BP\&B, NERC is proposing the release of $\$ 550 \mathrm{k}$ of Assessment Stabilization Reserve funds to offset U.S. assessments. Assuming FERC approves the proposal, the remaining balance of $\$ 1.5 \mathrm{M}$ in the Assessment Stabilization Reserve will be used to reduce U.S. assessments in one or more future periods, subject to review and approval by the Board and FERC in the applicable year's BP\&B.


## Department Budget and FTE Comparisons

The following table shows a 2019 versus 2018 total budget comparison by department. The amounts reflect all direct and indirect departmental costs, including fixed asset (capital) costs. Costs incurred for general and administrative and other overheads are considered indirect and are allocated to the statutory departments based on the ratio of that department's budgeted FTEs to total budgeted statutory FTEs.

2019 versus 2018 Total Budget by Department

| Total Budget | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | Change2019 Budget v2018 Budget |  | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reliability Standards* | \$ | 6,821,893 | \$ | 6,736,078 | \$ | $(85,816)$ | -1.3\% |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Programs* |  | 20,465,126 |  | 20,801,651 |  | 336,525 | 1.6\% |
| Reliability Assessments and System Analysis |  | 7,312,956 |  | 8,029,587 |  | 716,631 | 9.8\% |
| Reliability Risk Management* |  | 13,641,560 |  | 14,863,087 |  | 1,221,527 | 9.0\% |
| Training, Education, and Personnel Certification |  | 3,043,024 |  | 2,223,625 |  | $(819,399)$ | -26.9\% |
| NERC Budget, excluding E-ISAC | \$ | 51,284,559 | \$ | 52,654,028 | \$ | 1,369,469 | 2.7\% |
| E-ISAC (non-CRISP) | \$ | 13,130,686 | \$ | 18,351,920 | \$ | 5,221,234 | 39.8\% |
| E-ISAC (CRISP)* |  | 8,719,912 |  | 9,043,707 |  | 323,795 | 3.7\% |
| Total E-ISAC Budget | \$ | 21,850,597 | \$ | 27,395,627 | \$ | 5,545,030 | 25.4\% |
| Total Budget | \$ | 73,135,156 | \$ | 80,049,655 | \$ | 6,914,499 | 9.5\% |

*Includes key technology application costs, including the CMEP Technology Project and complementary solutions for entity registration and standards data, as well as SAFNR, for which funding is shared by Reliability Risk Management and E-ISAC.

The primary areas of increase are in E-ISAC, Reliability Assessments and System Analysis (RASA), and Reliability Risk Management (RRM). The E-ISAC increase reflects additional staff related to the long-term strategy discussed in the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center section of Section A and the attachment to Exhibit E, Expanding E-ISAC Operations to Include 24x7 Onsite Operations. The increase for 2019 due to the implementation of this strategy is approximately $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{M}$; most of the remaining increase is due to the allocation of general and administrative overhead costs based on the additional FTEs. The increases in RASA and RRM are due to reallocations of personnel to these programs from other programs to align with current resource needs, and, for RRM, the capital costs associated with the upgrade to SAFNR (see Exhibit G - Situation Awareness for FERC, NERC, and the Regional Entities (SAFNR).

The capital costs associated with the CMEP Technology Project result in an increase in the CMEP areas, but the total increase for the CMEP is reduced by the elimination or reallocation of FTEs to other program areas, which also results in lower allocations of indirect costs and fixed assets from Administrative Services to these departments. Similarly, the decreases in the Reliability Standards and Training, Education, and Personnel Certification departments is largely the result of the elimination or reallocation of FTEs.

The following table presents a 2019 versus 2018 comparison of budgeted FTEs by department and reflects 2019 personnel additions, interdepartmental transfers of previously budgeted positions, and attrition assumptions. The number of FTEs represents the number of employees employed full time during the year, plus the number of employees employed part time (less than full schedule) or during a portion of the year, converted to a full-time basis. Headcount represents the total number of personnel employed during the year, regardless of the length of their employment or whether they are full-time or part-time employees. FTEs will be less than headcount, unless there are no part-time employees and no employees who are employed less than a full year. The company's 2019 personnel budget is based upon existing headcount and associated compensation and benefit costs, as well as assumptions on the number and cost of new hires and the assumed vacancy rate, all within an overall FTE budget. An average vacancy rate is applied to each position and its associated costs to arrive at an overall personnel cost budget. The vacancy rate represents an adjustment that is applied in the calculation of budgeted personnel costs to account for attrition and for variations from the budget assumptions on the timing of new hires.

## 2019 versus 2018 FTEs by Department

| FTEs* | 2018 <br> Budget | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ | Change 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reliability Standards | 15.51 | 14.57 | (0.94) | -6.1\% |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Programs | 40.89 | 39.01 | (1.88) | -4.6\% |
| Reliability Assessments and System Analysis | 14.10 | 15.04 | 0.94 | 6.7\% |
| Reliability Risk Management | 26.32 | 27.26 | 0.94 | 3.6\% |
| Training, Education, and Personnel Certification | 5.88 | 3.76 | (2.12) | -36.0\% |
| Administrative Programs | 67.45 | 67.68 | 0.23 | 0.3\% |
| NERC FTEs, excluding E-ISAC | 170.14 | 167.32 | (2.82) | -1.7\% |
| E-ISAC (non-CRISP) | 25.38 | 33.84 | 8.46 | 33.3\% |
| E-ISAC (CRISP) | 3.76 | 3.76 | - | 0.0\% |
| Total E-ISAC FTEs | 29.14 | 37.60 | 8.46 | 29.0\% |
| Total FTEs | 199.28 | 204.92 | 5.64 | 2.8\% |

[^8]The Administrative Programs encompass a number of necessary support functions, including Information Technology, Legal and Regulatory, Finance and Accounting, Human Resources, Facilities and Meeting Planning, Communications, External Affairs, and Government Relations staff. It also includes General and Administrative functions, which include the CEO, the Chief Reliability Officer (CRO), and their support staff. For FERC and external reporting purposes, these programs are allocated as indirect expenses to the operating areas on a per FTE basis.

For 2019, NERC is budgeting an increase of 11 positions in support of the long-term strategy for the EISAC, which includes 9 positions in the E-ISAC and 2 in the Administrative Programs area (see the Electricity Information and Analysis Center section of Section A for details). There will also be a decrease of 5 open positions in the remaining NERC departments. This results in an increase of 9 positions (8.46 FTEs) in the E-ISAC, a net decrease of 3 positions ( 2.82 FTEs) in other NERC departments (decrease of 5 positions plus the 2 added support roles for E-ISAC), resulting in a total net increase of 6 positions ( 5.64 FTEs) for NERC in 2019. The table above reflects the elimination of 5 open positions and reallocations of staff among departments. Currently, the proposed position eliminations are in the Compliance Assurance, Training and Education, and RRM areas.

The 2019 organizational chart can be found in Appendix 1. The difference between the number of positions reflected in the organizational chart and total budgeted FTEs is due to assumptions regarding vacancy rates and timing of new hires.

The following table is a statement of activities and fixed asset expenditures comparing the 2018 budget, 2018 projection, and 2019 budget.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 and 2019 Budgets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATUTORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2018 <br> Budget |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Projection } \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance <br> Projection 18 Budget er(Under) |  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | riance <br> Budget <br> 8 Budget <br> (Under) | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { Inc } \\ & 2019 \\ & \text { over } \\ & 2018 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 62,936,968 | \$ | 62,936,968 | \$ |  | \$ | 68,883,995 | \$ | 5,947,027 | 9.5\% |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  |  |  | 550,000 |  | $(50,000)$ |  |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 63,536,968 | \$ | 63,536,968 | \$ | - | \$ | 69,433,995 | \$ | 5,897,027 |  |
| Third-Party Funding (CRISP) | \$ | 7,324,253 | \$ | 7,219,381 | \$ | $(104,872)$ | \$ | 7,486,353 | \$ | 162,101 |  |
| Testing Fees |  | 1,790,000 |  | 1,689,757 |  | $(100,243)$ |  | 1,790,000 |  | - |  |
| Services \& Software |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | - |  | 40,000 |  | $(10,000)$ |  |
| Workshops |  | 185,000 |  | 301,380 |  | 116,380 |  | 195,000 |  | 10,000 |  |
| Interest |  | 95,000 |  | 268,413 |  | 173,413 |  | 185,000 |  | 90,000 |  |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total Funding (A) | \$ | 72,981,221 | \$ | 73,065,900 | \$ | 84,678 | \$ | 79,130,349 | \$ | 6,149,128 | 8.4\% |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 31,791,098 | \$ | 31,931,961 | \$ | 140,863 | \$ | 33,810,276 | \$ | 2,019,179 |  |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 1,949,557 |  | 1,864,208 |  | $(85,349)$ |  | 2,044,880 |  | 95,324 |  |
| Benefits |  | 3,988,886 |  | 4,251,518 |  | 262,632 |  | 4,673,208 |  | 684,322 |  |
| Retirement Costs |  | 3,239,565 |  | 3,084,178 |  | $(155,386)$ |  | 3,423,826 |  | 184,261 |  |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 40,969,105 | \$ | 41,131,865 | \$ | 162,760 | \$ | 43,952,190 | \$ | 2,983,085 | 7.3\% |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 1,071,500 |  | 1,177,447 | \$ | 105,947 | \$ | 1,056,500 | \$ | $(15,000)$ |  |
| Travel |  | 2,204,000 |  | 2,147,202 |  | $(56,798)$ |  | 2,184,000 |  | $(20,000)$ |  |
| Conference Calls |  | 119,600 |  | 159,378 |  | 39,778 |  | 139,900 |  | 20,300 |  |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 3,395,100 | \$ | 3,484,028 | \$ | 88,928 | \$ | 3,380,400 | \$ | $(14,700)$ | -0.4\% |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 13,724,185 | \$ | 14,308,501 | \$ | 584,316 | \$ | 15,043,318 | \$ | 1,319,133 |  |
| Office Rent |  | 3,091,804 |  | 3,087,919 |  | $(3,885)$ |  | 3,335,058 |  | 243,254 |  |
| Office Costs |  | 5,365,084 |  | 5,640,947 |  | 275,863 |  | 6,506,917 |  | 1,141,833 |  |
| Professional Services |  | 2,537,500 |  | 2,453,388 |  | $(84,112)$ |  | 2,757,600 |  | 220,100 |  |
| Miscellaneous |  | 39,500 |  | 39,500 |  | - |  | 82,000 |  | 42,500 |  |
| Depreciation |  | 1,594,299 |  | 3,042,075 |  | 1,447,776 |  | 3,446,022 |  | 1,851,724 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 26,352,371 | \$ | 28,572,330 | \$ | 2,219,959 | \$ | 31,170,916 | \$ | 4,818,544 | 18.3\% |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 70,716,577 | \$ | 73,188,223 | \$ | 2,471,647 | \$ | 78,503,506 | \$ | 7,786,929 | 11.0\% |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | \$ | (0) | \$ | - | \$ | (0) |  |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | 138,878 | \$ | 165,048 | \$ | 26,170 | \$ | 214,171 | \$ | 75,293 | 54.2\% |
| Total Expenses (B) | \$ | 70,855,455 | \$ | 73,353,271 | \$ | 2,497,816 | \$ | 78,717,677 | \$ | 7,862,222 | 11.1\% |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 2,125,766 | \$ | $\underline{(287,372)}$ | \$ | $(2,413,138)$ | \$ | 412,672 | \$ | $(1,713,095)$ |  |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(1,594,299)$ | \$ | $(3,042,075)$ | \$ | $(1,447,776)$ | \$ | $(3,446,022)$ | \$ | $(1,851,724)$ |  |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 2,549,000 |  | 2,549,000 |  | - |  | 3,488,000 |  | 939,000 |  |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | (285,000) |  |
| Equipment CapEx |  | 1,175,000 |  | 565,559 |  | $(609,441)$ |  | 890,000 |  | $(285,000)$ |  |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | - |  | 400,000 |  | 250,000 |  |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 0 |  | (0) |  | (0) |  | (0) |  | (0) |  |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (C) | \$ | 2,279,701 | \$ | 222,484 | \$ | (2,057,218) | \$ | 1,331,978 | \$ | (947,724) | -41.6\% |
| TOTAL BUDGET ( $=\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}$ ) | \$ | 73,135,156 | \$ | 73,575,755 | \$ | 440,599 | \$ | 80,049,655 | \$ | 6,914,499 | 9.5\% |
| TOTAL CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL (=A-B-C)* | \$ | $(153,935)$ | \$ | $(509,855)$ | \$ | $(355,920)$ | \$ | $(919,306)$ | \$ | 1,086,353 |  |
| FTEs |  | 199.28 |  | 187.63 |  | (11.65) |  | 204.92 |  | 5.64 | 2.8\% |

[^9]
## FERC Order 830 - Geomagnetic Disturbance

In FERC's Order No. 830 approving Reliability Standard TPL-007-1 (Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events), ${ }^{21}$ FERC directed NERC to file a research work plan describing how NERC will conduct research into the specific geomagnetic disturbance (GMD)-related topics identified in the order. Since that time, NERC developed a preliminary GMD research work plan containing a set of GMD research activities, which was filed with FERC on May 30, 2017 in accordance with the Order No. 830 directive. The research activities identified in the preliminary plan are expected to advance the understanding of GMD events and the risks these high-impact, low-frequency events pose to the reliability of the BPS. In October 2017, FERC issued an order accepting NERC's preliminary work plan.

NERC developed a research plan ${ }^{22}$ with the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) and filed it with FERC on April 19, 2018 ${ }^{23}$. This $\$ 3.4 \mathrm{M}$ research project is being co-funded by NERC ( $\$ 200 \mathrm{k}$ per year for three years, budgeted in RASA Consultants and Contracts expense) along with more than 20 owners and operators from the electric industry. Further, NERC continues to work with industry to collect information about geomagnetically induced current (GIC) and the potential impacts on power system reliability.

NERC has also worked with the technical committees to develop an ROP Section 1600 Data Request for the collection of GMD data, as directed by FERC in Order 830. The GMD Data Request was presented to and approved by the NERC Board on August 16, 2018. NERC has begun developing requirements for the necessary technology application to collect GMD data from reporting entities. These requirements will be used to determine future funding needs.

NERC continues to conduct outreach with representatives from governmental agencies in the U.S., Europe, and Canada, academia, vendors, and industry to identify the GMD-related work that is currently in progress and determine where opportunities exist for research synergies.

## E-I SAC Long-Term Strategy

Over the past several years the E-ISAC has focused on improving its technical and analytical capabilities with a goal of becoming the electricity industry's leading, trusted source for analysis and sharing of security information. Significant support from the Electricity Subsector Coordinating Council (ESCC), the ESCC Members Executive Committee (MEC) ${ }^{24}$, the DOE, and other stakeholders have helped the E-ISAC provide the industry with unique insights, leadership, and coordination on security matters.

At the request of the NERC Board and under the guidance of the ESCC and MEC, executive leadership of the E-ISAC developed a long-term strategic plan, which is included as Exhibit E-E-ISAC Long-Term Strategy. The long-term strategic plan is to transform the E-ISAC into a world-class intelligence collecting and analytical capability for the electricity industry. The E-ISAC Long-Term Strategy was approved by the MEC on April 24, 2017 and accepted by the Board on May 11, 2017.

To implement this vision, the E-ISAC is planning a deliberate growth strategy over the next four years that increases both staff and technical resources. Based on industry and stakeholder feedback, the 2019 BP\&B includes the second year's recommended additions related to this strategy, primarily related to analytical capabilities, as further described in the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center section of Section A and the attachment to Exhibit E, Expanding E-ISAC Operations to Include 24x7 Onsite Operations.

[^10]
## Projections for 2020-2021

NERC has developed preliminary operating and fixed asset (capital) projections for 2020 and 2021. Significant assumptions in these projections include:

- No increase in total FTEs over the 2019 budget (except for impacts of the long-term E-ISAC strategy discussed below).
- Personnel and benefit cost increases are consistent with 2019 assumptions.
- Debt service repayment obligations in connection with the company's Capital Financing Program are consistent with the projected Enterprise IT Applications capital forecast. The Capital Financing Program is the primary funding source for the CMEP Technology Project, which is expected to continue through 2020 (see Exhibit F - CMEP Technology Project for more details).
- E-ISAC budget increases in 2020 and 2021 will represent the vast majority of projected increases in the total NERC budget. The current budget projections for E-ISAC, including CRISP, for 2020 and 2021 are $\$ 29.8$ and $\$ 33.5$ million, respectively. These projected budget increases will be funded in part by the CRISP participating utilities and are primarily driven by planned headcount additions and strategic program initiatives.

Currently, NERC projects a total budget increase versus the prior year of $9.5 \%$ in 2019, 3.2\% in 2020, and $3.5 \%$ in 2021. Assessments are budgeted to increase $9.5 \%$ in 2019, and projected to increase $6.5 \%$ in 2020 and $5.4 \%$ in 2021, before the impact of any release of Assessment Stabilization Reserve funds. The assessment increase for 2019 includes the proposed release of $\$ 550 \mathrm{k}$ from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve to achieve a matching budget and assessment increase of $9.5 \%$. The budget and assessment increases for 2020 and 2021 are projections that will be refined as those budgets are finalized.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2019 Budget \& Projected 2020 and 2021 Budgets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Projection } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \$ Change } \\ & 20 \text { v } 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Change } \\ & 20 \text { v } 19 \end{aligned}$ | 2021 <br> Projection |  | \$ Change$21 \text { v } 20$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Change } \\ & 21 \text { v } 20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 68,883,995 | \$ | 73,392,456 | \$ | 4,508,461 | 6.5\% | \$ | 77,383,032 | \$ | 3,990,576 | 5.4\% |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 550,000 |  | - |  | $(550,000)$ | 0.0\% |  | - |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 69,433,995 | \$ | 73,392,456 | \$ | 3,958,461 | 5.7\% | \$ | 77,383,032 | \$ | 3,990,576 | 5.4\% |
| Third-Party Funding (CRISP) | \$ | 7,486,353 | \$ | 7,544,926 | \$ | 58,573 | 0.8\% | \$ | 7,551,401 | \$ | 6,475 | 0.1\% |
| Testing Fees |  | 1,790,000 |  | 1,790,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 1,790,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Services \& Software |  | 40,000 |  | 40,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 40,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Workshops |  | 195,000 |  | 275,000 |  | 80,000 | 41.0\% |  | 275,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Interest |  | 185,000 |  | 185,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 185,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - | 0.0\% |  | - |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Total Funding (A) | \$ | 79,130,349 | \$ | 83,227,382 | \$ | 4,097,034 | 5.2\% | \$ | 87,224,433 | \$ | 3,997,051 | 4.8\% |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 33,810,276 | \$ | 35,491,859 | \$ | 1,681,583 | 5.0\% | \$ | 37,710,982 | \$ | 2,219,123 | 6.3\% |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 2,044,880 |  | 2,118,363 |  | 73,483 | 3.6\% |  | 2,227,488 |  | 109,125 | 5.2\% |
| Benefits |  | 4,673,208 |  | 5,047,742 |  | 374,534 | 8.0\% |  | 5,412,135 |  | 364,393 | 7.2\% |
| Retirement Costs |  | 3,423,826 |  | 3,601,527 |  | 177,701 | 5.2\% |  | 3,833,952 |  | 232,425 | 6.5\% |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 43,952,190 | \$ | 46,259,491 | \$ | 2,307,301 | 5.2\% | \$ | 49,184,557 | \$ | 2,925,066 | 6.3\% |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 1,056,500 | \$ | 1,146,500 | \$ | 90,000 | 8.5\% | \$ | 1,146,500 | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
| Travel |  | 2,184,000 |  | 2,184,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 2,184,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Conference Calls |  | 139,900 |  | 139,900 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 139,900 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 3,380,400 | \$ | 3,470,400 | \$ | 90,000 | 2.7\% | \$ | 3,470,400 | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 15,043,318 | \$ | 15,377,948 | \$ | 334,630 | 2.2\% | \$ | 15,732,644 | \$ | 354,696 | 2.3\% |
| Office Rent |  | 3,335,058 |  | 3,455,058 |  | 120,000 | 3.6\% |  | 3,575,058 |  | 120,000 | 3.5\% |
| Office Costs |  | 6,506,917 |  | 6,890,037 |  | 383,120 | 5.9\% |  | 7,146,610 |  | 256,573 | 3.7\% |
| Professional Services |  | 2,757,600 |  | 2,742,061 |  | $(15,539)$ | -0.6\% |  | 2,725,395 |  | $(16,666)$ | -0.6\% |
| Miscellaneous |  | 82,000 |  | 59,500 |  | $(22,500)$ | -27.4\% |  | 59,500 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Depreciation |  | 3,446,022 |  | 3,506,873 |  | 60,851 | 1.8\% |  | 4,024,750 |  | 517,877 | 14.8\% |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 31,170,916 | \$ | 32,031,478 | \$ | 860,562 | 2.8\% | \$ | 33,263,958 | \$ | 1,232,480 | 3.8\% |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 78,503,506 | \$ | 81,761,369 | \$ | 3,257,863 | 4.1\% | \$ | 85,918,914 | \$ | 4,157,546 | 5.1\% |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 0 | \$ | 0 | 0.0\% | \$ | 0 | \$ | (0) | 0.0\% |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | 214,171 | \$ | 297,203 | \$ | 83,032 | 38.8\% | \$ | 290,127 | \$ | $(7,076)$ | -2.4\% |
| Total Expenses (B) | \$ | 78,717,677 | \$ | 82,058,572 | \$ | 3,340,895 | 4.2\% | \$ | 86,209,041 | \$ | 4,150,470 | 5.1\% |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 412,672 | \$ | 1,168,810 | \$ | 756,139 | 183.2\% | \$ | 1,015,392 | \$ | $(153,419)$ | -13.1\% |

## Fixed Assets

Depreciation
Computer \& Software CapEx
Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx
Equipment CapEx
Leasehold Improvements
Allocation of Fixed Assets
$\operatorname{Inc}(\operatorname{Dec})$ in Fixed Assets (C) TOTAL BUDGET (=B+C)

FTEs

| \$ | $(3,446,022)$ | \$ | $(3,506,873)$ | \$ | $(60,851)$ | 1.8\% | \$ | $(4,024,750)$ | \$ | $(517,877)$ | 14.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3,488,000 |  | 2,408,000 |  | $(1,080,000)$ | -31.0\% |  | 1,701,000 |  | $(707,000)$ | -29.4\% |
|  | - |  | - |  | - | 0.0\% |  | - |  | - | 0.0\% |
|  | 890,000 |  | 1,530,000 |  | 640,000 | 71.9\% |  | 1,530,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
|  | 400,000 |  | 100,000 |  | $(300,000)$ | -75.0\% |  | 100,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
|  | (0) |  | (0) |  | 0 | 0.0\% |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0\% |
| \$ | 1,331,978 | \$ | 531,127 | \$ | $(800,851)$ | -60.1\% | \$ | $(693,750)$ | \$ | (1,224,877) | -230.6\% |
| \$ | 80,049,655 | \$ | 82,589,698 | \$ | 2,540,044 | 3.2\% | \$ | 85,515,291 | \$ | 2,925,593 | 3.5\% |
|  | 204.92 |  | 211.50 |  | 6.58 | 3.2\% |  | 219.96 |  | 8.46 | 4.0\% |

# Section A - 2019 Business Plan and Budget Program Area and Department Detail 

## Reliability Standards

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Reliability Standards Program } \\ \text { (in whole dollars) }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Increase <br>

(Decrease)\end{array}\right]\)

## Background and Scope

The Reliability Standards program carries out the ERO's statutory responsibility to develop, adopt, obtain approval of, and modify (as and when appropriate) mandatory NERC Reliability Standards (both continentwide standards and regional reliability standards) to assure the BES is planned, operated, maintained, and secured to minimize risks of cascading failures, avoid damage to major equipment, or limit interruptions of the BPS. The major activities undertaken by the Standards department include:

- Delivering high-quality, continent-wide reliability standards: NERC standard developers and other standards staff provide project management and leadership to develop solutions necessary to address reliability risks identified through the Reliability Risk Management Process (RRMP). These may include the development of, or modifications to, Reliability Standards through standard development outreach activities, facilitation of drafting team activities, drafting support, assisting drafting teams in maintaining adherence to the development process as outlined in the Standard Processes Manual, and ensuring that the quality of documents produced is appropriate for approval by industry and the Board. Compliance Assurance continues to work closely with the standard development program to provide compliance information, statistics, technical input, and perspectives to drafting teams to clarify compliance risks.
- Facilitating continent-wide industry engagement: NERC manages the work of over 200 industry contributors who serve on the Standards Committee, subgroups, and other project teams for the development of Reliability Standards through the standards development program.
- Conducting balloting, disseminating information, and supporting regulatory filings: Through NERC's commenting and ANSI-accredited balloting process, industry consensus is built by engaging thousands of industry volunteers within hundreds of registered entities throughout North America who review, comment on, and approve the standards created by the standard drafting teams. The department also supports the filing of standards with applicable regulatory authorities and provides support with regulatory proceedings.

The Reliability Standards program provides a mechanism for the Regional Entities to process regional standards when unique regional reliability gaps are detected, or incorporate regional variances into continent-wide standards. The NERC Standards department staff supports regional standards development processes by providing technical advice, final quality review of regional standards, presentation to the Board, and preparation of regional standards materials for submission for standard adoption to the applicable regulatory authorities in the U.S. and Canada.

## Stakeholder Engagement and Cost Effectiveness Project

As part of the standard development process, industry technical experts scope, draft, and review the new or revised Reliability Standards for approval by the industry ballot body, adoption by the Board, and filing with regulatory authorities in the U.S. and Canada. Additionally, federal, state and provincial regulatory authorities, the Board, Regional Entities, and many industry stakeholders have expressed interest in the identification of costs incurred from implementing Reliability Standards compared to risks they address. The objective is to ensure that these elements are considered during the standards development and revision process. A process has been established that ensures that industry feedback on costs is taken into account throughout the standard development process.

## Key Efforts Underway

NERC ensures that the Reliability Standards Development Plan (RSDP) is effectively executed and that Reliability Standards are focused on and mitigate significant risks to BES reliability. Department resources are focused on supporting the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, including but not limited to support of the RRMP and resolving FERC directives. Standards department key activities include:

- Focus on the selection of projects undertaken. Resources are expended on issues determined to be a reliability risk through the RRMP (also see the Reliability Assessment and System Analysis section and the Performance Analysis section below for additional detail). The department applies broad project management skills to implement a variety of solutions to a reliability concern. An effective solution to an identified reliability risk may be a Reliability Standard, or it may be a guideline, information request, training, NERC Alert, technical conference, research, or a combination of these or other tools.
- Address FERC directives and respond to FERC orders through standard development projects, as necessary. Each project determines whether: (1) the directive will be complied with as issued, (2) there is an equally effective and efficient way to address the concern that fostered the directive, or (3) there is technical justification (including that the directive has been overcome by events, processes, or advances in technology) that resolution of the directive is no longer needed.
- Perform a comprehensive review of standards. In 2018, NERC and industry will complete a comprehensive review of the Reliability Standards to measure their effectiveness and ability to mitigate the risks to the reliability and security of the BPS, compared to the industry burden for their implementation. An outcome of this review will inform the need to retire or enhance requirements based on operational experience. This will include an analysis of reliability risk, particularly emerging risks, and cost effectiveness. In 2019, projects will be initiated to address the results of this review to retire or modify Reliability Standards.
- Facilitate smooth transition to new standards. This includes working with the Compliance Assurance, Enforcement, Registration, Reliability Assurance, Reliability Assessment and System Analysis, and Performance Analysis groups to develop guidelines, webinars, and other activities to support auditor and industry training for the new standards.

The 2019-2021 RSDP will be developed in 2018 in conjunction with the Standards Committee, RISC, and RRMP. It will outline the work plan for the continued evaluation of Reliability Standards, the Standards department's support of Reliability Risk Management, and resolution of FERC directives. Additionally, standards grading metrics will be used to measure the overall quality of each enforceable Reliability Standard as a basis for measuring needed improvements.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

In 2018, the body of Reliability Standards will be reviewed for potential improvements while considering quality and content criteria, as well as results-based standards principles. In 2019, industry and NERC will determine whether there is a need to make further improvements to the standards through periodic reviews that include: (1) a measured review of the content of standards, considering whether the requirements could more effectively mitigate risks to the BPS, (2) whether the standards are results-based and drafted with high quality, (3) whether the standards are concise or if the number of requirements could be reduced, and (4) whether compliance expectations are clear. Also in 2019, Standards staff will continue to support the operating plan through the key activities discussed above by addressing potential improvements, any new directives issued by FERC, as well any reliability risks identified through RRMP or by the RISC for which a Reliability Standard is part of the solution.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The 0.94 reduction in FTEs results from the reallocation of one position ( 0.94 FTEs) to realign staff with current needs.

## Consultants and Contracts

No consultant or contract expenses were budgeted in 2018. Budgeted consultant and contract expenses are $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ for 2019 for standards development support. A detailed breakdown of 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contractor Costs.

## Other Costs

The $\$ 300 \mathrm{k}$ increase in computer and software capital expenditures is for a standards database solution that will integrate with the new CMEP tool.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RELIABILITY STANDARDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $2018$ <br> rojection |  | riance <br> Projection <br> 8 Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> (Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 6,689,437 | \$ | 6,689,437 | \$ | - | \$ | 6,598,401 | \$ | $(91,036)$ |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 71,739 |  | 71,739 |  | - |  | 58,793 |  | $(12,946)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 6,761,176 | \$ | 6,761,176 | \$ | - | \$ | 6,657,194 | \$ | $(103,982)$ |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | - |  | 60,000 |  | 10,000 |
| Interest |  | 10,717 |  | 24,323 |  | 13,605 |  | 18,884 |  | 8,166 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 6,821,893 | \$ | 6,835,499 | \$ | 13,605 | \$ | 6,736,078 | \$ | $(85,816)$ |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 2,207,431 | \$ | 1,879,225 | \$ | $(328,205)$ | \$ | 2,031,580 | \$ | $(175,850)$ |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 145,638 |  | 118,136 |  | $(27,502)$ |  | 134,348 |  | $(11,290)$ |
| Benefits |  | 299,194 |  | 261,710 |  | $(37,484)$ |  | 297,782 |  | $(1,412)$ |
| Retirement Costs |  | 246,107 |  | 220,557 |  | $(25,550)$ |  | 224,171 |  | $(21,936)$ |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 2,898,370 | \$ | 2,479,629 | \$ | $(418,741)$ | \$ | 2,687,881 | \$ | $(210,489)$ |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 105,000 | \$ | 105,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 105,000 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 240,000 |  | 238,050 |  | $(1,950)$ |  | 220,000 |  | $(20,000)$ |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 3,369 |  | 3,369 |  | 18,000 |  | 18,000 |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 345,000 | \$ | 346,419 | \$ | 1,419 | \$ | 343,000 | \$ | $(2,000)$ |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | - | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | 100,000 | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 50,000 |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 49,796 |  | 26,281 |  | $(23,515)$ |  | 38,200 |  | $(11,596)$ |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 39,278 |  | 173,799 |  | 134,521 |  | 257,774 |  | 218,496 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 89,574 | \$ | 300,580 | \$ | 211,006 | \$ | 346,474 | \$ | 256,900 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 3,332,944 | \$ | 3,126,629 | \$ | $(206,315)$ | \$ | 3,377,356 | \$ | 44,412 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 3,470,011 | \$ | 3,553,026 | \$ | 83,015 | \$ | 3,446,152 | \$ | $(23,859)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 6,802,955 | \$ | 6,679,655 | \$ | $(123,300)$ | \$ | 6,823,508 | \$ | 20,553 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 18,939 | \$ | 155,844 | \$ | 136,905 | \$ | $(87,430)$ | \$ | $(106,369)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(39,278)$ | \$ | $(173,799)$ | \$ | $(134,521)$ | \$ | $(257,774)$ | \$ | $(218,496)$ |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 300,000 |  | 300,000 |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 58,217 |  | $(133,048)$ |  | $(191,264)$ |  | $(129,656)$ |  | $(187,872)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 18,939 | \$ | $(306,847)$ | \$ | $(325,785)$ | \$ | $(87,430)$ | \$ | $(106,369)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET (=A+B) | \$ | 6,821,893 | \$ | 6,372,808 | \$ | $(449,085)$ | \$ | 6,736,078 | \$ | $(85,816)$ |
| FTEs |  | 15.51 |  | 13.38 |  | (2.13) |  | 14.57 |  | (0.94) |

## Compliance Assurance, Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, and Compliance Enforcement

The Compliance Assurance, Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, and Compliance Enforcement program areas promote a culture of reliability excellence through risk-informed compliance monitoring, mitigation, enforcement, and registration.

## Compliance Assurance

| Compliance Assurance <br> (in whole dollars)   <br>    <br> 2018 Budget 2019 Budget Increase <br> (Decrease)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total FTEs <br> Direct Expenses <br> Indirect Expenses <br> Other Non-Operating Expenses <br> Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets <br> TOTAL BUDGET |  | 19.27 |  | 16.45 |  | (2.82) |
|  | \$ | 4,520,550 | \$ | 4,294,505 | \$ | $(226,044)$ |
|  |  | 4,311,226 |  | 3,890,817 |  | $(420,409)$ |
|  |  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  |  | 72,330 |  | 737,614 |  | 665,285 |
|  | \$ | 8,904,105 | \$ | 8,922,937 | \$ | 18,832 |

## Background and Scope

NERC's Compliance Assurance group works collaboratively with the Regional Entities to ensure effective implementation of risk-based compliance monitoring under the CMEP across the entire ERO Enterprise. This program ensures that Regional Entities monitor registered entities for compliance according to their own specific facts and circumstances, including the entity's inherent risks, evaluation of controls in place to mitigate the inherent risks, and other factors, such as risk elements and entity performance. Additionally, the risk-based compliance monitoring approach allows for the appropriate allocation of resources to the issues that pose a higher level of risk to the reliability of the BPS.

The CMEP provides for Regional Entities to develop customized compliance oversight plans (COPs) for each registered entity that identifies: (1) the standards or requirements to be monitored; (2) the monitoring processes (tools) for use by the Regional Entities, including compliance audits, selfcertification, and spot checking; and (3) the interval of monitoring. NERC and the Regional Entities ensure that inherent risk assessments (IRAs) for registered entities begin with a consistent framework and that Regional Entities' implementation of the CMEP coalesce around effective and efficient practices, ensuring comprehensive data management procedures that address data reporting requirements, integrity, retention, security, and confidentiality.

The Compliance Assurance group's responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following major activities and functions:

- Oversight of the Regional Entities' implementation of the risk-based compliance monitoring program and NERC ROP in North America;
- Development and execution of the annual CMEP Implementation Plan (IP);
- Oversight of the use of necessary compliance-related processes, procedures, IT platforms, tools, and templates;
- Development and delivery of education and training for ERO Enterprise staff;
- Training and outreach activities for the Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Reliability Standards and subsequent enhancements to support industry compliance and security;
- Coordination with the NERC Standards department to assist in the smooth transition for standards from development to enforceability and feedback on risks seen in the field that are not addressed by a standard, as well as information on where a standard is too broad; and
- Support for Regional Entity and industry committees, working groups, and task forces, such as the ERO Compliance Monitoring Group, NERC Compliance and Certification Committee (CCC) and NERC Critical Infrastructure Protection Committee (CIPC).


## Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit

NERC continues to promote the Regional Entities' development of customized COPs for registered entities. As the risk-based compliance monitoring approach was implemented in 2015 and 2016, Regional Entities worked closely with stakeholders to develop IRAs and appropriately scope compliance monitoring activities. As this process continues to mature, Regional Entities will continue to customize compliance monitoring tools and frequency of monitoring for each registered entity, based on its IRA as well as additional considerations such as risk elements, entity performance, internal controls, and mitigating activities to inform the development of their COPs.

Compliance Assurance continues to work closely with the standard development program to provide compliance information, statistics, technical input, and perspectives to drafting teams to provide an increased reliability benefit and clarify compliance risks. This collaboration with industry and the Standards department occurs early in the standard development process by providing draft compliance monitoring insights, including information on how compliance with draft standards will be determined, as well as input to the drafting teams on the auditability and enforceability of the draft standards. This collaboration ensures that ERO Enterprise tools used in the auditing process, such as the reliability standards auditing worksheet (RSAW), do not expand or modify standards requirements.

NERC also continues to provide industry-focused outreach events and webinars on the ERO Enterprise's approaches to risk-based CMEP activities. ERO Enterprise staff will continue its webinar series providing views on standards and requirements associated with the 2019 risk elements identified for consideration for compliance monitoring.

## Key Efforts Underway

## NERC Oversight of Risk-Based Compliance Monitoring

Consistent with the goals and objectives set forth in the operating plan, NERC continues to implement risk-based compliance monitoring as part of its stated objectives of ensuring BPS reliability, improving consistency, effectiveness, and efficiency of ERO Enterprise compliance operations, focusing on identified risks, and reducing unnecessary burdens on registered entities. Ensuring the successful implementation of NERC's risk-based CMEP remains the priority of Compliance Assurance's oversight plan for the Regional Entities. As part of that oversight, and in addition to offering regular feedback to the Regional Entities, NERC continues to identify areas for improvement or promoting consistency through training, guidance, or adjustments during the following year. NERC also produces an ERO Enterprise CMEP annual report, which includes an assessment of the risk-based CMEP implementation.

NERC performs oversight of the Regional Entities' compliance monitoring programs primarily through the review of processes, supporting evidence, observations, and other information provided by the Regional Entities over the course of focused program area engagements that are scheduled throughout the year. NERC communicates the recommendations and findings to the Regional Entities to help the ERO

Enterprise develop responsive strategies and solutions to potential issues and ensure uniform and consistent implementation of the CMEP. Such recommendations and findings also help identify priority areas for training of ERO Enterprise staff during the year.

## CIP Compliance

NERC and the Regional Entities continue to manage the smooth implementation of compliance activities for CIP Version 5 Reliability and Physical Security Standards, along with their subsequent enhancements by providing training, webinars, and other forms of outreach. The ERO Enterprise continues to provide educational programs to support industry compliance and the integration of risk assessment and internal controls.

## CMEP Technology Project

Beginning in 2017 through 2020, NERC, in collaboration with the Regional Entities, will develop and implement a common CMEP tool, including the various processes and activities (e.g., analysis of risk, development of implementation plans and audit schedules, actual compliance monitoring, and enforcement processing). For more information on the CMEP Technology Project, see Exhibit F - CMEP Technology Project.

## Regional Entity Training

NERC Compliance Assurance provides training to Regional Entity staff on the most important elements of risk-based compliance monitoring, including enhancements to registered entity IRAs, internal controls reviews, COP development, as well as Reliability Standards monitoring. NERC develops this training based on observations from its oversight activities of the Regional Entities, as well as the process reviews described above.

## Emerging Technology Roundtables

Compliance Assurance periodically hosts an Emerging Technology Roundtable with industry and vendors that includes in-depth discussions around the integration of emerging technologies associated with BPS operations to address and mitigate cyber and physical security risks of the BPS.

## Compliance Enforcement Authority for Southwest Power Pool Regional Transmission Organization

As a result of the Southwest Power Pool Regional Entity (SPP RE) dissolution process, in early 2018 the Board approved, and FERC subsequently approved, ${ }^{25}$ that NERC assume the Compliance Enforcement Authority (CEA) activities for the registered entity SPP Regional Transmission Organization (RTO) for two years. This is the role that is generally delegated by NERC to a Regional Entity. Essentially the CEA is responsible for planning and conducting all CMEP activities as described in the ROP and other guiding documents. NERC will leverage existing internal and Regional Entity resources and expertise to undertake the CEA activities with respect to the SPP RTO.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

The Compliance Assurance group has several goals and deliverables that support the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan. Resources will be focused on improvements implemented as a result of the risk-based compliance monitoring activities in 2017 and 2018. Specific 2019 objectives for this group are:

- Continue to mature the risk-based compliance monitoring program, providing ongoing oversight of the risk-based CMEP, including IRAs, consideration of internal controls, coordinated oversight of Multi-Region Registered Entities (MRREs), and ensuring that COPs are addressing the relevant risks.

[^11]- Work closely with NERC's Enforcement and IT departments, as well as staff in the Regional Entities, to develop application business requirements and test business functionality for the ERO Enterprise CMEP tool.
- Support the continued successful implementation of the CIP Version 5 Reliability Standards and subsequent enhancements as they become effective.
- Monitor and support effective implementation of the physical security Reliability Standard.
- Enhance and implement training to support monitoring of Reliability Standards, integrating principles from the Compliance Monitoring Competency Guide.
- Continue feedback to Standards through integration and coordination between the standards and compliance functions for clear stakeholder implementation and feedback on risks seen in the field that are not addressed by a standard, as well as information on where a standard is too broad. This effort will be supported through a common set of RSAWs, guidance, and outreach.
- Support international CMEP activities, including reliability and security subject matter expertise and outreach.
- Provide support and leadership to the CIPC and CCC as well as their subcommittees, working groups, and task forces. Support the CIPC and CCC leadership and development and implementation of annual work plans.
- Develop and implement the NERC CEA program for SPP RTO.

These 2019 activities are necessary to further implement risk-based compliance monitoring, including the CIP standards, and integrate the standards and compliance functions. A number of activities that support the implementation of the strategic risk-based reforms are intended to reduce regulatory burden by focusing compliance monitoring according to each registered entity's potential impact on the BPS.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The increase in Compliance Assurance personnel in prior years through the reallocation of resources from other departments to Compliance Assurance was the result of NERC's plan to strengthen the implementation and oversight of the risk-based CMEP, increase risk analysis capabilities and technical expertise, and support feedback loops that improve program oversight and the development and implementation of Reliability Standards. Due to the maturation of these areas, three open positions (2.82 FTEs) are being eliminated from the Compliance Assurance department.

## Consultants and Contracts

Funds budgeted for consultant and contract expenses to assist in successful implementation of risk-based compliance monitoring remains unchanged at $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$. A detailed breakdown of the 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contractor Costs.

## Other Costs

The $\$ 884 \mathrm{k}$ increase in computer and software capital expenditures is attributed to the CMEP Technology Project, for which the total capital expenditure of approximately $\$ 1.8 \mathrm{M}$ is split evenly between Compliance Assurance and Compliance Enforcement. The $\$ 204 \mathrm{k}$ increase in office costs is primarily for license and hosting fees for the new CMEP tool.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | 2018 <br> Projection |  | riance <br> Projection <br> 8 Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 8,801,659 | \$ | 8,801,659 | \$ | - | \$ | 8,835,237 | \$ | 33,578 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 89,130 |  | 89,130 |  | - |  | 66,379 |  | $(22,751)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 8,890,790 | \$ | 8,890,790 | \$ | - | \$ | 8,901,616 | \$ | 10,827 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | 13,316 |  | 36,881 |  | 23,565 |  | 21,320 |  | 8,005 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 8,904,105 | \$ | 8,927,671 | \$ | 23,565 | \$ | 8,922,937 | \$ | 18,832 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 2,936,161 | \$ | 2,744,850 | \$ | $(191,311)$ | \$ | 2,526,754 | \$ | $(409,407)$ |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 192,067 |  | 190,220 |  | $(1,847)$ |  | 166,873 |  | $(25,194)$ |
| Benefits |  | 398,424 |  | 443,766 |  | 45,342 |  | 441,671 |  | 43,247 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 324,835 |  | 292,832 |  | $(32,003)$ |  | 278,308 |  | $(46,527)$ |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 3,851,487 | \$ | 3,671,667 | \$ | $(179,819)$ | \$ | 3,413,605 | \$ | $(437,881)$ |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 200,000 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 375,000 |  | 327,197 |  | $(47,803)$ |  | 375,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 12,506 |  | 12,506 |  | 8,000 |  | 8,000 |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 575,000 | \$ | 539,703 | \$ | $(35,297)$ | \$ | 583,000 | \$ | 8,000 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 93,750 | \$ | 43,750 | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | - |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 43,563 |  | 140,469 |  | 96,906 |  | 247,400 |  | 203,837 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 94,063 | \$ | 234,719 | \$ | 140,656 | \$ | 297,900 | \$ | 203,837 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 4,520,550 | \$ | 4,446,089 | \$ | $(74,461)$ | \$ | 4,294,505 | \$ | $(226,044)$ |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 4,311,226 | \$ | 4,635,061 | \$ | 323,835 | \$ | 3,890,817 | \$ | $(420,409)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 8,831,775 | \$ | 9,081,149 | \$ | 249,374 | \$ | 8,185,322 | \$ | $(646,453)$ |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 72,330 | \$ | $(153,479)$ | \$ | $(225,809)$ | \$ | 737,614 | \$ | 665,285 |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 884,000 |  | 884,000 |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 72,330 |  | $(173,566)$ |  | $(245,896)$ |  | $(146,386)$ |  | $(218,715)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 72,330 | \$ | $(173,566)$ | \$ | $(245,896)$ | \$ | 737,614 | \$ | 665,285 |
| TOTAL BUDGET (=A+B) | \$ | 8,904,105 | \$ | 8,907,583 | \$ | 3,478 | \$ | 8,922,937 | \$ | 18,832 |
| FTEs |  | 19.27 |  | 17.82 |  | (1.45) |  | 16.45 |  | (2.82) |

# Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification 

| Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | Increase <br> (Decrease) |  |
| Total FTEs |  | 9.40 |  | 9.40 |  | - |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 2,148,762 | \$ | 2,393,481 | \$ | 244,718 |
| Indirect Expenses |  | 2,103,037 |  | 2,223,324 |  | 120,287 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets |  | 635,283 |  | 404,674 |  | $(230,608)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$ | 4,887,082 | \$ | 5,021,479 | \$ | 134,397 |

## Background and Scope

The Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration, and Organization Certification functions are fulfilled by two groups at NERC: Registration and Reliability Assurance (includes Compliance Analysis and Organization Certification). The groups are responsible for a range of requirements and activities embodied in Section 500 (Organization Registration and Certification) and Appendices 5A and 5B of the NERC ROP. The groups provide technical resource support to the standards development, compliance monitoring, and enforcement functions. The following specific activities are conducted:

- Registration - Identify and register BES users, owners, and operators that are responsible for compliance with Reliability Standards. Organizations that are registered are included on the NERC Compliance Registry (NCR) and responsible for knowing the content of and complying with all applicable Reliability Standards. Maintain the current registry for the entire ERO as entities take on and drop functional responsibilities.
- Certification - Evaluate and certify the competency of reliability entities, i.e., RCs, BAs, and TOPs. Entities performing these functions must be evaluated for having the necessary personnel, knowledge, facilities, programs, and other qualifications to carry out these important responsibilities. For example, they must demonstrate the ability to meet the requirements and sub-requirements of all of the Reliability Standards applicable to the reliability function(s). This also includes confirming through the certification review process that a reliability entity continues to have the capabilities mentioned above following planned and unplanned material changes to that entity's operation.
- Reliability assurance - Conduct activities to reasonably assure the ERO that certain actions have been taken as reported in response to NERC Alerts or guidance to industry.
- Oversight - Provide oversight of Regional Entity implementation of regional registration, compliance, certification, investigation, complaint programs, and processes.
- Investigations - Conduct non-public, confidential investigations to identify possible violations of NERC Reliability Standards in response to complaints, BES disturbances, or other similar triggers. Registration and Reliability Assurance staff participate on all Regional Entity-led investigations and as observers as requested on FERC-led reliability investigations and inquiries.
- Compliance evaluations - Work closely with Regional Entity staff to confirm that qualified events and disturbances are evaluated against the relevant approved Reliability Standards and ensure formal compliance monitoring occurs if indicated. These analyses are shared with FERC staff.
- Complaints - Address formal complaints that allege the violation of Reliability Standards, through a confidential process.


## Key Efforts Underway

Registration continues to implement areas for improvements identified in 2016. These areas included:

- Conducting NERC-led Review Panels on registration requests and identifying process improvements;
- NERC ROP changes;
- Reviewing the Coordinated Functional Registration (CFR) process and model efficiencies;
- Supporting the entity registration xRM database (centralized entity registration system) initiative (for more information on entity registration solution, see the Information Technology section of Section A);
- Conducting a thorough review of the NERC website for any registration-related modifications;
- Continuing Regional Entity oversight activities.

Additionally, on July 27, 2017, NERC issued a letter to entities registered in the SPP RE footprint that NERC and SPP had mutually agreed to terminate the delegation agreement between NERC and SPP RE. NERC Registration is leading this effort to transition these entities to other Regional Entities, which requires an extensive amount of time and resources. Work will continue throughout the majority of 2018 and into 2019.

NERC Reliability Assurance, in conjunction with Regional Entities, performed a review of the Certification program in 2016 regarding its effectiveness in determining an entity's ability to become certified and then operational, and to begin incorporating changes to the program, if applicable, based on the outcomes of the review. The team concluded that the certification process is necessary and is effective in determining an entity's ability to become certified and operational. The team recommended two improvements to the existing certification process which are continuing to be addressed:

- Clearly establish the focus of certification on evaluation of an entity's capability to perform the reliability function of TOP, BA, and/or RC through the use of standardized templates to be used by each Regional Entity's certification team.
- Conduct an evaluation of the certification review process to determine effectiveness of the current triggers of the certification review and execution of the actual process, and implement any needed ROP changes.
- Continue Regional Entity oversight activities.


## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

The Registration and Reliability Assurance groups have several goals and deliverables that support the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan. Resources will be focused on building upon the improvements identified in 2016 as well as the SPP RE transition. Specific 2019 objectives for these groups are:

- Continue to conduct NERC-led Review Panels on registration requests.
- Continue to implement Registration program improvements and conduct any additional actions identified by the project.
- Begin the entity registration xRM database initiative (centralized entity registration system).
- Continue to manage the SPP RE transition.
- Monitor and support changing footprints, functional relationships, and model changes in the Western Interconnection, especially with regard to the RC role.
- Ensure proper oversight of the Regional Entities for the Certification program.
- Respond to industry changes requiring certification review, with particular emphasis on control center relocations, Energy Management System (EMS) replacements, and RC, BA, and TOP footprint changes.
- Evaluate BES disturbances and events for potential gaps in compliance monitoring or Reliability Standards.
- Support the ongoing joint FERC, NERC, and Regional Entity restoration and recovery initiatives in conjunction with industry.


## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

There is no change in FTEs for 2019 from the 2018 budget.

## Consultants and Contracts

No consultant or contract expenses are budgeted in 2019, which is consistent with the 2018 budget.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS, ORGANIZATION REGISTRATION and CERTIFICATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Projection } \end{gathered}$ |  | iance <br> rojection <br> Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 4,837,109 | \$ | 4,837,109 | \$ | - | \$ | 4,971,365 | \$ | 134,257 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 43,478 |  | 43,478 |  | - |  | 37,931 |  | $(5,547)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 4,880,587 | \$ | 4,880,587 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,009,296 | \$ | 128,709 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | 6,495 |  | 18,468 |  | 11,973 |  | 12,183 |  | 5,688 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 4,887,082 | \$ | 4,899,055 | \$ | 11,973 | \$ | 5,021,479 | \$ | 134,397 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 1,514,712 | \$ | 1,588,447 | \$ | 73,735 | \$ | 1,596,696 | \$ | 81,983 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 95,616 |  | 94,753 |  | (863) |  | 98,909 |  | 3,293 |
| Benefits |  | 194,709 |  | 221,082 |  | 26,373 |  | 232,391 |  | 37,682 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 168,791 |  | 178,168 |  | 9,377 |  | 178,558 |  | 9,767 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 1,973,828 | \$ | 2,082,451 | \$ | 108,623 | \$ | 2,106,554 | \$ | 132,726 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 2,250 | \$ | 2,250 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,250 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 150,500 |  | 153,995 |  | 3,495 |  | 150,500 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 6,736 |  | 6,736 |  | 5,400 |  | 5,400 |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 152,750 | \$ | 162,981 | \$ | 10,231 | \$ | 158,150 | \$ | 5,400 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 21,684 |  | 20,755 |  | (929) |  | 16,600 |  | $(5,084)$ |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | - |  | 67,006 |  | 67,006 |  | 111,677 |  | 111,677 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 22,184 | \$ | 88,261 | \$ | 66,077 | \$ | 128,777 | \$ | 106,592 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 2,148,762 | \$ | 2,333,693 | \$ | 184,931 | \$ | 2,393,481 | \$ | 244,718 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 2,103,037 | \$ | 2,504,805 | \$ | 401,769 | \$ | 2,223,324 | \$ | 120,287 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 4,251,799 | \$ | 4,838,499 | \$ | 586,699 | \$ | 4,616,805 | \$ | 365,005 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 635,283 | \$ | 60,556 | \$ | $(574,727)$ | \$ | 404,674 | \$ | $(230,608)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | - | \$ | $(67,006)$ | \$ | $(67,006)$ | \$ | $(111,677)$ | \$ | $(111,677)$ |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | - |  | 600,000 |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 35,283 |  | $(93,796)$ |  | $(129,079)$ |  | $(83,649)$ |  | $(118,932)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 635,283 | \$ | 439,198 | \$ | $(196,084)$ | \$ | 404,674 | \$ | $(230,608)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET ( $=\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}$ ) | \$ | 4,887,082 | \$ | 5,277,697 | \$ | 390,615 | \$ | 5,021,479 | \$ | 134,397 |
| FTEs |  | 9.40 |  | 9.53 |  | 0.13 |  | 9.40 |  | - |

## Compliance Enforcement

| Compliance Enforcement (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | Increase (Decrease) |  |
| Total FTEs |  | 12.22 |  | 13.16 |  | 0.94 |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 2,451,137 | \$ | 3,082,704 | \$ | 631,567 |
| Indirect Expenses |  | 2,733,948 |  | 3,112,654 |  | 378,706 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets |  | 1,488,854 |  | 661,877 |  | $(826,976)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$ | 6,673,939 | \$ | 6,857,235 | \$ | 183,297 |

## Background and Scope

The NERC Enforcement group is responsible for overseeing enforcement processes, the application of penalties or sanctions, and activities to mitigate and prevent recurrence of noncompliance with Reliability Standards. The group works collaboratively with the Regional Entities to ensure consistent and effective implementation of the risk-based CMEP. Importantly, the department also focuses on ensuring that the ERO Enterprise dedicates resources to the matters that pose the greatest risk to reliability. The Enforcement department performs its responsibilities by:

- Monitoring Regional Entities' enforcement processes and providing oversight of their outcomes to ensure due process, to identify best practices and process efficiency opportunities, and to promote consistency among Regional Entities' business practices;
- Collecting and analyzing enforcement data and trends to assist with the identification of emerging risks and to help inform the development of enforcement policies and processes;
- Filing Notices of Penalty (NOPs) and other submittals associated with noncompliance discovered through Regional Entity compliance monitoring and enforcement activities;
- Processing and filing NOPs and other submittals associated with violations discovered through NERC-led investigations and audits;
- Collaborating with other NERC departments, including Reliability Assurance, Standards, and Event Analysis,; and
- Delivering training to ERO Enterprise staff and registered entities, as well as supporting other outreach efforts.

Under §215(e)(1) of the FPA, NERC or a Regional Entity may impose a penalty on a user, owner, or operator of the BPS for a violation of a Reliability Standard approved by FERC. As the ERO, NERC has Sanction Guidelines in its ROP that govern the ERO Enterprise's determinations of penalties and non-monetary sanctions for Reliability Standard violations. The Sanction Guidelines provide information on the factors that affect penalty determinations and the behaviors, e.g., self-reporting, timely mitigation, and cooperation, that the ERO Enterprise seeks to encourage to promote compliance and reliable operations.

## ERO Enterprise Core Values and Guiding Principles

The ERO Enterprise Operating Plan promotes the ERO Enterprise's core values and guiding principles. A goal of the ERO Enterprise is to be "a strong enforcement authority that is objective, fair, and promotes a culture of reliability excellence through risk-informed compliance monitoring, mitigation, enforcement, and registration." The following principles serve as guidelines for the conduct and behavior of all involved in the ERO Enterprise enforcement program to ensure alignment with this goal and the core values.

CEAs are independent, without conflict of interest, objective, and fair. The ERO Enterprise strives to be a strong enforcement authority that is independent, without conflict of interest, objective, and fair. NERC and each of the Regional Entities has a code of conduct addressing the professional and ethical standards applicable to its personnel. Foremost among these standards is the requirement that no person work on a matter where that work may affect the person's financial interest. The ERO Enterprise also expects its personnel to conduct themselves professionally and respectfully when engaging with registered entities or other stakeholders. Personnel who do not meet these standards are subject to discipline, up to and including termination.

The Enforcement program promotes a culture of reliability excellence through a risk-based approach.
The ERO Enterprise's risk-based enforcement philosophy generally advocates reserving enforcement actions under section 5.0 of the CMEP for those issues that pose a higher risk to the reliability of the BPS. The risk of a noncompliance is determined based on specific facts and circumstances, including any controls in place at the time of the noncompliance. The ERO Enterprise works with registered entities to ensure timely remediation of potential risks to reliability and prevent recurrence of noncompliance. The enforcement process allows parties to address risks collaboratively and promote increased compliance and reliability through improvement of programs and controls at the registered entities.

The ERO Enterprise applies a presumption of non-enforcement treatment of minimal risk noncompliance to entities with demonstrated internal controls who are permitted to self-log such minimal risk issues. Regarding other issues posing a minimal risk, NERC and the Regional Entities may exercise appropriate judgment whether to initiate a formal enforcement action or resolve the issue outside of the formal enforcement processes. The availability of streamlined treatment of minimal risk noncompliance outside of the formal enforcement process encourages self-inspection by registered entities. When self-identified minimal risk noncompliance is more than likely not going to be subject to a financial penalty, registered entities are encouraged to establish more robust internal controls for the detection and correction of noncompliance. This approach allows the ERO Enterprise to oversee the activities of registered entities in a more efficient manner and to focus resources where they result in the greatest benefit to reliability. In this context, efficiency does not necessarily mean less time or effort. Rather, it is using the requisite time, knowledge, and skills required for each circumstance. In addition, this approach allows the ERO Enterprise to continue to provide clear signals to registered entities about identified areas of concern and risk prioritization, while maintaining existing visibility into potential noncompliance and emerging areas of risk. Outcomes for noncompliance are based on the risk of a specific noncompliance and may range from streamlined, non-enforcement processes, to significant monetary penalties.

Enforcement actions are used and penalties are imposed when warranted, commensurate with risk. An element of a risk-based approach to enforcement is accountability of registered entities for their noncompliance. No matter the risk of the noncompliance, the registered entity still bears the responsibility of mitigating that noncompliance. Based on the risk, facts, and circumstances associated with that noncompliance, the Regional Entity decides on an appropriate disposition track, inside or outside of an enforcement action, as described above, and whether a penalty is appropriate for the noncompliance.

Penalties are generally warranted for serious risk violations (e.g., uncontrolled loss of load, CIP program failures) and for when repeated noncompliance constitutes an aggravating factor. In addition to the use of significant penalties to deter undesired behavior, the ERO Enterprise also incents desired behaviors. ${ }^{26}$

[^12]Specifically, Regional Entities may offset penalties to encourage valued behavior. Factors that may mitigate penalty amounts include registered entity cooperation, accountability (including admission of violations), culture of compliance, and self-identification of noncompliance. Regional Entities may also grant credit in enforcement determinations for certain actions undertaken by registered entities for improvements in addition to mitigating factors. For example, Regional Entities may consider significant investments in reliability made by registered entities, beyond those otherwise planned and required, as an offset for proposed penalties in enforcement determinations. Regional Entities do not award credits or offsets for actions or investments undertaken by a registered entity that are required to mitigate noncompliance.

NERC engages in regular oversight of Regional Entity enforcement activities to confirm that the Regional Entities have followed the CMEP. This oversight evaluates the consistency of disposition methods, including assessment of a penalty or sanction, with previous resolutions of similar noncompliance involving similar circumstances. The Board Compliance Committee considers the recommendations of NERC staff regarding approval of Full NOPs and monitors the handling of noncompliance through the streamlined disposition methods of Spreadsheet NOPs, Find, Fix, Track, and Reports (FFTs), and Compliance Exceptions (CEs).

Actions are timely and transparent. NERC's ROP (including the CMEP and Sanction Guidelines) and program documents are available to the public. ${ }^{27}$ NERC also posts information on enforcement actions on a monthly basis. ${ }^{28}$ Moreover, information on the efficiency of the enforcement program is available to regulators, industry stakeholders, and the public on a quarterly basis. ${ }^{29}$

Noncompliance information is used as an input to other processes. When developing risk elements, NERC annually identifies and prioritizes risks to BPS reliability, taking into account factors such as compliance findings, event analysis experiences, and data analysis. In addition, Regional Entities consider factors such as noncompliance information when conducting an IRA of a registered entity. The ERO Enterprise also uses noncompliance information in a feedback loop to the standards development process. This allows enhanced Reliability Standards through appropriate information flows from compliance monitoring and enforcement to the standards drafting process and other NERC programs. NERC regularly provides analysis and lessons learned from noncompliance information to industry stakeholders and the public. ${ }^{30}$

## Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit

Over the past few years, NERC and the Regional Entities have made substantial progress in reducing the number of instances of noncompliance remaining to be evaluated and processed. The ERO Enterprise has held registered entities accountable for instances of noncompliance that posed a risk to reliability while ensuring that enforcement actions are timely and transparent. NERC promotes a culture of reliability excellence by examining registered entities' internal compliance programs and considering them as mitigating factors in penalty determinations.

[^13]
## Key Efforts Underway

## Enforcement Metrics

In an effort to improve the efficiency of enforcement processing throughout the ERO Enterprise, NERC developed a series of key enforcement metrics, which are tracked and analyzed throughout the year.
The ERO Enterprise has continued to promote timely mitigation of noncompliance with over 99 percent of noncompliance discovered before 2015, and over 85 percent discovered in 2016, having completed Mitigation Plans or mitigating activities, reducing risk to the BPS. Including noncompliance discovered in 2017, there are 1,530 instances of noncompliance with outstanding mitigation activities. Of these, only one minimal risk instance of noncompliance has a discovery date of 2014 or earlier. It has an expected completion date in Q4 2018.

The ongoing use of CEs throughout the ERO Enterprise, has contributed to the noncompliance average age of 8.0 months. As a comparison, the average age of noncompliance was 12 months at its highest point in 2014. In 2016, it had dropped to 10.8 months. As of the end of 2017, 82 percent of the ERO Enterprise noncompliance inventory was less than one year old and only three percent was over two years old. During 2017, the ERO completed processing of all pre-2014 non-federal entity noncompliances and all but three outstanding pre-2014 federal entity noncompliances.

## Continued Outreach Efforts in 2018 and Beyond

In 2018, NERC and the Regional Entities continue to conduct outreach activities that focus on self-logging, compliance exceptions, and risk assessment of noncompliance. NERC plans to use existing industry events, such as the standards and compliance workshops and industry webinars, to provide information on enforcement activities.

## NERC Oversight of Risk-Based CMEP Implementation

For 2018, ensuring the successful implementation of NERC's risk-based CMEP remains the priority of Enforcement's oversight plan for the Regional Entities. As part of that oversight and in addition to offering regular feedback to the Regional Entities, NERC will continue to identify areas for improvement or promoting consistency through training, guidance, or adjustment the following year. NERC also produces an ERO Enterprise CMEP annual report, which includes an assessment of the risk-based CMEP implementation. NERC expects to publish that report during Q1 2019.

NERC performs oversight of the Regional Entities' enforcement programs primarily through the review of the processes, supporting evidence, and other information provided by the Regional Entities over the course of focused engagements of program areas that are scheduled throughout the year. NERC communicates the recommendations and findings to the Regional Entities to help the ERO Enterprise develop responsive strategies and solutions to potential issues and ensure consistent implementation of the CMEP. Such recommendations and findings also help identify priorities for training of ERO Enterprise staff during the year.

## Regional Entity Training

NERC Enforcement will provide training to Regional Entity staff on the most important elements of riskbased enforcement, including risk assessment of noncompliance and the determination of appropriate penalties and sanctions for noncompliance. NERC is developing this training based on observations from its oversight activities of Regional Entity settlement agreements, as well as the process reviews described above.

## CMEP Technology Project

Beginning in 2017 through 2020, NERC, in collaboration with the Regional Entities, will develop and implement a common CMEP tool that supports the CMEP, including the various processes and activities (e.g., analysis of risk, development of implementation plans and audit schedules, actual compliance monitoring, and enforcement processing). For more information on the CMEP Technology Project, see Exhibit F - CMEP Technology Project.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

Specific 2019 objectives for the Enforcement department include:

- Continuing to refine and improve the risk-based CMEP processes;
- Continuing to implement in a transparent manner an ERO Enterprise enforcement philosophy that is risk-focused and drives desired behaviors by registered entities;
- Expanding the feedback loop of information from Enforcement to Standards and other program areas; and
- Working closely with NERC's Compliance Assurance and IT departments, as well as the Regional Entities, to develop application business requirements and test business functionality for the CMEP tool.


## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The increase of one position ( 0.94 FTEs) is the result of resource allocations to realign staff with current needs.

## Consultants and Contracts

No consultant or contract expenses were budgeted in Enforcement in 2018. The addition of $\$ 161 \mathrm{k}$ of expenses is a result of a reclassification of support for the Compliance Reporting and Tracking System (CRATS) from the IT department to Enforcement. A detailed breakdown of the 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contractor Costs.

## Other Costs

The $\$ 884 \mathrm{k}$ budgeted for computer and software capital expenditures is attributed to the CMEP Technology Project, for which the total capital expenditure of approximately $\$ 1.8 \mathrm{M}$ is split evenly between Compliance Assurance and Compliance Enforcement. The $\$ 211 \mathrm{k}$ increase in office costs is primarily for license and hosting fees for the new CMEP tool.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Projection } \end{gathered}$ |  | iance <br> rojection <br> Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \end{aligned}$ |  | ariance <br> 9 Budget <br> 18 Budget <br> r(Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 6,608,973 | \$ | 6,608,973 | \$ | - | \$ | 6,787,076 | \$ | 178,103 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 56,522 |  | 56,522 |  | - |  | 53,103 |  | $(3,418)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 6,665,495 | \$ | 6,665,495 | \$ | - | \$ | 6,840,179 | \$ | 174,684 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | 8,444 |  | 20,961 |  | 12,517 |  | 17,056 |  | 8,612 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 6,673,939 | \$ | 6,686,456 | \$ | 12,517 | \$ | 6,857,235 | \$ | 183,297 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 1,792,112 | \$ | 1,972,628 | \$ | 180,516 | \$ | 1,991,052 | \$ | 198,940 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 115,916 |  | 115,709 |  | (206) |  | 126,256 |  | 10,340 |
| Benefits |  | 168,533 |  | 185,311 |  | 16,777 |  | 198,145 |  | 29,612 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 200,403 |  | 211,841 |  | 11,438 |  | 218,788 |  | 18,385 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 2,276,963 | \$ | 2,485,489 | \$ | 208,526 | \$ | 2,534,240 | \$ | 257,277 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 47,500 |  | 48,471 |  | 971 |  | 47,500 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 3,367 |  | 3,367 |  | 2,400 |  | 2,400 |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 49,500 | \$ | 53,838 | \$ | 4,338 | \$ | 51,900 | \$ | 2,400 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | - | \$ | 48,500 | \$ | 48,500 | \$ | 161,000 | \$ | 161,000 |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 19,160 |  | 120,480 |  | 101,320 |  | 230,050 |  | 210,890 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 105,014 |  | 105,014 |  | 0 |  | 105,014 |  | - |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 124,674 | \$ | 274,494 | \$ | 149,820 | \$ | 496,564 | \$ | 371,890 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 2,451,137 | \$ | 2,813,822 | \$ | 362,685 | \$ | 3,082,704 | \$ | 631,567 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 2,733,948 | \$ | 3,084,838 | \$ | 350,890 | \$ | 3,112,654 | \$ | 378,706 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 5,185,085 | \$ | 5,898,660 | \$ | 713,575 | \$ | 6,195,358 | \$ | 1,010,273 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 1,488,854 | \$ | 787,796 | \$ | $(701,058)$ | \$ | 661,877 | \$ | $(826,976)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(105,014)$ | \$ | $(105,014)$ | \$ | (0) | \$ | $(105,014)$ | \$ | - |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 1,548,000 |  | 1,548,000 |  | - |  | 884,000 |  | $(664,000)$ |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 45,868 |  | $(115,516)$ |  | $(161,383)$ |  | $(117,109)$ |  | $(162,976)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 1,488,854 | \$ | 1,327,470 | \$ | $(161,384)$ | \$ | 661,877 | \$ | $(826,976)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET (=A+B) | \$ | 6,673,939 | \$ | 7,226,130 | \$ | 552,191 | \$ | 6,857,235 | \$ | 183,297 |
| FTEs |  | 12.22 |  | 11.86 |  | (0.36) |  | 13.16 |  | 0.94 |

## Reliability Assessment and System Analysis

| Reliability Assessment and System Analysis (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | Increase <br> (Decrease) |  |
| Total FTEs |  | 14.10 |  | 15.04 |  | 0.94 |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 4,256,247 | \$ | 4,831,482 | \$ | 575,235 |
| Indirect Expenses |  | 3,154,555 |  | 3,557,318 |  | 402,763 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets |  | $(97,847)$ |  | $(359,213)$ |  | $(261,366)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$ | 7,312,956 | \$ | 8,029,587 | \$ | 716,631 |

## Background and Scope

The NERC Reliability Assessment and System Analysis (RASA) department, which includes the Reliability Assessment, System Analysis, and Advanced Analytics and Modeling (AAM) groups, carries out the ERO's statutory responsibility to conduct assessments of the reliability of the BPS. These assessments are used to provide insight and guidance about reliability risks, which provide a foundation for the development of new Reliability Standards or modifications to Reliability Standards, or other initiatives, such as guidelines, alert(s), webinars, etc., all focused on enhancing overall reliability. The majority of the activities in the RASA department directly address the risk priorities established by the RISC. In particular, the risks pertaining to changing resources and planning noted in the RISC report are of particular importance to the assessment and analysis work being performed in RASA.

NERC staff works closely with stakeholders on creating assessment development schedules, including schedules with adequate stakeholder review at every level. All NERC reliability assessments typically have a sponsoring technical committee, subcommittee, or other subgroup. The long-term and seasonal assessments are conducted by the NERC Planning Committee's (PC's) Reliability Assessment Subcommittee (RAS), and ultimately endorsed by the PC. Special assessments often require a separate and specialized task force or advisory group to help construct, conduct, and produce special topic assessments.

The department focuses on developing a technical framework and understanding the emerging reliability risks facing the industry. It also provides guidance and insights to stakeholders across North America. The department relies on its own engineering and analysis expertise, as well as Regional Entity and stakeholder resources. RASA is responsible for:

- Independent reliability assessments on the overall reliability and adequacy of the BES and associated emerging reliability risks that could impact the short-, mid- and the long-term (e.g., 10year) planning horizons, and other reliability issues requiring an in-depth analysis.
- Support for the development and improvement of long-term, sustainable interconnection-based power flow, dynamic, and load models that exhibit the accuracy and fidelity reflecting actual BES reliability performance and dynamic conditions.
- Interconnection-wide analysis of steady-state and dynamic conditions, including frequency, ERS, stability, short circuit ratio, and oscillatory behavior aspects.
- Advancement of industry and the ERO's understanding of power system characteristics and behaviors by gathering larger phasor measurement units (PMU) datasets for advanced data analytics and modeling improvements.
- Assurance oversight that the BES electrical elements necessary for its reliable operation are identified, requiring the elements to follow the Reliability Standards.
- Establishment of reliability leadership and consistent, technically sound insights and recommendations that position industry and policymakers to enhance reliability through effective outreach and communications.


## Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit

RASA works with industry leaders to create a reliability strategy that is relevant, timely, and effective to address the most important reliability risks. This effort includes (1) reviewing and addressing key priority risks identified by the RISC; (2) synthesizing key information identified through analysis and assessment efforts; (3) extracting and prioritizing the associated reliability risks; (4) sharing and integrating risk analysis insights across the ERO Enterprise; and (5) translating that knowledge into actionable guidance and recommendations for NERC management, the Board, and industry, along with state, federal, and provincial policymakers.

## Key Efforts Underway

RASA focuses its efforts in the following key areas:

## Reliability Assessment

Reliability assessments serve to evaluate the expected reliability of the BES through extensive deterministic and probabilistic analyses to identify potential reliability risks and potential mitigation approaches. These reviews include both evaluations at the edge of the planning horizon, as well as assessments of the anticipated performance during the short-term (12- to 18 -month outlook). These analyses involve planned and anticipated changes to generation resources, transmission infrastructure, and load behavior compared to base-line needs of the system to remain reliable, and formulate recommendations and related guidance. This assessment is often completed by examining special scenarios and unique situations within the BES. These analyses provide a technical platform for important policy discussions on challenges facing the interconnected BES, as well as focused recommendations on mitigation to improve overall reliability or lessen reliability risks.

By identifying and quantifying emerging issues, NERC is able to provide risk-informed recommendations and support a learning environment for industry to address emerging risks and pursue improved reliability performance. These efforts are expanding to assess reliability impacts from the changing resource mix, reliability behavior of resources, distributed energy resources, and loads. Many recent resource additions are asynchronous and energy-limited, requiring assessment of a substantial number of scenarios rather than just seasonal peak conditions. Reliability assessments must therefore include a greater focus on probabilistic approaches, assessing the sufficiency of essential reliability services (ERS), as well as focusing seasonal assessments on short-term horizons to encompass evaluations beyond peak condition reserve margin analyses. Key assessments include:

- Long-Term Reliability Assessment (LTRA) (supplemented by the Probabilistic Assessment)
- Summer and Winter Reliability Assessments
- Special Reliability Assessments (selected based on high-priority/high-risk issues that require an independent assessment from the ERO)

A significant ongoing effort involving RASA, Regional Entity staff, and stakeholders focuses on effective ERS. These efforts are expected to lead to a broad set of recommendations that will culminate with defined elements, an evaluation of initial metrics and data compilation of actual performance, and refinement of the ongoing assessment of ERS measures.

As part of reliability assessment activities, NERC collects, maintains, and annually publishes the Electricity Supply and Demand (ES\&D) database, which includes 10-year projections for the North American BPS. Data is validated by the Regional Entities, NERC staff, and the RAS during NERC's annual development of the LTRA. The data collection and management of its systems are an essential component to NERC's MOU with the DOE's Energy Information Agency.

## System Analysis

Understanding the technical behavior of the North American grid is the foundation for identifying crucial aspects of performance that are important for sustaining overall reliability. NERC's understanding of grid behavior is achieved through constant observation and study, analytic simulations, and forensic analysis of system disturbances. The System Analysis group focuses on:

- Power system analysis - Develop technical analyses in key reliability areas, resulting in technically accurate and comprehensive reports addressing areas of concern (e.g., frequency response, short circuit strength, inter-area oscillation, distributed energy resources, etc.). The purpose of these technical analyses are to understand and evaluate BPS characteristics, behavior, and performance due to the changing resource mix and integration of new technology. These analyses are also intended to provide oversight, guidance, direction, and technical expertise to address key planning-related issues and interconnection-wide concerns.
- Advance software capabilities - Continue to explore the use of state-of-the-art software to conduct power system analysis. Enhance the usage of real-time tools used by the industry to sharpen and fine-tune models as the system evolves with the integration of new technology.
- Technical support, implementation and outreach - Provide technical expertise, research, and feedback to the industry. Provide foundational technical efforts that support development of key reliability planning-related standards. Solicit industry's help by using resources and leveraging any research that has been done by the industry. NERC system analysis assessment and studies are coordinated through the PC's System Analysis and Modeling Subcommittee (SAMS) in a collaborative manner to engage stakeholder involvement and support.

System analysis activities also support the following objectives:

- Continue leading and improving NERC's analytical capabilities to address a broad range of engineering topics.
- Conduct analyses and assessments in response to FERC directives.
- Support Reliability Standards development with subject matter expertise.
- Support and lead technical analysis of emerging risks requiring advanced analytics and interconnection-wide assessment.
- Conduct detailed forensic analyses of significant system disturbances.

Key focus areas include:

- PMU measurement, use, and analysis improvements
- Synchrophasor technology
- Power plant model verification
- Oscillation analysis
- Frequency response analysis, interconnection frequency response obligation analysis, and forward-looking reliability assessment
- Interconnection-wide system inertia study
- Interconnection-wide short circuit ratio assessment
- Interconnection-wide model building designation and criteria administration
- Interconnection-wide model validation
- Improving model quality and fidelity
- Analysis of TPL Footnote 12
- Load and distributed energy resource modeling
- Event analysis (simulation and forensic analysis of major events)
- Reliability Standards support
- BES exception and self-determined notification processing


## Advanced Analytics and Modeling

The AAM group focuses on emerging reliability risks to the BPS through advanced system analysis techniques and modeling capabilities. The AAM group works collaboratively with NERC stakeholders, particularly through the NERC PC and Operating Committee (OC) as well as their technical subgroups. Through these activities, AAM's key focuses include:

- State of Modeling Report - Provide industry insight related to modeling improvements and interconnection-wide system analysis, with recommendations for enhancement and industry engagement. Provide industry with annual updates related on modeling and modeling practices.
- Inverter-based resource performance - Perform event analyses and investigate abnormal performance of inverter-based resources, particularly solar photovoltaic. Develop industry recommendations and address potential reliability gaps through NERC Alerts, guidelines, technical reference documents, industry education, and evaluation of Reliability Standards. Coordinate the PC's Inverter-Based Resource Performance Task Force (IRPTF).
- Distributed energy resources - Support industry in the reliable integration of increased levels of distributed energy resources. Provide industry leadership and technical guidance on key reliability impacts of distributed energy resources. Develop recommended practices (modeling, planning, and operations) to ensure BPS reliability.
- Synchrophasor technology - Support industry adoption and advancement of synchrophasor technology through the PC's Synchronized Measurement Subcommittee (SMS). Study interconnection-wide oscillatory behavior (and other interconnection-wide phenomena) through PMU data collected from RCs.
- Power plant model verification - Support industry understanding and expertise in power plant modeling through the PC's System Analysis and Modeling Subcommittee's (SAMS's) Power Plant Modeling and Verification Task Force (PPMVTF). Advance capabilities to perform a disturbancebased model verification, working with software vendors. Support industry implementation of MOD-026-1 and MOD-027-1.
- Dynamic load modeling - Drive improvements of dynamic load modeling capabilities in support of industry stability studies for planning and real-time reliability assessments. Advance state of the art modeling capability across North America. Support the SAMS's Load Modeling Task Force (LMTF) efforts.
- Changing end-use loads - Support studies and technical positions on the changing nature of enduse loads and advocate for grid-friendly load behavior. Engage with industries collaboratively, working with utility members, to represent BPS needs.
- Interconnection-wide case quality assessments - Perform annual assessments of case quality and fidelity on the interconnection-wide cases released by the MOD-032 designees. Develop a feedback loop mechanism with the MOD-032 designees to instigate improvements to models.
- Modeling notifications - Proactively address deficiencies in interconnection-wide models and provide industry education on key modeling topics as identified by NERC or industry.
- Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits (IROLs) - Coordinate with the PC's Methods for Establishing IROLs Task Force (MEITF) and support improvements to the methods, practices, and tools used for establishing IROLs. Coordinate with industry and FERC on potential new approaches to characterize IROLs while ensuring reliable operation of the BPS.


## Technical Committees

RASA coordinates and administers the activities and efforts of the PC and its subgroups. The PC and its subgroups provide the oversight, guidance, and leadership essential to address these areas of strategic focus efficiently and comprehensively, and ensure technical accuracy, with the objective of enhancing BPS reliability. Further, the PC recognizes the need to strengthen the ties between the technical committees to ensure expertise is leveraged and amplified, thereby increasing the relevance and value of the technical committee results. NERC supports industry volunteers and helps them achieve industry consensus around important and strategic reliability issues as identified by the RISC and detailed in the ERO Enterprise LongTerm Strategy and ERO Enterprise Operating Plan.

## NERC and Regional Entity Coordination

NERC's Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis (RAPA) staff coordinate with Regional Entity counterparts through the ERO RAPA Group to collaborate on and provide oversight for reliability assessment and reliability risk analysis functions. The responsibilities of this group include facilitating the exchange of information, jointly coordinating work product expectations (scope, timing, schedule, resource expenditures, budget assumptions, etc.), and promoting consistency across the ERO Enterprise. Additionally, ERO RAPA continually seeks improvements to data and information coordination, methods, and approaches for the advancement of BPS risk analysis, and interfaces with the NERC technical committees accordingly to fulfill these objectives. Key objectives include:

- Program management and operations
- Achieve consistent implementation and alignment across the ERO Enterprise for reliability assessment and performance analysis functions.
- Periodically review coordination plans and ensure they are aligned with the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan.
- Program oversight
- Provide oversight to reliability assessments and other key reports. ERO RAPA establishes common approaches and processes for reliability assessments and solutions for program challenges.
- Implement enhancements to improve ERO Enterprise-wide efficiency and effectiveness of RAPA-related functions.
- Data and information coordination
- Provide consistent oversight materials regarding data collection, checking, validation, and assessment for use throughout NERC and the Regional Entities.
- Coordinate data and information systems across the ERO Enterprise.

Further, RASA continues to work closely with other organizations, including but not limited to the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), the DOE, the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE), the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO), the North American Transmission Forum (NATF), the North American Generation Forum (NAGF), and the Canadian Electricity Association (CEA). RASA collaborates with these groups on a number of fronts, including GMD, vegetation management, and variable generation integration. RASA also works with the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) and the Natural Gas Supply Association (NGSA) regarding studies pertaining to the interdependency of gas and electric systems.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

RASA activities and deliverables for 2019 are in support of the following goals and objectives identified in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan.

Goal 3: Reduction of Known Risks to Reliability

- Ensure that the IRPTF completes its scope of work on schedule and implements the recommendations needed to maintain reliability. The recommendations should include addressing any gaps in Reliability Standards.
- Collaborate with Planning Coordinators to expand development of interconnection-wide models with expected dispatches to support effective long-term planning assessments.
- Work with stakeholders to develop and share knowledge and information supporting BPS resilience.

Goal 4: Identification and Assessment of Emerging Reliability Risks

- Improve resource adequacy assessments with increased probabilistic and risk analysis.
- Conduct interconnection-wide analysis of steady-state and dynamic conditions, including frequency, ERS, stability, short circuit ratio, and oscillatory behavior aspects to support NERC's reliability assessments and improve industry planning.
- Perform model validations at the interconnection level and compare with internal transmission owner models (short circuit model validation).
- Gather additional system performance data (e.g., data on balancing and frequency performance, renewables, and ERS) to advance analytics and improve modeling.
- Increase technical analysis and assessment focus on natural gas, wind, and solar resource and fuel availability.
- Develop technical references and guidelines that advance and improve reliability using new technologies.
- Develop quality and fidelity assessments of interconnection models.


## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The increase of one position ( 0.94 FTEs ) is the result of resource allocations to realign staff with current needs.

## Consultants and Contracts

The total consultant and contract expenses for the RASA department increased from \$525k in 2018 to $\$ 625 k$ in 2019, specifically to support research on the reliability effects of GMD. A detailed breakdown of 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses are shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract Costs.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT and SYSTEM ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Projection } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | ariance <br> Projection <br> 18 Budget <br> r(Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { Budget } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 7,212,995 | \$ | 7,212,995 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,924,404 | \$ | 711,409 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 65,217 |  | 65,217 |  | - |  | 60,690 |  | $(4,528)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 7,278,213 | \$ | 7,278,213 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,985,094 | \$ | 706,881 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  | - |  | 25,000 |  | - |
| Interest |  | 9,743 |  | 27,684 |  | 17,941 |  | 19,493 |  | 9,750 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 7,312,956 | \$ | 7,330,896 | \$ | 17,941 | \$ | 8,029,587 | \$ | 716,631 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 2,334,967 | \$ | 2,505,353 | \$ | 170,387 | \$ | 2,588,128 | \$ | 253,162 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 144,330 |  | 150,118 |  | 5,787 |  | 156,888 |  | 12,558 |
| Benefits |  | 283,513 |  | 323,070 |  | 39,557 |  | 355,375 |  | 71,862 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 258,277 |  | 277,158 |  | 18,881 |  | 285,005 |  | 26,728 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 3,021,087 | \$ | 3,255,699 | \$ | 234,612 | \$ | 3,385,397 | \$ | 364,310 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 121,000 | \$ | 121,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 121,000 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 250,000 |  | 263,486 |  | 13,486 |  | 250,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 3,367 |  | 3,367 |  | 6,500 |  | 6,500 |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 371,000 | \$ | 387,853 | \$ | 16,853 | \$ | 377,500 | \$ | 6,500 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 525,000 | \$ | 525,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 625,000 | \$ | 100,000 |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 187,889 |  | 202,769 |  | 14,880 |  | 217,710 |  | 29,821 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 150,771 |  | 196,362 |  | 45,591 |  | 225,375 |  | 74,604 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 864,160 | \$ | 924,631 | \$ | 60,471 | \$ | 1,068,585 | \$ | 204,425 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 4,256,247 | \$ | 4,568,183 | \$ | 311,936 | \$ | 4,831,482 | \$ | 575,235 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 3,154,555 | \$ | 3,896,364 | \$ | 741,809 | \$ | 3,557,318 | \$ | 402,763 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 7,410,803 | \$ | 8,464,547 | \$ | 1,053,744 | \$ | 8,388,800 | \$ | 977,997 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | $(97,847)$ | \$ | $(1,133,650)$ | \$ | $(1,035,804)$ | \$ | $(359,213)$ | \$ | $(261,366)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(150,771)$ | \$ | $(196,362)$ | \$ | $(45,591)$ | \$ | $(225,375)$ | \$ | $(74,604)$ |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 52,924 |  | $(145,905)$ |  | $(198,829)$ |  | $(133,838)$ |  | $(186,762)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | $(97,847)$ | \$ | $(342,267)$ | \$ | $(244,420)$ | \$ | $(359,213)$ | \$ | $(261,366)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET (=A+B) | \$ | 7,312,956 | \$ | 8,122,280 | \$ | 809,325 | \$ | 8,029,587 | \$ | 716,631 |
| FTEs |  | 14.10 |  | 14.98 |  | 0.88 |  | 15.04 |  | 0.94 |

## Reliability Risk Management

NERC's Reliability Risk Management (RRM) department carries out the ERO's statutory responsibility to perform assessments (real-time or near real-time continual awareness, detailed analysis of significant events, and longer-term broad performance assessments) of the reliability and adequacy of the BPS including identifying potential issues of concern relating to system, equipment, entity, and human performance that may indicate the need to implement targeted interventions. RRM has three groups: Situation Awareness (also referred to as Bulk Power System Awareness), Event Analysis, and Performance Analysis. These groups have five primary functions: (1) BPS awareness; (2) event and root cause analysis; (3) assessment of human performance challenges that affect reliability and identification of improvement opportunities; (4) continent-wide analysis and reporting of BPS performance; and (5) support of the OC.

RRM's functions and resources are directly focused on proactive awareness of BPS conditions and all events over a threshold of certain risk or impact. Through awareness and continuous assessment, RRM identifies potential reliability risks. RRM analyzes events in detail, addresses the most significant risks to reliability, and ensures that industry is well informed of system events, emerging trends, risk analysis, and lessons learned. Through performing these functions, RRM provides data and analysis to inform other aspects of NERC's statutory functions. The group also provides strategic direction for using risk-based concepts in planning and executing its responsibilities.

## Situation Awareness

| Situation Awareness <br> (in whole dollars)   <br>    <br> 2018 Budget 2019 Budget Increase <br> (Decrease)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total FTEs <br> Direct Expenses <br> Indirect Expenses <br> Other Non-Operating Expenses Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets <br> TOTAL BUDGET |  | 5.64 |  | 5.64 |  |  |
|  | \$ | 2,566,215 | \$ | 2,621,352 | \$ | 55,137 |
|  |  | 1,261,822 |  | 1,333,994 |  | 72,172 |
|  |  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  |  | 18,610 |  | 340,863 |  | 322,252 |
|  | \$ | 3,846,648 | \$ | 4,296,209 | \$ | 449,561 |

## Background and Scope

NERC's Situation Awareness group and the Regional Entities monitor BPS conditions, significant occurrences and emerging risks, and threats across the 14 RC regions in North America to maintain an understanding of conditions and situations that could impact reliable operation. This group also supports the development and publication of NERC Alerts and awareness products and facilitates information sharing among industry, the Regional Entities, and the government during crisis situations and major system disturbances. The process for understanding the potential threats or vulnerabilities to BPS reliability starts with understanding occurrences and events in the context in which they occur.

## Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit

BPS conditions continually change and provide recognizable signatures through automated tools, mandatory reports and voluntary information sharing, and third-party publicly available sources. The significant majority of these signatures represents conditions and occurrences that have little or no reliability impact, either positive or adverse, on the BPS. However, being cognizant of the short-term condition of the BPS and the signatures associated with the entire range of reliability performance helps the ERO identify significant occurrences more accurately and efficiently. Registered entities continue to robustly share information and collaborate with the ERO to maintain and improve the overall reliability.

## Key Efforts Underway

Situation Awareness focuses on the following in support of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan:

- Ensure that the ERO is aware of all BES events above a threshold of impact.
- Enable the sharing of information and data to facilitate wide-area situational awareness.
- During crisis situations, facilitate the exchange of information among industry, the Regional Entities, and the U.S. and Canadian governments.
- Keep industry informed of emerging reliability threats and risks, including any expected actions.
- Conduct the annual NERC Monitoring and Situational Awareness Conference and Human Performance Conference.
- Administer the NERC Alerts process as specified in ROP $\S 810$ to issue Advisory (Level 1) Alerts on significant and emerging reliability- and security-related topics as needed, and facilitate the tracking of actions specified in Recommendation (Level 2) and Essential Action (Level 3) Alerts.
- Perform oversight, as per the Situation Awareness Oversight Plan, of the activities and performance of the Regional Entities.

The department uses the following major reliability-related tools to support department activities:

- Resource Adequacy (Area Control Error [ACE] Frequency) Tool - This software application provides continuous monitoring of key resource adequacy performance metrics, including preestablished thresholds and limits defined in standards. It alerts RCs and resource subcommittees to conditions that could result in critical inadequacies, such as major tie errors, inaccurate load forecasts, and inadequate frequency response.
- Inadvertent Interchange - This tool facilitates the entering of monthly scheduling data and submittal of monthly inadvertent performance standards reports to NERC. It also assists in the monitoring and resolution of reliability issues originated by inadvertent interchange imbalances.
- Frequency Monitoring and Analysis Tool - This tool detects frequency events and captures key frequency response information for each interconnection.
- Intelligent Alarms Tool - This tool detects short-term and long-term frequency deviations using data transmitted to NERC by the BAs. When coupled with the FNet ${ }^{31}$ and Frequency Monitoring and Analysis tools, this tool allows immediate differentiation of the cause of a frequency deviation-a generator trip or a scheduling error.
- Genscape - The PowerIQ and PowerRT tools provide more detailed insight into current-day conditions impacting BPS conditions in both normal operations and stressed conditions.
- Process Information (PI) Historian System - The PI Historian system benefits RASA for the attainment of deliverables recommended in the 2015 ERS Task Force (ERSTF) Report (specifically, collect and analyze system inertia data) and offers longer term value for both RASA and RRM. The system enables the continued strategy to transition away from other applications, offsetting future expenses by replicating the functionality of Resource Adequacy and Intelligent Alarms inhouse in the 18-36 months outlook, and creates the necessary foundation for NERC's eventual receipt and consumption of streaming synchrophasor data in near real time.

[^14]Several reliability-related situational awareness and monitoring tools and processes are undergoing enhancement or modification. The following are being focused on during 2018: (1) an upgrade to the SAFNR software application to include preparation of a request for proposals (RFP) in late 2018; (2) operation and maintenance of the NERC Alerts tool while planning for a streamlined NERC Alert process and platform appropriately integrated with related ongoing NERC, E-ISAC, and ERO Enterprise IT initiatives; (3) a refresh of the Reliability Coordinator Information System (RCIS) legacy application for operability and maintainability reasons, with no significant changes to functionality; and (4) continuing to set the conditions to bring limited streaming synchrophasor data into NERC for wide-area situational awareness and event triage applications.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

In 2019, the Situation Awareness group will continue to accomplish the specific goals and deliverables referenced above in support of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, and will also focus on the upgrade to the SAFNR application. The current SAFNR platform limits the Situation Awareness group's ability to accurately understand current conditions on the BPS due to the inability to easily or cost-effectively update the underlying power system information, including incorporating available real-time data feeds on risks to reliability, such as severe weather, flooding, and wildfires, as well as available information on interconnection frequency, BA ACE, and aggregated customer outages.

Further, enhancing SAFNR will incorporate functionality elements piloted during GridEx IV that will enable the Situation Awareness group to provide the E-ISAC and the ESCC with more timely and understandable common operating picture information, meeting the GridEx IV Executive Tabletop Report recommendation that states that NERC and the E-ISAC should enhance their ability to provide reliable, timely, and accurate information regarding the state of grid reliability and security threats and events, and largely meeting the observation \#3 recommendation from the GridEx IV Distributed Play Lessons Learned Report, which states that the E-ISAC should consider adding a "common operational picture" function to the E-ISAC portal.

With the insight gained from more than five years of use, the system can be implemented as envisioned a shared platform for rapid and accurate situational awareness that appropriately protects the proprietary information in the tool while maximizing the value of understanding shared to the right audiences. See Exhibit $G$ - Situation Awareness for FERC, NERC, and the Regional Entities (SAFNR) for further details.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

There is no change in FTEs for 2019 from the 2018 budget.

## Consultants and Contracts

The overall funding of approximately $\$ 1.3 \mathrm{M}$ for consultant and contract expenses (which largely includes support costs of the tools described above) in 2019 is consistent with the 2018 budget. A detailed breakdown of the 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract costs.

## Other Costs

The $\$ 400 \mathrm{k}$ increase for computer and software capital expenditures is attributed to the upgrade for SAFNR, for which the total capital expenditure of $\$ 600 \mathrm{k}$ is split between Situation Awareness and the EISAC.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SITUATION AWARENESS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $2018$ <br> rojection |  | iance <br> rojection <br> Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 3,816,664 | \$ | 3,816,664 | \$ | - | \$ | 4,266,141 | \$ | 449,477 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 26,087 |  | 26,087 |  | - |  | 22,759 |  | $(3,328)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 3,842,751 | \$ | 3,842,751 | \$ | - | \$ | 4,288,899 | \$ | 446,149 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | 3,897 |  | 8,403 |  | 4,506 |  | 7,310 |  | 3,413 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 3,846,648 | \$ | 3,851,154 | \$ | 4,506 | \$ | 4,296,209 | \$ | 449,561 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 888,593 | \$ | 747,279 | \$ | $(141,314)$ | \$ | 865,683 | \$ | $(22,910)$ |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 59,143 |  | 50,725 |  | $(8,418)$ |  | 58,475 |  | (668) |
| Benefits |  | 144,353 |  | 178,875 |  | 34,523 |  | 182,721 |  | 38,368 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 98,676 |  | 95,692 |  | $(2,984)$ |  | 95,435 |  | $(3,240)$ |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 1,190,764 | \$ | 1,072,571 | \$ | $(118,193)$ | \$ | 1,202,314 | \$ | 11,550 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 33,000 |  | 26,400 |  | $(6,600)$ |  | 33,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 3,369 |  | 3,369 |  | - |  | - |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 35,000 | \$ | 31,769 | \$ | $(3,231)$ | \$ | 35,000 | \$ | - |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 1,295,495 | \$ | 1,295,495 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,280,990 | \$ | $(14,505)$ |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 41,897 |  | 39,322 |  | $(2,575)$ |  | 93,600 |  | 51,703 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 2,559 |  | 7,722 |  | 5,162 |  | 8,948 |  | 6,389 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 1,340,451 | \$ | 1,343,039 | \$ | 2,587 | \$ | 1,384,038 | \$ | 43,587 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 2,566,215 | \$ | 2,447,379 | \$ | $(118,836)$ | \$ | 2,621,352 | \$ | 55,137 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 1,261,822 | \$ | 1,212,087 | \$ | $(49,736)$ | \$ | 1,333,994 | \$ | 72,172 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 3,828,038 | \$ | 3,659,466 | \$ | $(168,572)$ | \$ | 3,955,347 | \$ | 127,309 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 18,610 | \$ | 191,688 | \$ | 173,078 | \$ | 340,863 | \$ | 322,252 |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(2,559)$ | \$ | $(7,722)$ | \$ | $(5,162)$ | \$ | $(8,948)$ | \$ | $(6,389)$ |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 400,000 |  | 400,000 |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 21,170 |  | $(45,388)$ |  | $(66,558)$ |  | $(50,189)$ |  | $(71,359)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 18,610 | \$ | $(53,110)$ | \$ | $(71,720)$ | \$ | 340,863 | \$ | 322,252 |
| TOTAL BUDGET ( $=\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}$ ) | \$ | 3,846,648 | \$ | 3,606,356 | \$ | $(240,292)$ | \$ | 4,296,209 | \$ | 449,561 |
| FTEs |  | 5.64 |  | 4.66 |  | (0.98) |  | 5.64 |  | - |

## Event Analysis

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Event Analysis } \\ \text { (in whole dollars) }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Increase <br>

(Decrease)\end{array}\right]\)

## Background and Scope

The Event Analysis group performs assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the BES. This includes identifying potential issues of concern related to system, equipment, entity, and human performance that may indicate a need to develop remediation strategies, action plans, or data used to revise or retire Reliability Standards or consider new Reliability Standards. The group analyzes and determines the cause of the events, promptly ensures tracking of corrective actions to prevent recurrence, and provides lessons learned to the industry. Event Analysis ensures that reporting and analysis are consistent to allow widearea assessment of trends and risks. The department analyzes all reportable events for sequence of events, root cause, risk to reliability, and mitigation, and keeps the industry well informed of system events, emerging trends, risk analysis, lessons learned, and expected actions.

Additional resources within this department focus on identifying human-error risks and those precursor factors that allow human error to impact system reliability. The department educates industry regarding risks, precursors, and mitigation methods. Resources also support compliance and standards training initiatives and trending and analysis to identify emerging reliability risks. These efforts are conducted in collaboration with industry human performance projects, including WECC's Human Performance Working Group, the OC's Event Analysis Subcommittee (EAS), and others.

## Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit

The Event Analysis department coordinates the use of collective resources, consistency in analysis, and timely delivery of event analysis reports. ${ }^{32}$ The ERO disseminates lessons learned and other useful information to the electric industry obtained from or as a result of event analysis. The Event Analysis team conducts in-depth analyses of approximately 150 events per year on average. Annually, the team also conducts calls facilitated by the Regional Entities with over 140 registered entities to finalize root and contributing causes for the categorized events analyzed. Major analysis to date includes continuing assessment of Energy Management System (EMS) outages, continued collaboration with the RASA and Performance Analysis groups on frequency response performance, analyses of substation equipment failure events, and protective relay trends, including ground overcurrent relay misoperations, relay communication system failures, and the importance of commissioning testing.

## Collaboration with the Trade Associations and Forums

The activities of the NATF, the NAGF, trade associations, and other industry groups are expected to compliment ERO Enterprise activities and limit the need to add incremental resources to the NERC and Regional Entity BP\&Bs that might otherwise be required in the absence of these forums.

[^15]NATF has been invited to participate in several reliability initiatives that are expected to continue into 2019, including protection systems misoperations reduction, challenges associated with inverter-based resources, physical security, various activities related to reliability assurance initiatives, improvement of modeling practices, and complementary efforts on addressing the GMD challenges.

Event Analysis seeks to accomplish several specific goals and objectives as part of the strategic focus of the ERO Enterprise and in support of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan:

- Work with the Regional Entities to review information from registered entities on qualifying events and disturbances advancing awareness of events above a threshold level; facilitate analysis of root and contributing causes, risks to reliability, wide-area assessments, and remediation efforts; and disseminate information regarding events in a timely manner.
- Ensure that all reportable events are analyzed for sequence of events, root cause, risk to reliability, and mitigation.
- Continue to refine risk-based methods to support better identification of reliability risks, including the use of more sophisticated cause codes for analysis.
- Conduct training (webinars, workshops, and conference support) to inform industry and the ERO Enterprise of lessons learned, root cause analysis, trends, human performance, and extreme weather preparedness and recommendations.
- Develop reliability recommendations and Alerts as needed and track industry accountability for critical reliability recommendations.
- Ensure that industry is well informed of system events, emerging trends, risk analysis, lessons learned, and expected actions.
- Conduct major event analysis and reporting of major findings and recommendations that will improve reliability.
- Perform oversight, as per the Event Analysis Oversight Plan, of the activities and performance of the Regional staffs.

The Event Analysis department also supports several of the top-priority reliability risk projects as identified and described under the Performance Analysis section of this document.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

In 2019, the Event Analysis group will continue to accomplish the specific goals and deliverables referenced above in support of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, particularly with regard to analysis in the area of inverters and inverter technologies as the proliferation of renewables using these technologies are rapidly increasing.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

There is no change in FTEs for 2019 from the 2018 budget.

## Consultants and Contracts

No funding is budgeted for consultant and contract expenses in 2019, which is consistent with the 2018 budget.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EVENT ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $2018$ <br> rojection |  | iance <br> rojection <br> Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 5,061,521 | \$ | 5,061,521 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,239,131 | \$ | 177,610 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 52,174 |  | 52,174 |  | - |  | 45,517 |  | $(6,657)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 5,113,695 | \$ | 5,113,695 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,284,648 | \$ | 170,953 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | 40,000 |  | 156,380 |  | 116,380 |  | 40,000 |  | 0 |
| Interest |  | 7,794 |  | 19,927 |  | 12,133 |  | 14,620 |  | 6,825 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 5,161,490 | \$ | 5,290,002 | \$ | 128,512 | \$ | 5,339,268 | \$ | 177,778 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 1,783,120 | \$ | 1,868,493 | \$ | 85,373 | \$ | 1,903,950 | \$ | 120,830 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 110,619 |  | 105,369 |  | $(5,250)$ |  | 113,420 |  | 2,801 |
| Benefits |  | 227,802 |  | 245,405 |  | 17,603 |  | 264,308 |  | 36,506 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 198,179 |  | 194,876 |  | $(3,303)$ |  | 210,479 |  | 12,300 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 2,319,720 | \$ | 2,414,144 | \$ | 94,424 | \$ | 2,492,158 | \$ | 172,438 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 81,500 | \$ | 187,447 | \$ | 105,947 | \$ | 81,500 | \$ | 0 |
| Travel |  | 150,000 |  | 146,310 |  | $(3,690)$ |  | 150,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 10,559 |  | 10,559 |  | - |  | - |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 231,500 | \$ | 344,317 | \$ | 112,817 | \$ | 231,500 | \$ | 0 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 43,786 |  | 56,159 |  | 12,373 |  | 47,500 |  | 3,714 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 84,943 |  | 85,582 |  | 639 |  | 85,582 |  | 639 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 129,229 | \$ | 142,241 | \$ | 13,012 | \$ | 133,582 | \$ | 4,353 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 2,680,449 | \$ | 2,900,702 | \$ | 220,253 | \$ | 2,857,240 | \$ | 176,791 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 2,523,644 | \$ | 2,923,574 | \$ | 399,929 | \$ | 2,667,989 | \$ | 144,344 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 5,204,093 | \$ | 5,824,276 | \$ | 620,182 | \$ | 5,525,228 | \$ | 321,135 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | $(42,604)$ | \$ | $(534,273)$ | \$ | $(491,670)$ | \$ | $(185,960)$ | \$ | $(143,357)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(84,943)$ | \$ | $(85,582)$ | \$ | (639) | \$ | $(85,582)$ | \$ | (639) |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 42,339 |  | $(109,477)$ |  | $(151,816)$ |  | $(100,379)$ |  | $(142,718)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | $(42,604)$ | \$ | $(195,059)$ | \$ | $(152,455)$ | \$ | $(185,960)$ | \$ | $(143,357)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET (=A+B) | \$ | 5,161,490 | \$ | 5,629,217 | \$ | 467,727 | \$ | 5,339,268 | \$ | 177,778 |
| FTEs |  | 11.28 |  | 11.24 |  | (0.04) |  | 11.28 |  | - |

## Performance Analysis

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Performance Analysis } \\ \text { (in whole dollars) }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ Budget |  |  |  | 2019 Budget \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Increase <br>

(Decrease)\end{array}\right]\)

## Background and Scope

The Performance Analysis department currently consists of balancing and frequency control (B\&FC) and data analytics (DA) groups and provides significant statistical analysis and outreach support for NERC and the entire ERO Enterprise. The outreach includes initiatives with the Regional Entities and electricity industry-related organizations.

## B\&FC Scope

B\&FC provides support and services necessary for the real-time operation of the BPS in the areas of balancing resources and demand, interconnection frequency, interchange scheduling, and control performance. B\&FC is responsible for providing technical assistance in the development and administration of the NERC balancing standards (BAL standards) that include BAL-001 Real Power Balancing Control Performance, BAL-002 Disturbance Control Performance, BAL-003 Frequency Response and Frequency Bias Setting, BAL-004 Time Error Correction, and BAL-006 Inadvertent Interchange. B\&FC is also instrumental in performing the analysis and development of annual reports and informational filings that satisfy the FERC directives set forth in the orders that approved the balancing standards.

B\&FC supports the OC's Resources Subcommittee (RS), Frequency Working Group (FWG), Inadvertent Interchange Working Group (IIWG), and Reserves Working Group (RWG) through facilitation of quarterly in-person meetings, organizing and hosting of teleconferences as needed, drafting and posting of agendas and meeting minutes, and hosting subcommittee and industry webinars. B\&FC also maintains the RS website and Balancing Authority Submittal Site (BASS), which are critical to industry stakeholders by providing operational information and a submittal mechanism for the aforementioned balancing standard requirements.

The PC and OC jointly created the ERS Working Group (ERSWG) to advance the work initiated by the ERSTF in consideration of the technical and operational impacts to BPS reliability that could result from the changing generation resource mix throughout North America. B\&FC provides support through data collection, analysis, and reporting for five of the ERS measures that include Measure 1: Synchronous Inertial Response at an Interconnection Level, Measure 2: Initial Frequency Deviation Following Largest Contingency, Measure 3: Synchronous Inertial Response at a BA Level, Measure 4: Frequency Response at an Interconnection Level, and Measure 6: Net Demand Ramping Variability. B\&FC supports the annual State of Reliability report (SOR report) by providing data and analysis for interconnection frequency response ( $\mathrm{M}-4$ ) and related statistical analysis.

In 2017, B\&FC partnered with the Situation Awareness group, IT, and OSIsoft to accomplish the specification, development, and installation of a PI Historian system that allows NERC to retrieve, analyze, and report on data that is currently hosted and analyzed by external parties. The initial data includes
interconnection frequency and BA ACE across North America and provides enhanced wide area visualization and analysis of the North American BES. B\&FC is leading the effort to build the asset framework hierarchy that will further enhance analysis and reporting that support the efforts of NERC staff and technical committees. Near-term project initiatives include the retrieval of high-speed subsecond frequency data from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville into the NERC PI Historian. While the implementation of PI Historian at NERC is a very large step forward, the maintenance of this database and continued development of visualization, analysis, and reporting tools continue to be a considerable effort and resource requirement going forward.

## DA Scope

DA is responsible for the collection, management, and analysis of data related to the performance of five areas of BPS operations: transmission, conventional generation, wind generation, protection system misoperations, and demand response. DA also provides application training and end-user support to reporting entities and Regional Entity staff. DA collaborates with internal and external stakeholders through working groups associated with the industry sectors reporting performance data to define and revise reporting requirements and related applications. Analysis performed by DA includes identifying potential risks of concern related to system, equipment, entity, and organizational performance that may indicate a need to develop remediation strategies, improvements to the reporting applications, new data collection or analysis tools, or data used to create, revise, or retire reliability standards or consider new reliability standards or reporting areas. Such analysis provides the foundation for the annual SOR report, the annual misoperations report, and technical papers to the industry.

DA continues the 2018 trend of highly concentrated business engagement in IT projects. 2019 projects include: (1) the planning and subsequent deployment of the solar data collection system; (2) continued refinement and implementation of the data sharing process to comply with FERC Order 824; (3) development of portal applications on the NERC enterprise platform; (4) integration of the next application data set for the ERO data warehouse; and (5) continued planning and collection of ROP Section 1600 data requests, including but not limited to GMD studies and cyber and physical security data. Throughout these projects, DA has developed effective and efficient processes and work products that are being adopted by the NERC Project Management Office as models for other NERC IT projects. To improve data quality, DA conducts multiple multi-day in-person training sessions for end-users that provide data to the reporting applications. In addition to its legacy work with data collection and analysis, DA provides business subject matter expertise for several IT projects, including new data reporting and analytical tools, projects to support FERC data needs, ERO Enterprise data sharing, as well as projects with other NERC groups.

## Stakeholder Engagement and Benefit

The Performance Analysis group monitors the performance and identifies risks to reliability of the BES in North America through analyzing data from industry measuring historic trends. The group provides reports and recommendations regarding the anticipated conditions that could impact the reliability, security, and stability of the BPS to the industry, Regional Entities, regulatory entities, and other designated entities.

Performance Analysis works with industry leaders to create a reliability strategy that is relevant, timely, and effective at addressing the most important reliability risks. This effort includes Performance Analysis's contribution (including its data gathering and statistical analyses of data, trends, and events) toward the ERO's understanding of key information identified through (1) analysis and assessment efforts; (2) extraction and prioritization of the associated reliability risks from that information; (3) communication and integration of those risk analysis insights across the ERO Enterprise; and (4) translation of that knowledge into actionable guidance and recommendations for NERC management, the Board, industry,
and state, federal, and provincial policymakers. This offers stakeholders an open and transparent approach for the development of NERC's reliability strategy, ultimately ensuring the ERO is accountable to industry, regulators, and the public at large.

B\&FC will continue to support the RS, ERSWG, and industry stakeholders through performance-based webinars, technical whitepapers, reliability guidelines, and individual outreach. These efforts have proven successful throughout 2017 and 2018, with an emphasis on frequency response performance and operational capabilities.

## Key Efforts Underway

In addition to support of the RS and its working groups, the maintenance and administration of the BAL standards is a major effort for B\&FC, with particular current focus on BAL-003-1 Frequency Response and Frequency Bias Setting. B\&FC fulfils the ongoing tasks assigned to the ERO in BAL-003-1 Attachment A and the Procedure for ERO Support. These tasks include, but are not limited to:

- Ongoing quarterly identification, review, selection, and posting of BAL-003-1 and M-4 frequency events for use by BAs and other industry stakeholders;
- Calculation and posting of Minimum Frequency Bias Settings for each BA;
- Calculation and assignment of BA Frequency Response Obligations for the upcoming year;
- Calculation and assignment of BA annual Frequency Bias Settings and L10 values for April implementation into $B A$ control systems;
- Ongoing maintenance of and necessary modifications to BAL-003-1 Frequency Response Standard Forms used by BAs to calculate frequency response performance and document bilateral purchase or sale of frequency response and/or participation in a Frequency Response Sharing Group in accordance with BAL-003-1;
- Maintenance of the BASS used by BAs for BAL-003-1 submittals and performance of vetting for stakeholders requesting access to the BASS;
- Ongoing annual development of the Frequency Response Annual Analysis Report, which is necessary to identify changes in frequency response performance and recommend changes in Interconnection Frequency Response Obligations in accordance with BAL-003-1; and
- Leading efforts related to FERC Order 794 that approved the BAL-003-1 standard and directed NERC to submit a report in 2018 addressing (1) an evaluation of the use of linear regression methodology to calculate frequency response and (2) the availability of resources for applicable entities to meet the Frequency Response Obligation.

The key trends, findings, and recommendations from Performance Analysis serve as technical input to Reliability Standards and standards project prioritization, compliance process improvements, event analyses, reliability assessment, and critical infrastructure protection efforts. This analysis of BES performance provides an industry reference for historical BES reliability, but it also offers analytical insights that lead toward the prioritization of specific actionable risk control steps for industry. These analyses and results are summarized in the annual SOR report, which provides guidance and recommendations for enhanced BPS reliability. Performance Analysis has added Generator Availability Data System (GADS) wind data to the data collected under NERC ROP Section 1600, requiring the development of a new software tool to enable this. In 2019, DA will begin development of the system for solar data collection.

Performance Analysis is working with Event Analysis to develop a link between their databases. Specific equipment outages will be linked to disturbance reports filed with NERC, enabling better association of transmission and generation outages. The continued alignment between these efforts will enhance the ability to conduct effective event analyses as well as to identify key reliability areas for trend analyses of multiple databases. This is expected to improve the depth of event analyses across the ERO Enterprise and expand the quality of data gathered. With use of sophisticated statistical and probabilistic analyses, trends and insights about reliability performance will be identified, as well as effective measures and actions to address reliability risks. Performance Analysis has begun data mining of completed Event Analysis efforts to identify any insights from these events. This is important for as the grid evolves, these events may have been particularly relevant to enhanced grid reliability at the time of the original event investigation.

Performance Analysis is currently refining the composition of NERC's annual SOR report to expand the GADS data trend analysis and, for 2018, has begun reflecting post-seasonal reliability review, insights from analysis of the GADS, Transmission Availability Data System (TADS), and Demand Response Data System (DADS), and integration of event analysis and misoperations. Also, in 2019, the department will implement the decision of whether the SOR report should move from a Q1-Q4 report to a Q4-Q3 report. Current dynamics around validation and reporting of corporate metrics might even move the SOR report to a Q3Q2 reporting to accommodate the needs of this activity within a common reporting framework.

Further, Performance Analysis continues to work closely with other organizations, including but not limited to EPRI, DOE, IEEE, INPO, NATF, NAGF, and CEA. Performance Analysis collaborates with these groups on a number of fronts, including the TADS, GADS, and DADS.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

In 2019, Performance Analysis has a number of specific goals and deliverables in support of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, including:

- Issue the SOR report, guidelines, recommendations, and Alerts as needed (including the verification and validation of data and information through Regional Entities and technical committees, as required).
- Provide support and leadership to the OC, Operating Reliability Subcommittee (ORS), and RS and its working groups, the FWG, IIWG, and RWG, with emphasis on balancing operations and analysis, administration of balancing standards, and performance-based outreach to functional entities responsible for real-time BPS reliability.
- Continue the administration of the BAL standards, with emphasis on BAL-003-1 Frequency Response.
- Provide technical assistance to Compliance Assurance and Enforcement with emphasis on BAL-003-1 for the BA performance requirements that became effective in 2017.
- Develop quarterly BPS performance reports using PI Historian data and functionality to support the OC and RS.
- Oversee and evaluate reliability trends that identify reliability risks by analyzing data contained in GADS, TADS, and DADS, along with reliability metrics and protection and controls system misoperations data.
- Support Reliability Standards development by providing subject matter expertise.
- Provide support and leadership to the PC's subcommittees, working groups, and task forces, with primary focus on the Performance Analysis Subcommittee (PAS) and its subgroups.
- Assist in the development of approaches to registration and provide input to NERC staff in support of the development of CMEP risk elements.
- Conduct major event investigations, analyses, and reporting of major findings, recommendations, and lessons learned that will improve reliability.
- Provide insight on emerging system protection issues, and hand-off any issues gleaned with future implications to RASA.

Additionally, a major effort in 2019 will be the development of the technical report to be filed with FERC, in accordance with the directives set forth in Order 794, in addition to development of the Frequency Response Annual Analysis Report. Another major effort in 2019 will be the expansion of the PI Historian to include high speed frequency data from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, as well as interconnection inertia data to support efforts of the RS and ERSWG.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The increase of one position ( 0.94 FTEs) is the result of resource allocations to realign staff with current needs.

## Consultants and Contracts

Performance Analysis's budgeted consultant and contract expenses increased from $\$ 572 \mathrm{k}$ in 2018 to $\$ 654 \mathrm{k}$ in 2019, primarily due to an increased need for GADS, TADS, and DADS support. A detailed breakdown of 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract Costs.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Projection } \end{gathered}$ |  | iance <br> rojection <br> Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 4,533,448 | \$ | 4,533,448 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,132,484 | \$ | 599,036 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 43,478 |  | 43,478 |  | - |  | 41,724 |  | $(1,754)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 4,576,927 | \$ | 4,576,927 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,174,208 | \$ | 597,282 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | 50,000 |  | 50,000 |  | - |  | 40,000 |  | $(10,000)$ |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | 6,495 |  | 18,468 |  | 11,973 |  | 13,401 |  | 6,906 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 4,633,422 | \$ | 4,645,395 | \$ | 11,973 | \$ | 5,227,610 | \$ | 594,188 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 1,372,376 | \$ | 1,500,026 | \$ | 127,650 | \$ | 1,581,929 | \$ | 209,553 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 92,361 |  | 96,058 |  | 3,697 |  | 104,052 |  | 11,690 |
| Benefits |  | 154,799 |  | 165,524 |  | 10,725 |  | 186,375 |  | 31,576 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 154,224 |  | 161,005 |  | 6,781 |  | 176,656 |  | 22,433 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 1,773,760 | \$ | 1,922,613 | \$ | 148,853 | \$ | 2,049,012 | \$ | 275,252 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 11,000 | \$ | 11,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 11,000 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 80,000 |  | 76,708 |  | $(3,292)$ |  | 80,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 3,367 |  | 3,367 |  | 3,600 |  | 3,600 |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 91,000 | \$ | 91,075 | \$ | 75 | \$ | 94,600 | \$ | 3,600 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 572,030 | \$ | 572,030 | \$ | - | \$ | 653,565 | \$ | 81,535 |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 57,812 |  | 44,521 |  | $(13,291)$ |  | 76,290 |  | 18,478 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 143,999 |  | 252,434 |  | 108,435 |  | 295,995 |  | 151,996 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 774,341 | \$ | 869,485 | \$ | 95,144 | \$ | 1,026,350 | \$ | 252,009 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 2,639,101 | \$ | 2,883,173 | \$ | 244,072 | \$ | 3,169,962 | \$ | 530,861 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 2,103,037 | \$ | 2,481,396 | \$ | 378,359 | \$ | 2,445,656 | \$ | 342,619 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 4,742,138 | \$ | 5,364,569 | \$ | 622,431 | \$ | 5,615,618 | \$ | 873,480 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | $(108,716)$ | \$ | $(719,175)$ | \$ | $(610,458)$ | \$ | $(388,009)$ | \$ | $(279,293)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(143,999)$ | \$ | $(252,434)$ | \$ | $(108,435)$ | \$ | $(295,995)$ | \$ | $(151,996)$ |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 35,283 |  | $(92,919)$ |  | $(128,202)$ |  | $(92,014)$ |  | $(127,297)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | $(108,716)$ | \$ | $(345,353)$ | \$ | $(236,637)$ | \$ | $(388,009)$ | \$ | $(279,293)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET (=A+B) | \$ | 4,633,422 | \$ | 5,019,216 | \$ | 385,794 | \$ | 5,227,610 | \$ | 594,188 |
| FTEs |  | 9.40 |  | 9.54 |  | 0.14 |  | 10.34 |  | 0.94 |

## Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { E-ISAC (including CRISP) } \\ \text { (in whole dollars) }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Increase <br>

(Decrease)\end{array}\right]\)

## Background and Scope

The E-ISAC reduces cyber and physical risk to the electricity industry across North America by providing unique insights, leadership, and coordination. NERC formed the Electricity Sector Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ES-ISAC) in 1998 when the U.S. Secretary of Energy requested that NERC serve as the ISAC ${ }^{33}$ for the Electricity Subsector. ${ }^{34}$ NERC rebranded the ES-ISAC to the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center (E-ISAC) in September 2015. The current E-ISAC organizational structure is designed to support the three primary focus areas in support of its long-term strategy, which is discussed further below: information sharing, analysis, and engagement. The Programs and Engagement group manages the portfolio of E-ISAC products and services and is focused on ensuring stakeholder needs are understood and addressed. The Operations group consists of four teams. The Watch Operations team and CRISP team are primarily focused on information sharing, while the Cyber and Physical teams are focused on deeper analysis of incidents, threats, and mitigations. Both of the main groups support each other across the three focus areas wherever possible.

The E-ISAC also oversees CRISP, a unique public-private initiative between the E-ISAC, the North American electric utility industry, the DOE, and the U.S. Intelligence Community that delivers real-time, relevant, and actionable cybersecurity risk information to all E-ISAC member electricity asset owners and operators. The program leverages subject matter expertise and resources from the E-ISAC, DOE, the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), and the Argonne National Laboratory. Using passive information sharing devices (ISD) on participant networks outside boundary firewalls, packet header information is collected. The CRISP participation agreement contains strict data-handling procedures and guidelines. Participant data is used and then matched against known threat signatures-classified and unclassifiedto identify potential threats and provide participants with recommended mitigation steps. Aggregated indicators of compromise and other relevant security information are shared with all E-ISAC members, regardless of participation in CRISP.

In addition to voluntary reporting of security and threat information by industry participants, registered entities subject to Reliability Standard CIP-008-5 with High Impact and Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems are required to have processes in place for identifying Cyber Security Incidents, determining if a Cyber Security Incident is a Reportable Cyber Security Incident, and if so, notifying the E-ISAC. Further, in its Order No. 848 issued July 19, 2018, FERC directed NERC to develop and submit modifications to Reliability Standards to provide for mandatory reporting to the E-ISAC (and other organizations) of Cyber Security

[^16]Incidents that compromise, or attempt to compromise, a responsible entity's Electronic Security Perimeter or associated Electronic Access Control or Monitoring Systems.

Additionally, since 2011, the E-ISAC has sponsored a biennial grid security exercise (GridEx). This geographically-distributed exercise is designed to exercise the electricity industry's crisis response in handling simulated coordinated cyber and physical security threats and incidents, to strengthen utilities' crisis response functions and relationships with government emergency managers and law enforcement, and to provide input for lessons learned. Most recently, GridEx IV, held in November 2017, consisted of a two-day grid-focused operational exercise for participants across North America and a half-day tabletop discussion for executives. Over 6,500 participants from 450 industry and government organizations participated in GridEx IV. The E-ISAC manages the program and collects industry information during and after the exercise, subject to existing data collection and protection policies. During the exercise, E-ISAC watch and analysis staff exercise the E-ISAC mission and share crisis information and analysis towards mitigating the threats and attacks. Lessons learned and recommendations are shared with exercise participants via restricted reports, and are also shared publically at a high level.

Also since 2011, NERC has sponsored an annual grid security conference (GridSecCon). This conference brings together hundreds of industry and government subject matter experts on cyber, physical, and operations technology threats and solutions, with training sessions and classified or official use briefs on topics vital to grid security. The E-ISAC provides expertise and gathers appropriate speakers, panelists, and training providers.

E-ISAC staff also routinely engages stakeholders through monthly briefings and threat workshops. The briefings cover timely physical and cyber security topics with regards to critical infrastructure protection. Private and government partner representatives, including those from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (NCCIC), regularly discuss current events and risk mitigation strategies within the electricity industry audience. Special guest speakers from industry or security analysis firms also provide coverage of emerging threats and mitigation information.

## Key Efforts Underway: E-I SAC Long-Term Strategy

At the request of the Board and under the guidance of the ESCC and the ESCC MEC, E-ISAC executive leadership developed a long-term strategic plan, a copy of which is included as Exhibit E-E-ISAC LongTerm Strategy. The goal of the long-term strategic plan is to build the E-ISAC into a world-class, trusted source of quality analysis and rapid sharing of electricity industry security information. The MEC approved the long-term strategy on April 24, 2017. The strategy was accepted by the Board on May 11, 2017 and incorporated into NERC's 2018 BP\&B that was approved by both the Board and FERC. The E-ISAC's longterm strategy contemplates a measured increase in resources over a five-year period, with the exact timing of resource additions dependent on progress in execution of the long-term strategy and NERC's annual BP\&B process. Resource increases to augment existing capabilities for 2019 are detailed below under 2019 Goals and Deliverables, and in the attachment to Exhibit E, Expanding E-ISAC Operations to Include 24x7 Onsite Operations.

The three primary elements of the E-ISAC's long-term strategy are depicted in the chart below: information sharing, analysis, and engagement.


## Information Sharing

Timely and effective information sharing is critical to security risk identification and mitigation. Long-term strategy focus areas include the development and implementation of high priority notification procedures, automated information sharing technology, improving the functionality of the E-ISAC portal, and improving access of personnel to classified intelligence sources. The E-ISAC communication portal capabilities include publishing immediate notifications and other informational products, exchanging threat indicator information, and providing self-service access to user security awareness services. With the support of the IT department, the E-ISAC installed a completely new communication portal, incorporating important enhancements with improved functionality and capabilities, such as facilitating direct data exchange with E-ISAC members, other ISACs, and government partners, and establishing user communities that allow registered users to discuss security issues.

Additionally, beyond the portal notifications, the E-ISAC developed the Critical Broadcast Program (CBP) to deliver information rapidly to stakeholders about emerging security threats, based on the best analysis available at the time, with follow-on updates as more details emerge. The CBP allows a faster response to events and a higher level of awareness for members provided by E-ISAC analysts.

The E-ISAC has also broadened automated information sharing capabilities beyond CRISP, piloting a program using the Structured Threat Information Expression/Trusted Automated Exchange of Indicator Information (STIX/TAXII) protocols in use by many organizations, including the DHS. During 2017 and early 2018, the E-ISAC and several industry partners piloted the Cyber Automated Information Sharing System (CAISS). The pilot evaluated technological solutions for bi-directional communication, workflow between participants, the handling and vetting of shared information, and lessons learned from the technology and processes overall. The CAISS pilot will transition to an operational program in 2018 and will be available for voluntary participation from industry asset owners and operators.

## Analysis

E-ISAC management is making strategic investments in hiring and training skilled security analysts, identifying and leveraging additional technology, enhancing relationships with and access to government analysis sources, and developing strategic vendor relationships. Working with the NERC IT department, the E-ISAC is building a high-capacity data warehouse to support increasingly complex analytical needs. The data warehouse will assimilate all of the data feeds (including CRISP data) and allow greater correlation and pattern analysis by E-ISAC staff.

Building and maintaining highly skilled cyber and physical security analysis teams is a focus for the E-ISAC, and resource additions are necessary to provide the advanced skills required for analysis in an evolving and complex threat environment. The E-ISAC will also evaluate and where appropriate contract with outside service providers with security analysis expertise to support highly specialized analytical needs, as well as to supplement in-house capabilities.

The E-ISAC is also evaluating several strategic vendor relationships to provide additional data sources from an even wider range of industry participants to both strengthen and enhance existing programs, such as CRISP and CAISS. Available data sources, together with associated technological and analytical capabilities, will be identified, evaluated and, as appropriate, piloted with E-ISAC members to ensure viability.

## Engagement

Successful engagement with the electric sector and other stakeholders is critical to cyber and physical security risk identification and mitigation. There are many factors affecting increasing industry engagement, but perhaps the most vital is the trust of the members that shared information is protected. The E-ISAC has made and continues to make significant investments in physical and cyber security systems, procedures, training, and testing to ensure the security of industry data, and adopted a code of conduct to programmatically safeguard information shared by members.

After a successful pilot phase with several Large Public Power Council members, the E-ISAC recently launched an industry augmentation program that embeds industry security analysts at the E-ISAC to interact with E-ISAC staff, observe data collection and handling procedures, and share their own expertise with E-ISAC personnel. Participants also provide valuable feedback regarding their organizations' security practices and needs, which helps inform ongoing and future practices and programs within the E-ISAC.

The E-ISAC also regularly interacts with industry members, in coordination with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA), American Public Power Association (APPA), EEI, and CEA, by providing analyst briefings and information regarding E-ISAC programs and services. Through regional security events, such as NRECA's Rural Cooperative Cybersecurity Capabilities Program, the E-ISAC ensures that actionable security information is available across the industry landscape. The location of GridSecCon is rotated through a different Regional Entity each year. The E-ISAC is committed to being responsive to the needs of the wide range of industry members.

As described above, the new E-ISAC portal includes a user community capability that will allow groups of stakeholders with similar security concerns to collaborate directly with E-ISAC staff on a trusted, secure platform. Building on lessons learned from CRISP participants, the user communities will bring together expertise regarding common areas of issue and build trust through increased interaction among stakeholders.

Additionally, the E-ISAC is continually working to strengthen relationships between industry and government. These relationships are practiced regularly during GridEx and other exercises, and help build understanding between stakeholders that would be vital in responding to any crisis to the grid. Interfacing
smoothly with the government intelligence community would bring with it increased access to government-informed threat information and analysis, and a proposed specific function of additional EISAC staff. The E-ISAC is also engaged in regular communications with the DOE, DHS, and the FERC Office of Energy and Infrastructure Security, as well as continuing to build on its cross sector relationships with the other ISACs (financial sector, water, communications, and nuclear).

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

The E-ISAC remains focused on furtherance of the strategic efforts discussed above as 2019 marks the second year of the E-ISAC Long-Term Strategy. The following discusses areas of increased resource needs to fulfill strategic efforts in 2019 and the overall impact to the E-ISAC budget.

## Resources for 2019 Strategy

Watch Operations is the principal entry and egress point for information sharing between the E-ISAC and its members and partners. Information-both required reporting as well as voluntary shares-flows into the organization via portal postings, emails, phone calls, and other means and receives initial analysis by Watch Officers to determine (1) the severity of the event, (2) if it is part of an ongoing series of related event, and (3) whether it rises to the level that requires a "deeper dive" by cyber and physical security subject matter experts. The results of that analysis are shared in a format of greatest benefit to the recipient (operational intelligence for network defenders, recommended actions for leadership, the CBP, etc.). In effect, Watch Operations is responsible for sharing the "so what" that best allows the stakeholders to take the appropriate actions.

With the full support and encouragement of the MEC, the E-ISAC has evaluated resource requirements and options to phase in a $24 \times 7$ capability to more rapidly respond to threats outside of normal business hours, beyond a Watch Officer duty rotation. Details of this evaluation are available in the attachment to Exhibit E, Expanding E-ISAC Operations to Include $24 \times 7$ Onsite Operations.

The E-ISAC also requires expertise necessary to maintain critical links with the intelligence community, which is vital to supporting core analytical and information sharing functions. Key responsibilities of the Government Intelligence Interface team include (1) gathering intelligence community information relevant to the electricity sector and making timely reports of this information (edited as appropriate to avoid disclosure of classified information) available to industry through the E-ISAC, (2) providing electricity sector subject matter expertise required by the intelligence community to inform their intelligence efforts and enhance electricity sector security, (3) facilitating recurring threat update briefings with industry leadership and technical management at both secret and higher classification levels, and (4) supporting collaborative analysis of information between the E-ISAC and the intelligence community.

In support of the needs discussed above, in 2019 resources are being added to the E-ISAC as follows: four cyber analysts, four Watch officers (two for $24 \times 7$ capabilities), and one addition to the Government Intelligence Interface team. This increase is primarily to address immediate needs for increased analytical capabilities and expanded watch capabilities outside standard working hours as a first phase in providing the necessary resources for $24 \times 7$ operations. In addition, to support E-ISAC operations, two corporate support positions are being added, one in IT (business requirements analyst) and one in the finance area (budget analyst), as further outlined in the long-term strategy.

Additionally, the nature of evolving security threats requires ongoing specialized training and education for E-ISAC staff. As mentioned in the analysis section above, each technically-focused staff member requires significant resources to stay current in their field of expertise and obtain or maintain their certifications. Training requirements for 2019 have been identified and are reflected in personnel expense.

## Budget Impacts of 2019 Strategy

The total budget increase for E-ISAC in 2019 is $\$ 5.5 \mathrm{M}$, of which $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{M}$ is directly attributed to the costs for the second year of the E-ISAC long-term strategy, with the remaining $\$ 2.0 \mathrm{M}$ increase due primarily to the resulting allocation of indirect costs. Building on the resources and foundation put in place in the 2018 BP\&B, the E-ISAC 2019 budget reflects a continued measured approach in strengthening the required resources and technology required to support the three primary elements of the E-ISAC's long-term strategy: information sharing, analysis, and engagement.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The increase of 9 positions ( 8.46 FTEs) is to address the analytical capabilities discussed above in support of the long-term strategy for the E-ISAC. An additional two positions ( 1.88 FTEs) are being added to Administrative Programs areas for E-ISAC support activities.

## Consultants and Contracts

Consultant and contract expenses for the E-ISAC for 2019, including CRISP, are approximately $\$ 8.3 \mathrm{M}$, which is an increase of $\$ 886 \mathrm{k}$ from the 2018 budget. CRISP's consultant and contracts expenses are $\$ 6.5 \mathrm{M}$, which is $\$ 166 \mathrm{k}$ more than was in the 2018 budget. Total E-ISAC increases in 2019 are largely due to funding for GridEx planning, funding for vendor support costs to advance CRISP and other cyber security program participation by smaller municipal utilities, further enhancing the E-ISAC portal capabilities, and strengthening overall analytical capacity and capabilities. A detailed breakdown of the budgeted 2018 and 2019 costs is provided in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contractor Costs.

## Other Costs

The $\$ 250 \mathrm{k}$ increase for leasehold improvements is for facility costs associated with the growth in the EISAC in support of the E-ISAC long-term strategy. The $\$ 200 \mathrm{k}$ increase for computer and software capital expenditures is attributed to the upgrade for SAFNR, for which the total capital expenditure of $\$ 600 \mathrm{k}$ is split between Situation Awareness and the E-ISAC.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E-ISAC (including CRISP) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $2018$ <br> Projection |  | ariance <br> Projection 18 Budget r(Under) |  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | riance <br> Budget <br> 8 Budget <br> (Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments |  | 14,297,524 | \$ | 14,297,524 | \$ | - | \$ | 19,627,897 | \$ | 5,330,373 |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 134,783 |  | 134,783 |  | - |  | 155,517 |  | 20,735 |
| Total NERC Funding |  | 14,432,307 | \$ | 14,432,307 | \$ | - | \$ | 19,783,414 | \$ | 5,351,107 |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | 7,324,253 | \$ | 7,219,381 | \$ | $(104,872)$ | \$ | 7,486,353 | \$ | 162,101 |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |  | - |  | 70,000 |  | - |
| Interest |  | 24,038 |  | 75,459 |  | 51,421 |  | 55,859 |  | 31,822 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding |  | 21,850,597 | \$ | 21,797,147 | \$ | $(53,451)$ | \$ | 27,395,627 | \$ | 5,545,030 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 4,634,838 | \$ | 4,326,752 | \$ | $(308,087)$ | \$ | 6,297,594 | \$ | 1,662,756 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 290,702 |  | 256,721 |  | $(33,982)$ |  | 384,429 |  | 93,727 |
| Benefits |  | 578,849 |  | 551,542 |  | $(27,306)$ |  | 825,677 |  | 246,828 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 499,793 |  | 410,639 |  | $(89,154)$ |  | 672,423 |  | 172,630 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 6,004,182 | \$ | 5,545,653 | \$ | $(458,529)$ | \$ | 8,180,123 | \$ | 2,175,942 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 127,000 | \$ | 127,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 127,000 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 291,000 |  | 319,206 |  | 28,206 |  | 291,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 9,455 |  | 9,455 |  | - |  | - |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 418,000 | \$ | 455,661 | \$ | 37,661 | \$ | 418,000 | \$ | - |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 7,391,794 | \$ | 7,491,594 | \$ | 99,800 | \$ | 8,278,000 | \$ | 886,206 |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 907,330 |  | 909,443 |  | 2,113 |  | 903,196 |  | $(4,134)$ |
| Professional Services |  | 250,000 |  | 204,366 |  | $(45,634)$ |  | 250,000 |  | (0) |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 85,136 |  | 101,397 |  | 16,261 |  | 118,296 |  | 33,160 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 8,634,760 | \$ | 8,707,300 | \$ | 72,540 | \$ | 9,549,992 | \$ | 915,232 |
| Total Direct Expenses |  | 15,056,942 | \$ | 14,708,614 | \$ | $(348,328)$ | \$ | 18,148,115 | \$ | 3,091,173 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 6,519,415 | \$ | 6,039,624 | \$ | (479,790) | \$ | 9,004,572 | \$ | 2,485,157 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) |  | 21,576,357 | \$ | 20,748,238 | \$ | $(828,118)$ | \$ | 27,152,687 | \$ | 5,576,330 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 274,241 | \$ | 1,048,908 | \$ | 774,668 | \$ | 242,940 | \$ | $(31,301)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(85,136)$ | \$ | $(101,397)$ | \$ | $(16,261)$ | \$ | $(118,296)$ | \$ | $(33,160)$ |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  | - |  | 300,000 |  | 200,000 |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | 150,000 |  | 150,000 |  | - |  | 400,000 |  | 250,000 |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 109,377 |  | $(226,162)$ |  | $(335,538)$ |  | $(338,764)$ |  | $(448,141)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 274,241 | \$ | $(77,559)$ | \$ | $(351,800)$ | \$ | 242,940 | \$ | $(31,301)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET ( $=\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}$ ) |  | 21,850,597 | \$ | 20,670,680 | \$ | $(1,179,918)$ | \$ | 27,395,627 | \$ | 5,545,030 |
| FTEs |  | 29.14 |  | 23.22 |  | (5.92) |  | 37.60 |  | 8.46 |

## Training, Education, and Personnel Certification

| Training, Education, and Personnel Certification (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | Increase (Decrease) |  |
| Total FTEs |  | 5.88 |  | 3.76 |  | (2.12) |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 1,708,013 | \$ | 1,369,674 | \$ | $(338,339)$ |
| Indirect Expenses |  | 1,314,398 |  | 889,330 |  | $(425,069)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets |  | 20,613 |  | $(35,379)$ |  | $(55,991)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET | \$ | 3,043,024 | \$ | 2,223,625 | \$ | $(819,399)$ |

## Background and Scope

## Training and Education

The Training and Education program provides oversight for coordination and delivery of learning materials, resources, and activities to allow for training and education of (1) ERO Enterprise staff supporting statutory and delegation-related activities and (2) BPS industry participants consistent with ERO functional program requirements.

The Training and Education program supports NERC's responsibilities to develop, adopt, and obtain approval of Reliability Standards and to monitor, enforce, and achieve compliance with the mandatory standards. Section 901 of the NERC ROP addresses the program's obligations to industry stakeholders and ERO Enterprise staff. The responsibility to participate in the program is shared among the NERC departments, ${ }^{35}$ in conjunction with the ERO Enterprise working groups.

NERC's Continuing Education program acknowledges high-quality learning activities within the electric utility industry by approving continuing education providers that meet NERC guidelines and standards. System Operator Certification, which is detailed below, is maintained by completing NERC-approved continuing education courses and activities. The OC's Personnel Subcommittee, composed of industry training experts, provides oversight of the Continuing Education program. Section 902 of the NERC ROP addresses the specific continuing education program expectations and activities.

## Personnel Certification

The System Operator Certification program ensures that personnel operating the BPS have the skills, training, and qualifications needed to operate the system reliably. NERC maintains credentials for over 7,500 System Operator credential holders who work in various industry areas across North America. NERC's System Operator Certification exam is designed to test specific knowledge of job skills and Reliability Standards, and prepares operators for complying with requirements of Reliability Standards and appropriately operating the BPS during normal and emergency operations. The System Operator Certification program is governed by the NERC Personnel Certification Governance Committee (PCGC), an industry group of operations experts, trainers, and supervisors. Certification exams are created by the PCGC's Exam Working Group (EWG), an industry group of operations subject matter experts. Under the PCGC oversight, the EWG reviews and updates job tasks and certification exams. Section 600 of the NERC ROP addresses the Personnel Certification activities in the area of System Operator Certification.

[^17]
## Key Efforts Underway

## Training and Education

The ERO provides learning materials, resources, and activities to assist industry and ERO Enterprise staff in their understanding of key program areas. These areas include:

- Reliability Standards;
- Risk-based compliance monitoring and enforcement;
- Organization Registration and Certification;
- Event Analysis, cause analysis, Performance Analysis, and lessons learned;
- RASA; and
- Continuing education for System Operators.


## Personnel Certification

The Personnel Certification department is performing the following activities:

- Continuing to update the System Operator Certification Exam Item Bank to ensure relevance to current Reliability Standards and promote reliability of the BPS;
- Developing the exam "skills assessment" process to better assess the skills and knowledge of System Operators;
- Developing a strategic plan for the System Operator Certification program; and
- Evaluating credential review and rationalization to maintain credentials.

Additionally, the PCGC approved and launched the System Operator Certification Continuing Education Database (SOCCED) to a new platform in 2018. The new platform will provide accurate and meaningful data to assist with the System Operator Certification program.

## 2019 Goals and Deliverables

## Training and Education

The annual NERC and ERO Enterprise Learning Priorities Plan articulates and prioritizes the accumulated learning needs for the ERO Enterprise and the potential delivery vehicles supporting achievement of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan goals. Development and management of the annual plan is exercised through monthly meetings to ensure priorities are reviewed and updated based on the changing business landscape informed through input received by the various functional program managers on behalf of their respective programs, ERO Enterprise working groups, and leadership teams.

An objective-based approach describing audience needs facilitates identification and formulation of products throughout the year. It inspires modular (interchangeable parts or building blocks) thought in implementing a cross-cutting multi-use product model. Production is accomplished by combining inhouse expertise and tools with vendor support to increase bandwidth that positively impacts the quality and timeliness of customer service.

NERC program leads spearhead the effort to identify gaps in program knowledge and associated learning needs of their employees, industry stakeholders, and ERO Enterprise partners. The following objectives serve as foundational building blocks for ongoing learning development work and will inform the priorities of focus in 2019 and beyond:

- Educate industry on managing risk to the reliability of the BPS based on the results of technical assessment and analysis, standards development, and human performance knowledge.
- Enhance ERO Enterprise compliance monitoring personnel performance through a deeper understanding of ERO Enterprise compliance monitoring processes and technical aspects of the BPS operations.
- Improve NERC employee understanding of NERC functions and core technical knowledge for regulating the BES.

NERC will deliver training and education products and resources by hosting workshops and webinars, as well as computer-based and instructor-led training courses. The responsibility for subject matter expertise input to the learning development process is shared among multiple departments at NERC. The Training and Education department provides coordination and synchronization efforts for shared NERC and ERO Enterprise learning responsibilities in addition to advancing and improving the skills of the NERC operating staff. The Human Resources department funds and manages the delivery of individual corporate employee training and continuing education programs in concert with the coordination efforts of the Training and Education department.

The Continuing Education program evaluates and revises the current program criteria as reflected in the program manual. The evaluation considers the growth and maturation of industry programs, as well as ongoing research in the area of adult learning to ensure that the Continuing Education program efforts improve core objectives in addition to fostering improvement of training and promoting quality industry training programs in general. The Continuing Education program will remain focused on NERC System Operator credential maintenance in 2019. The program will share funding responsibilities with the Personnel Certification program for SOCCED and the associated help desk tool.

## Personnel Certification

With the successful delivery of the certification exams using Linear on the Fly Testing (LOFT), which is the dynamic creation of exams, the PCGC has reduced the exam delivery cycle from 36 months to a dynamic process every time an exam is initiated by a candidate. As part of the ongoing exam development cycle, the EWG will continue to develop and analyze new items for future certification exams and ensure relevancy to current Reliability Standards.

In 2019, the PCGC will focus on further development of the System Operator Certification program strategic plan, which will include but is not limited to analyzing data from the System Operator Certification program survey and white papers to the industry. The PCGC is dedicated to enhancing the System Operator Certification program to assure reliable operation of the BPS. Key deliverables for the System Operator Certification program include:

- Annual analysis of the System Operator Certification Exam Item Bank;
- New exam items;
- Enhancement to the credential maintenance tool; and
- Strategic plan action items for program enhancements.

Personnel Certification will continue to work with industry stakeholders and the exam development vendor to create certification exams that will promote reliability of the BPS.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The 2.12 reduction in FTEs is the result of the elimination of one open position from the Training, Education, and Personnel Certification department and the reallocation of resources to realign staff with current needs.

## Consultants and Contracts

Consultant and contract expenses decreased to $\$ 335$ k for 2019 from $\$ 348 \mathrm{k}$ in 2018 , primarily due to decreased costs to support the continuing education program, partially offset by an increase in support costs for course development. A detailed breakdown of 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract Costs.

## Other Costs

The $\$ 64 \mathrm{k}$ increase for office costs is due primarily to software subscription and support costs for the new database system, which is being reclassified from contracts and consultants in the 2018 budget.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRAINING, EDUCATION, and PERSONNEL CERTIFICATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | 2018 <br> rojection |  | riance <br> Projection <br> 8 Budget <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2019 \\ & \text { 3udget } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | 1,309,031 | \$ | 1,309,031 | \$ | - | \$ | 569,839 | \$ | $(739,192)$ |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | 17,391 |  | 17,391 |  | - |  | 7,586 |  | $(9,805)$ |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | 1,326,422 | \$ | 1,326,422 | \$ | - | \$ | 577,426 | \$ | $(748,997)$ |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | 1,790,000 |  | 1,689,757 |  | $(100,243)$ |  | 1,790,000 |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | 4,060 |  | 17,839 |  | 13,779 |  | 4,873 |  | 814 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | 3,120,482 | \$ | 3,034,018 | \$ | $(86,464)$ | \$ | 2,372,299 | \$ | $(748,183)$ |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 701,307 | \$ | 532,876 | \$ | $(168,431)$ | \$ | 461,613 | \$ | $(239,694)$ |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 52,088 |  | 43,197 |  | $(8,892)$ |  | 34,613 |  | $(17,475)$ |
| Benefits |  | 95,207 |  | 73,777 |  | $(21,430)$ |  | 78,388 |  | $(16,820)$ |
| Retirement Costs |  | 79,353 |  | 62,239 |  | $(17,113)$ |  | 51,167 |  | $(28,185)$ |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 927,956 | \$ | 712,089 | \$ | $(215,867)$ | \$ | 625,781 | \$ | $(302,175)$ |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 44,250 | \$ | 44,250 | \$ | - | \$ | 44,250 | \$ | - |
| Travel |  | 17,000 |  | 16,353 |  | (647) |  | 17,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | 6,735 |  | 6,735 |  | 1,200 |  | 1,200 |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 61,250 | \$ | 67,338 | \$ | 6,088 | \$ | 62,450 | \$ | 1,200 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 598,900 | \$ | 598,900 | \$ | - | \$ | 497,000 | \$ | $(101,900)$ |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 117,969 |  | 118,197 |  | 228 |  | 182,024 |  | 64,055 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | 500 |  | 500 |  | - |  | 500 |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 1,439 |  | 1,919 |  | 480 |  | 1,919 |  | 480 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 718,808 | \$ | 719,516 | \$ | 708 | \$ | 681,443 | \$ | $(37,364)$ |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 1,708,013 | \$ | 1,498,942 | \$ | $(209,071)$ | \$ | 1,369,674 | \$ | $(338,339)$ |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 1,314,398 | \$ | 1,295,320 | \$ | $(19,078)$ | \$ | 889,330 | \$ | $(425,069)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 3,022,411 | \$ | 2,794,262 | \$ | $(228,149)$ | \$ | 2,259,004 | \$ | $(763,408)$ |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 98,071 | \$ | 239,756 | \$ | 141,686 | \$ | 113,295 | \$ | 15,224 |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(1,439)$ | \$ | $(1,919)$ | \$ | (480) | \$ | $(1,919)$ | \$ | (480) |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 22,052 |  | $(48,505)$ |  | $(70,557)$ |  | $(33,460)$ |  | $(55,511)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 20,613 | \$ | $(50,424)$ | \$ | $(71,037)$ | \$ | $(35,379)$ | \$ | $(55,991)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGET ( $=\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}$ ) | \$ | 3,043,024 | \$ | 2,743,838 | \$ | $(299,186)$ | \$ | 2,223,625 | \$ | $(819,399)$ |
| FTEs |  | 5.88 |  | 4.98 |  | (0.90) |  | 3.76 |  | (2.12) |

## Administrative Programs

| Administrative Programs (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | Increase <br> (Decrease) |  | 2018 Budget | FTEs <br> 2019 Budget | Increase <br> (Decrease) |
| General \& Administrative | \$ | 10,096,147 | \$ | 10,654,921 | \$ | 558,774 | 15.98 | 14.10 | (1.88) |
| Legal and Regulatory |  | 2,914,377 |  | 3,878,791 |  | 964,414 | 10.34 | 13.16 | 2.82 |
| Information Technology |  | 11,266,626 |  | 11,696,532 |  | 429,907 | 22.33 | 23.50 | 1.18 |
| Human Resources \& Administration |  | 1,704,459 |  | 2,562,371 |  | 857,913 | 2.82 | 9.40 | 6.58 |
| Finance and Accounting |  | 4,008,326 |  | 2,553,747 |  | (1,454,579) | 15.98 | 7.52 | (8.46) |
| Total Administrative Programs | \$ | 29,989,934 | \$ | 31,346,363 | \$ | 1,356,429 | 67.45 | 67.68 | 0.23 |

## Program Scope and Functional Description

NERC's Administrative Programs area includes the budget for all business and administrative functions of the organization, including (1) General \& Administrative, which includes Board fees and expenses, the CEO, CRO and support staff, communications, external affairs and governmental relations, and office rent; (2) Legal and Regulatory; (3) Information Technology; (4) Human Resources \& Administration; (5) Finance and Accounting; and (6) other general administrative expenses necessary to support program area activities. These functions are necessary to the existence and functioning of the organization and support the performance of NERC's ERO statutory activities. The costs of the Administrative Programs functions are allocated to the statutory programs as indirect expenses. The resource requirements and comparative budget information for each of these functions are described below.

## Technical Committees and Members' Forum Program

While NERC management and staff will continue to interact with and support numerous reliability-related forums (e.g., the NATF and NAGF), NERC's 2019 budget does not contain specific funding for any forum activities.

## General $\&$ Administrative

## Background and Scope

The General \& Administrative area is responsible for the administration and general management of the organization. Expenses allocated in this area include office rent as well as personnel and related costs of (1) the CEO, the CRO, and their support staff; (3) communications, external affairs, and government relations staff; and (4) Board costs. The 1.88 decrease in FTEs is the result of resource allocations to realign staff with current needs. Consultant and contract expenses for this area are increasing $\$ 140 \mathrm{k}$ due to consulting work for strategic support for the E-ISAC and effectiveness and efficiency initiative.

The following table details the Board costs included in the total costs of the General and Administrative area.

| Board of Trustee Expenses | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meeting and Travel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quarterly Board Meetings | \$ | 185,000 | \$ | 185,000 | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
| Trustee Travel |  | 130,000 |  | 130,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Total | \$ | 315,000 | \$ | 315,000 | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
| Professional Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Independent Trustee Fees | \$ | 1,237,500 | \$ | 1,410,000 | \$ | 172,500 | 13.9\% |
| Trustee Search Fees |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  |  | 0.0\% |
| Total | \$ | 1,337,500 | \$ | 1,510,000 | \$ | 172,500 | 12.9\% |
| Total | \$ | 1,652,500 | \$ | 1,825,000 | \$ | 172,500 | 10.4\% |

The increase in independence trustees fees is due to (1) the results of the 2018 annual review and periodic independent study of trustee compensation, which recommended, subject to approval by the Board, a $\$ 5,000$ increase per trustee each year for 2019-2021, and (2) the addition of a trustee per the Board's decision to search for this new trustee in 2018 instead of 2019. This decision was made to reduce the number of trustee searches that would need to be conducted in 2019 as a result of the coinciding term expirations of two current trustees.

## Legal and Regulatory

## Background and Scope

The Legal and Regulatory department supports the following key NERC program areas: Compliance Analysis, Organization Certification and Registration, RASA, RRM, and Reliability Standards. In addition, the Legal and Regulatory department is responsible for providing a wide range of legal support to the NERC management team regarding antitrust, corporate, commercial, insurance, contract, employment, real estate, copyright, tax, legislation, and other legal matters. The department also addresses legal and regulatory matters that arise in connection with the delegation agreements with the Regional Entities. Lastly, the Legal and Regulatory department also includes the internal audit and corporate risk management functions.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The increase of three positions ( 2.82 FTEs) is the result of resource allocations to realign staff with current needs.

## Professional Services

Outside law firms and consultants supporting this area are budgeted and tracked as Professional Services. The Professional Services budget for 2019 increased $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ as compared to 2018 primarily due to added support costs for the E-ISAC strategy.

## I nformation Technology

## Background and Scope

NERC's IT department plan includes capital and operating expenses required to support, build, configure, and enhance applications that serve registered entities, Regional Entities, and NERC staff. The plan also includes work related to ERO Enterprise data analysis, as well as ongoing NERC and E-ISAC internal operations.

The focus of budget funding for 2019 and 2020 is primarily on applications designed to better support effectiveness and consistency across the ERO Enterprise in the areas of Reliability Standards, Compliance Monitoring, Enforcement, Registration, and the associated assessment of reliability risk. These applications include the CMEP Technology Project and complementary solutions for entity registration and standards data. The entity registration application will consolidate core registration functions currently distributed across three applications into a single registration application. In similar fashion, the three applications used across NERC and the Regional Entities for enforcement processing will be replaced by a single common application that also provides compliance monitoring functionality. Additionally, a standards database solution will be developed to work in concert with the compliance and enforcement application. These investments will provide broad benefits across the ERO Enterprise in terms of the effectiveness and efficiency of operations and meeting reliability goals. Additionally, by providing more tools and systems to registered and Regional Entities, associated economies of scale will result from these investments, increasing value across the ERO Enterprise in the years to come.

The 2019-2021 planning period also includes improvements to NERC's public facing website (NERC.com), funding for GADS solar data (GADS Solar), GADS wind data (GADS Wind), and a rewrite or replacement of the Resource Adequacy application.

The IT budget is broken down into four categories as follows:

- ERO Enterprise new functionality - Items listed in this category are those items designed to add, enhance, or improve capabilities for registered entities, Regional Entities, and NERC staff. This includes the Entity Registration application, the CMEP Technology Project, NERC.com, and other applications.
- ERO Enterprise infrastructure and support - Items listed in this category are those infrastructure and support items required for applications used by registered entities, Regional Entities, and NERC staff. Items include security and applications used by the ERO Enterprise such as The Events Analysis Management System (TEAMS), the Bulk Electric System Notification and Exception System tool (BESnet), the Standards Balloting System (SBS), the Reliability Coordinator Information System (RCIS), User Management and Records (UMR), and numerous other applications.
- NERC new functionality - There is no new functionality targeted for NERC in the 2019-2021 planning period. The budget continues to be heavily focused on improving the registered entity and Regional Entity experience.
- NERC infrastructure and support - Items listed in this category are primarily those items required to maintain and run the internal office infrastructure and support NERC staff operations, including business continuity and disaster recovery. Items include server hardware and software licenses, network equipment, data and telecommunication circuits, and data storage, as well as office administrative applications (e.g., Microsoft Office) and user hardware such as laptops and peripherals.

A further discussion of each item is outlined below.

## ERO Enterprise New Functionality

As noted above, this category is primarily those applications or systems designed to improve or add capability to registered entities, Regional Entities, and NERC staff. Over the past two years, IT has successfully deployed a number of new applications and functionalities for the ERO Enterprise that have now moved into support. In 2019 and beyond, IT will continue that trend with a heavy focus on Entity Registration and the CMEP Technology Project.

- Entity Registration - The objective of the Entity Registration application is to take the core registration functions currently distributed across three systems-the OATI Compliance Data Management System (webCDMS), Guidance Compliance Information Tracking System (CITS), and Guidance CRATS—and move those functions to a single, consolidated registration system. Doing so will allow for an expansion of current functionality, more control over the future of the application, and ultimate reduction in costs through the long-term transfer of the remaining functions provided by those three systems into a single, common system.

This program is being implemented via multiple projects over four years. This first project in 2017 addressed the registration, tracking, and management of CFRs. Subsequent projects will address Joint Registration Organizations (JROs), tracking coordinated oversight of MRREs, consolidating all existing entity registration functions into a single platform, adding validation of business relationships and functional responsibilities, and the capability to integrate reliability and compliance data for risk analysis purposes (supporting the creation of an entity's risk profile).

- CMEP Technology Project - IT will work closely with the Regional Entities through 2020 to evaluate and implement strategic investments in tools that replace the current three applications mentioned above with a single, consolidated application. The scope of the project includes how Reliability Standards and entity registration data will be integrated with the tool, as well as how best to support the various parts of the CMEP process (e.g., analysis of risk, development of implementation plans and audit schedules, actual compliance monitoring, and enforcement processing). For more information on the CMEP Technology Project, see Exhibit F - CMEP Technology Project.

Funding for any capital investments in these areas will be subject to review and approval as part of the BP\&B application in the year when such investments are proposed to be made. Prior to actual start of each project, the project will be reviewed through the enterprise information technology investment planning process to ensure the project's estimated costs and benefits are reasonable and justify investment. For more information on this process, see Robust Planning for New Capital Projects section below.

- Additional tools - IT will continue to support the business in future years though the provision of software products that meet the analysis, communication, data collection, and analysis needs of the ERO Enterprise. Examples include the collection and analysis of solar generation performance data, further analysis of wind generation performance data, additional data collection and analysis to support and enhance reliability assessments, and further improvement of the effectiveness and efficiency of communications with stakeholders and industry participants.


## ERO Enterprise Infrastructure and Support

This category primarily consists of items used by registered entities, Regional Entities, and NERC staff. IT has worked closely with the Regional Entities to design and configure a number of ERO Enterprise applications, with a bias toward using commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) technology whenever possible. Infrastructure and support for these COTS tools (such as SharePoint and the Dynamics xRM platform), as
well as custom built applications developed in the past, require ongoing investment to maintain continuous operations. For many applications and systems, this includes the cost of maintaining development, quality assurance, and staging and production environments, which are required to ensure the security and operational integrity and stability of the multiple applications supported for the ERO Enterprise, including the necessary redundancy and business continuity hardware, network and licenses to ensure operational availability of these important business assets. These applications and systems are monitored, tested (including penetration and vulnerability testing), and maintained in a manner as to ensure the highest level of integrity, security, and availability to the roughly 4,000 users across North America.

IT continues to place emphasis on ensuring the environment is configured in a manner consistent with enterprise best practices, ensuring the security and integrity of the environment while allowing ERO Enterprise users to obtain the information and resources required to perform various analyses. Ongoing support for new applications, such as The Event Analysis Management System (TEAMS), the Misoperations Information Data Analysis System (MIDAS), the Standards Balloting System (SBS), and the Reliability Assessment Data System (RADS), in addition to numerous older ERO Enterprise products (such as GADS, TADS, and DADS), make up this portion of the IT budget.

## NERC New Functionality

There is no new functionality planned for the NERC environment in the 2019-2021 planning period.

## NERC Infrastructure and Support

As previously noted, NERC infrastructure and support are those items required to maintain and support the internal infrastructure for NERC staff, to include those items necessary for business continuity and disaster recovery. Items such as file servers, network equipment, storage, Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Email, SharePoint, etc.), along with security and telecommunications, are required to ensure staff have the necessary tools and technology to perform their daily operational functions. Emphasis continues to be placed on optimizing the amount of effort placed on NERC infrastructure and support in order to minimize spend on internal office steady state operations, allowing a larger portion of IT resources to focus on new ERO Enterprise functionality as well as ERO Enterprise infrastructure and support. Examples of items included in internal operations are outlined below:

- CRATS - This compliance database is used to track violations, mitigation plans, and reporting required by NERC as the ERO. The database has additional modules, such as the Reliability Standards, Technical Feasibility Exceptions (TFEs), and Registration module, which contains a list of all registered entities. Funding requirements include ongoing maintenance for the CRATS compliance tool. As noted above, the CRATS application will be replaced in 2020 by an enterprise CMEP tool used by NERC, the Regional Entities, and registered entities. Reduced funding for support of the CRATS application in 2020 and beyond will be required for historical purposes.
- Meeting manager, ERO membership, central repository of curtailment events - NERC maintains a number of legacy applications. Many of the legacy applications were developed and implemented five to ten years ago and are unable to benefit from contemporary application development. Some of these applications may have to be completely rewritten, or moved to the xRM application platform, as IT was able to do with Application Broker, NERC MyAccount, and the User Management Program (UMP) in 2016. Funding in 2019-2021 is required for ongoing maintenance and enhancements until the applications can be rewritten or moved to the xRM platform or, in some cases, potentially divested or transferred to industry support.
- Quarterly penetration and vulnerability testing of all NERC networks and systems - Expert consulting services to provide intrusion detection and vulnerability testing of NERC.com and NERC's network, applications, and systems, is an essential requirement for operations. NERC is
subject to frequent intrusion attempts where external parties try to gain access to its systems. Any vulnerability identified is documented and provided to NERC IT for rapid remediation.
- NERC security program - NERC's IT department performs a number of technology initiatives to ensure the security of the network and infrastructure. In order to continually improve security, a more holistic approach is required that implements technology improvements and constructs an overarching security program to ensure all aspects of security have been considered, including information classification, review of retention policies, and enforcement of security guidelines. Security remains an intensive focus area throughout the 2019-2021 budget cycle and increasing cyber security threats will continue to put pressure on the IT budget to meet demands.


## Robust Planning for New Capital Projects

NERC has adopted an enterprise IT investment planning methodology that ensures only projects with compelling and approved business cases are funded. The approval process uses four approval gates:

- Business unit sponsor approval;
- NERC vice president/chief technology officer (CTO) approval;
- ERO Technology Leadership Team (TLT) (comprised of the NERC CEO and three Regional Entity CEOs) approval; and
- Approval from all NERC and Regional Entity CEOs.

NERC's planning process and associated approval gates result in thorough review of both costs and benefits of the proposed technology project prior to moving forward with the project. The benefits of a given project are evaluated within the context of six identified value domains:

- Reducing reliability risk (the project is expected to address one or more identified risks to reliability);
- Increasing capability (the project is expected to make possible activities or analysis that are not currently possible given existing process, resource, or system limitations);
- Reducing corporate risk (the project is expected to address one or more corporate risks, such as reputational risk, contract risk, or litigation risk);
- Increasing work quality (the project is expected to reduce the probability of errors or provide information of better quality);
- Increasing productivity (the project is expected to increase the amount of work that can be completed within the same amount of time); and
- Reducing cost (the project is expected to provide a net reduction in costs related to the area(s) being addressed by the project).

As projects progress, complete, and mature, periodic evaluations of the manifesting benefits against the projections used within the business case are performed. This helps to create organizational discipline by ensuring projections are realistic and not unreasonably optimistic. NERC also considers potential benefits to the Regional Entities and registered entities when considering potential IT investments, which ensures recognition of Regional Entity staffing and budget impacts within the business case analysis, identifying economies of scale, and benefits to ERO Enterprise stakeholders through IT investment.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The 1.18 FTE increase is the result of the addition of one position in support of the E-ISAC long-term strategy and the reallocation of resources to realign staff with current needs.

## Consultants and Contracts

The consultant and contract budget decreased slightly to $\$ 2.0 \mathrm{M}$ in 2019 from $\$ 2.1 \mathrm{M}$ in 2018. A detailed breakdown of 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses are shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract Costs.

## IT Office Costs

The below table shows the major categories of IT Office Costs, and a short description of certain categories follows thereafter. Explanations for the major areas of increase from the 2018 budget to the 2019 budget are provided in Table B-8 in Section B.

| Office Costs | Budget <br> 2018 |  | Budget$2019$ |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telephone | \$ | 162,100 | \$ | 96,351 | \$ | $(65,749)$ | -40.6\% |
| Internet |  | 358,920 |  | 219,750 |  | $(139,170)$ | -38.8\% |
| Computer Supplies |  | 98,100 |  | 177,000 |  | 78,900 | 80.4\% |
| Software License and Support* |  | 1,773,030 |  | 2,336,000 |  | 562,970 | 31.8\% |
| Subscription and Publications |  | 126,200 |  | 131,000 |  | 4,800 | 3.8\% |
| Dues |  | 2,500 |  | 2,500 |  |  | 0.0\% |
| Express Shipping |  | 7,500 |  | 7,500 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Audio/Visual and Hardware Lease** |  | 640,336 |  | 752,529 |  | 112,193 | 17.5\% |
| Total | \$ | 3,168,686 | \$ | 3,722,630 | \$ | 553,944 | 17.5\% |

*Combined Software and Maintenance/Service Agreement accounts to streamline accounting activities
${ }^{* *}$ Combined Audio/Visual and Hardware Lease accounts to streamline accounting activities

## Telephone

Telephone costs are items associated with cellular phone, satellite phone (for business continuity), mobile laptop cellular air card, and Session Internet Protocol (SIP) data circuits.

## Internet

Internet expense is comprised of both primary and secondary data circuits to ensure continuous capability in the event of primary service provider failure.

## Computer Supplies

Computer supplies are expense items required for infrastructure support.

## Software License and Support

Includes non-capital software subscription and license costs, and related support agreements. Also includes costs for support and service agreements related to NERC infrastructure management software, data center co-location, offsite backup of data, and network and security monitoring.

## Audio/Visual and Hardware Leases

Consists of lease payments for audio visual equipment, computers, laptops, servers, and switches that were leased, in lieu of purchasing, beginning in January 2017.

## Fixed Asset (Capital) Expenses

The following table presents a summary of NERC's IT 2019 fixed asset (capital) budget ${ }^{36}$ compared to the 2018 budget:

| IT Capital Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Budget $2019$ |  | Variance <br> 19 Budget <br> v 2018 <br> Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hardware (storage, servers) | \$ | 705,000 | \$ | 465,000 |  | $(240,000)$ | -34.0\% |
| Other Equipment |  | 370,000 |  | 425,000 |  | 55,000 | 14.9\% |
| Disaster Recovery |  | 100,000 |  | - |  | $(100,000)$ | -100.0\% |
| NERC Software Licenses |  | 301,000 |  | 120,000 |  | $(181,000)$ | -60.1\% |
| Total | \$ | 1,476,000 | \$ | 1,010,000 | \$ | $(466,000)$ | -31.6\% |

As in prior years, the goal of the fixed assets (capital) program for the 2019-2021 planning period is to provide access, visibility, and analysis of data from many different sources. This requires ongoing investments in hardware, software, and associated tools. The overarching theme is to securely gather, analyze, and maintain data across the ERO Enterprise to support ERO operations. Adding the capability to centralize and mine data-in addition to foundational elements such as the Microsoft xRM application, SharePoint 2013, and disaster recovery and enhanced security-sets the stage for vastly improved reporting and business intelligence. It also allows the capability for collaboration and sharing of information vital to the ERO's mission.

In addition to the investments described in the preceding paragraph to support efficiency and consistency across the ERO Enterprise, the 2019 budget also includes the cost of network assets, software, servers, laptops, security, and other hardware to support daily operations.

## Human Resources \& Administration

## Background and Scope

Human Resources \& Administration primarily includes human resources and facilities and meeting planning functions. NERC's human resources functions include staffing, benefits administration, employee relations, performance and compensation management, and training and development. Management has implemented a robust, objective, and auditable performance management system to track corporate and individual performance against pre-established goals, objectives, and measures. Each year NERC continues to refine and improve this system.

## Leadership, Management, and Professional and Administrative Staff Training and Development

As part of the ERO Enterprise's ongoing efforts to engage and retain highly qualified talent with the leadership and technical skills to support its mission, NERC's executives, managers, and professional and support staff participate in ongoing training and development to improve competencies critical to success and succession planning for critical roles. As such, NERC will continue to invest in learning opportunities in several areas. First, Human Resources will continue to host and optimize an e-leaning platform, SkillSoft, to provide staff resources for improving soft and technical skills. Second, Human Resources will provide broad-based staff development training though real-world access via tours of and training on control centers, electric substations, and power generation plants. Finally, staff will have access to additional

[^18]education, including but not limited to degree-oriented university education, pursuit of specialized certifications, and other in-house and external training that provides essential competencies and skills development that will lead to improved organization performance.

## Compensation Strategy

NERC relies on data and advisory from multiple perspectives to hire and retain the necessary technical and other staff to support the goals and objectives in the company's operating plan. Under the mandate of the Board Corporate Governance and Human Resources Committee (CGHRC), NERC performs periodic market compensation studies to benchmark the pay practices of similar organizations and roles for which NERC hires. To ensure that NERC is able to attract the best-qualified staff to meet our mission, the CGHRC recommended a compensation philosophy of paying between the $50^{\text {th }}$ and $75^{\text {th }}$ percentiles, which has historically enabled the company to hire appropriate skills at prevailing market rates. Management will continue to closely monitor market conditions through periodic compensation studies and real-time pay trends of our candidate pool and expect that our pay philosophy will sustain the ability to hire qualified talent consistent with appropriate market levels.

## Compensation Consulting

Consultants are periodically retained to examine appropriate compensation based on current market data. This ensures that decisions affecting compensation are made in light of the current market climate and that qualified employees are attracted and retained within a defined total remuneration range. NERC also periodically retains compensation subject matter experts to perform periodic assessments of the Board compensation model to ensure alignment with market practices.

## Surveys

NERC periodically retains a vendor to conduct Board and committee effectiveness surveys to identify improvement opportunities. Human Resources will also launch additional surveys as appropriate, based on business needs, which may include periodic internal climate surveys.

## Succession Planning

Minimizing disruption of knowledge, skill, and experience of key staff is critical to the company's success. Human Resource works with senior management to identify essential roles and develop strategies to build succession and contingency plans for any loss of staff.

## Human Resources Products and Services Automation

Human Resource will continue to operate, maintain, and investigate investment in additional electronic platforms for Human Resource support services that reduce administrative burden and improve employee access to tools and information.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The increase of seven positions (6.58 FTEs) is primarily the result of a reclassification from the finance and accounting department to human resources and administration to better reflect actual activities and functions.

## Consultants and Contracts

The consultant and contract budget increased to $\$ 690$ k in 2019 from $\$ 640 \mathrm{k}$ in 2018 primarily due to increased funding for human resources and compensation-related consulting services. A detailed breakdown of 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract Costs.

## Miscellaneous Expenses

Miscellaneous expenses include community responsibility and employee engagement, the year-end employee appreciation event, and employee rewards and recognition.

## Finance and Accounting

## Background and Scope

NERC's Finance and Accounting department manages all finance and accounting functions, including employee payroll, $401(\mathrm{k})$, $457(\mathrm{~b})$, and 457 (f) plans, travel and expense reporting, monthly financial reporting, sales and use tax, and insurance. This area also holds primary responsibility for the development of the annual BP\&B. Over the past several years, NERC's Finance and Accounting department implemented additional policies, procedures, and controls governing day-to-day practices including contract and personnel procurements, expense reimbursement, and back office systems and procedures. The department will continue to refine, improve and, where necessary, implement additional procedures and controls.

## Resource Requirements

## Personnel

The reduction of eight positions ( 7.52 FTEs) is primarily the result of a reclassification from the finance and accounting department to the human resources and administration department to better reflect actual activities and functions.

## Consultants and Contracts

The consultant and contract budget increased to $\$ 475 \mathrm{k}$ in 2019 from $\$ 427 \mathrm{k}$ in 2018 primarily for outside auditor consulting support. A detailed breakdown of 2018 and 2019 budgeted expenses is shown in Exhibit B - Consultant and Contact Costs.

| Statement of Activities and Fixed Assets Expenditures 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2018 <br> Budget |  | $2018$ <br> Projection |  | ariance <br> Projection <br> 18 Budget <br> r(Under) |  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | ariance 9 Budget 18 Budget r(Under) |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ERO Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NERC Assessments | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(1,067,980)$ | \$ | $(836,587)$ |
| Assessment Stabilization Reserve - Penalties |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total NERC Funding | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(1,067,980)$ | \$ | $(836,587)$ |
| Third-Party Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Testing Fees |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Funding | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | - | \$ | (1,067,980) | \$ | $(836,587)$ |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries |  | 1,625,482 | \$ | 12,266,032 | \$ | 640,550 | \$ | 11,965,297 | \$ | 339,815 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 651,076 |  | 643,202 |  | $(7,875)$ |  | 666,617 |  | 15,541 |
| Benefits |  | 1,443,502 |  | 1,601,455 |  | 157,953 |  | 1,610,374 |  | 166,872 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 1,010,928 |  | 979,171 |  | $(31,757)$ |  | 1,032,835 |  | 21,907 |
| Total Personnel Expenses |  | 4,730,988 | \$ | 15,489,860 | \$ | 758,872 | \$ | 15,275,124 | \$ | 544,135 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 375,500 | \$ | 375,500 | \$ | - | \$ | 360,500 | \$ | $(15,000)$ |
| Travel |  | 570,000 |  | 531,026 |  | $(38,974)$ |  | 570,000 |  | - |
| Conference Calls |  | 119,600 |  | 96,547 |  | $(23,053)$ |  | 94,800 |  | $(24,800)$ |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 1,065,100 | \$ | 1,003,073 | \$ | $(62,027)$ | \$ | 1,025,300 | \$ | $(39,800)$ |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 3,290,966 | \$ | 3,583,232 | \$ | 292,266 | \$ | 3,447,763 | \$ | 156,797 |
| Office Rent |  | 3,091,804 |  | 3,087,919 |  | $(3,885)$ |  | 3,335,058 |  | 243,254 |
| Office Costs |  | 3,874,198 |  | 3,962,551 |  | 88,353 |  | 4,454,347 |  | 580,149 |
| Professional Services |  | 2,287,500 |  | 2,249,022 |  | $(38,478)$ |  | 2,507,600 |  | 220,100 |
| Miscellaneous |  | 34,500 |  | 34,500 |  | - |  | 77,000 |  | 42,500 |
| Depreciation |  | 981,159 |  | 2,050,840 |  | 1,069,681 |  | 2,235,443 |  | 1,254,284 |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 3,560,127 | \$ | 14,968,064 | \$ | 1,407,937 | \$ | 16,057,212 | \$ | 2,497,084 |
| Total Direct Expenses |  | 29,356,216 | \$ | 31,460,998 | \$ | 2,104,782 | \$ | 32,357,635 | \$ | 3,001,419 |
| Indirect Expenses |  | (29,495,094) |  | $(31,626,096)$ | \$ | $(2,131,002)$ | \$ | $(32,571,806)$ | \$ | $(3,076,712)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | 138,878 | \$ | 165,098 | \$ | 26,220 | \$ | 214,171 | \$ | 75,293 |
| Total Expenses (A) | \$ | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | (0) | \$ | - | \$ | (0) |
| Change in Assets | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | 0 | \$ | (1,067,980) | \$ | $(836,587)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(981,159)$ | \$ | $(2,050,840)$ | \$ | $(1,069,681)$ | \$ | $(2,235,443)$ | \$ | $(1,254,284)$ |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 301,000 |  | 301,000 |  | - |  | 120,000 |  | $(181,000)$ |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | 1,175,000 |  | 565,559 |  | $(609,441)$ |  | 890,000 |  | $(285,000)$ |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | $(494,841)$ |  | 1,184,281 |  | 1,679,122 |  | 1,225,443 |  | 1,720,284 |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets (B) | \$ | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | (0) | \$ | - | \$ | (0) |
| TOTAL BUDGET (=A+B) | \$ | 0 | \$ | - | \$ | (0) | \$ | - | \$ | (0) |
| FTEs |  | 67.45 |  | 66.42 |  | (1.02) |  | 67.68 |  | 0.23 |

## Section B - Supplemental Financial Information

## Breakdown by Statement of Activity Sections

The following detailed schedules support the consolidated Statement of Activities.

## Table B-1 - Operating Reserve and Assessment Analysis

| Operating Reserve and Assessment Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statutory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Operating Reserves Balance - 1/1/2018 | Total Reserves |  | Future Obligation Reserve ${ }^{1}$ |  | Operating <br> Contingency <br> Reserve |  | System <br> Operator Certification Reserve |  | CRISP <br> Reserve |  | Assessment Stabilization Reserve |
|  |  | 9,844,365 | \$ | 3,015,787 | \$ | 3,680,094 | \$ | 477,484 | \$ | 500,000 | \$ 2,171,000 |
| Generation or (Use) from 2018 Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| From 2018 budgeted operations | \$ | $(634,392)$ | \$ | $(480,457)$ | \$ | $(231,393)$ | \$ | 77,458 | \$ | - | \$ |
| From 2018 approved addition/(use) of reserves |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
| Proceeds from financing activities (non-current portion only) |  | 1,432,000 |  | - |  | 1,432,000 |  | - |  | - | - |
| Debt service |  | $(717,274)$ |  | - |  | $(717,274)$ |  | - |  | - | - |
| Other addition/(use) of reserves |  | $(971,679)$ |  | $(15,759)$ |  | $(328,120)$ |  | $(27,800)$ |  | - | $(600,000)$ |
| Projected Operating Reserves - 12/31/18 |  | 8,953,020 | \$ | 2,519,571 | \$ | 3,835,307 | \$ | 527,142 | \$ | 500,000 | \$ 1,571,000 |
| Required Working Capital and Operating Reserves - 12/31/19 |  | 8,571,237 | \$ | 2,039,114 | \$ | 3,835,307 | \$ | 675,816 | \$ | 500,000 | \$ 1,521,000 |
| Adjustment in funding to achieve required reserve balance |  | $(331,783)$ |  | $(480,457)$ |  | - |  | 148,674 |  | - | - |
| Penalty sanctions received 7/1/2017-6/30/2018 (See Table B-2) |  | 500,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | 500,000 |
| Less: Assessment Stabilization Reserve Release - Penalties |  | $(550,000)$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | $(550,000)$ |
| Total Adjustments to Reserves | \$ | $(381,783)$ | \$ | $(480,457)$ | \$ | - | \$ | 148,674 | \$ | - | \$ (50,000) |
| Assessment Reconciliation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 Expenses and Capital Expenditures |  | 80,049,655 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less: Assessment Stabilization Reserve Release - Penalties |  | $(550,000)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjustment in funding to achieve required reserve balance |  | 148,674 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less: Other Funding Sources |  | $(9,696,353)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less: Proceeds from financing activities (non-current only) |  | $(2,178,667)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plus: Debt service |  | 1,110,687 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 NERC Assessment |  | 68,883,995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^19]
## Table B-2 - Penalties

## Penalty Sanctions

The NERC Policy - Accounting, Financial Statement and Budgetary Treatment of Penalties Imposed and Received for Violations of Reliability Standard, as well as $\S 1107.2$ of the ROP, specify that penalty monies received by NERC during the 12 months ended June 30 are to be used in the subsequent budget year to offset assessments. In 2015, the Board approved an updated Working Capital and Operating Reserves Policy that was approved by FERC. This updated policy allows NERC, with Board and FERC approval pursuant to $\S 1107.4$ of the ROP, to place penalty funds into an Assessment Stabilization Reserve for use in future years to offset assessments. For the 2019 budget, subject to Board and FERC approval, NERC will deposit $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$ of penalty funds collected during the period July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018 into the Assessment Stabilization Reserve. NERC will also, subject to Board approval, use \$550k from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve to reduce 2019 assessments. The balance held in the Assessment Stabilization Reserve will be used for future assessment offsets.

## Allocation Method

Penalty sanctions released from the Asset Stabilization Reserve to offset 2019 assessments will be allocated to the following statutory programs to reduce assessments: (1) Reliability Standards, (2) Compliance Assurance, (3) Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, (4) Compliance Enforcement, (5) RASA, (6) Situation Awareness, (7) Event Analysis,( 8) Performance Analysis, (9) E-ISAC (including CRISP), and (10) Training and Education. Penalty sanctions are allocated based on the number of FTEs in the program divided by the aggregate total FTEs in the programs receiving the allocation.

All penalties received during the 12-month period ended June 30, 2018 are detailed in the table below, including the amount and date received.

## Penalties received between 7/1/2017 and 6/30/2018

November-17

Penalties received prior to 6/30/2017, held in the assessment stabilization reserve
Total penalties available on $1 / \mathbf{1 / 2 0 1 9}$ to offset assessments

## Adjustments

Total penalties released to offset assessments in the 2019 Budget Total penalties held in Assessment Stabilization Reserve 12/31/2019

| $\$$ | 500,000 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | 500,000 |


| $\$$ | $1,571,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | $2,071,000$ |


| $\$$ | $(550,000)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | $1,521,000$ |

Table B-3 - Outside Funding

| Outside Funding Breakdown By Program (Excludes Penalty Sanction) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reliability Standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workshops | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 60,000 | \$ | 10,000 |
| Interest Income Allocation |  | 10,717 |  | 18,884 |  | 8,166 |
| Total | \$ | 60,717 | \$ | 78,884 | \$ | 18,166 |
| Compliance Analysis, Registration and Certification |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income Allocation | \$ | 6,495 | \$ | 12,183 | \$ | 5,688 |
| Total | \$ | 6,495 | \$ | 12,183 | \$ | 5,688 |
| Compliance Assurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income Allocation | \$ | 13,316 | \$ | 21,320 | \$ | 8,005 |
| Total | \$ | 13,316 | \$ | 21,320 | \$ | 8,005 |
| Compliance Enforcement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income Allocation | \$ | 8,444 | \$ | 17,056 | \$ | 8,612 |
| Total | \$ | 8,444 | \$ | 17,056 | \$ | 8,612 |
| Reliability Assessment and System Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services and Software | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Workshops |  | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  | - |
| Interest Income Allocation |  | 9,743 |  | 19,493 |  | 9,750 |
| Total | \$ | 34,743 | \$ | 44,493 | \$ | 9,750 |
| Performance Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services and Software | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 40,000 | \$ | $(10,000)$ |
| Interest Income Allocation |  | 6,495 |  | 13,401 |  | 6,906 |
| Total | \$ | 56,495 | \$ | 53,401 | \$ | $(3,094)$ |
| Training, Education, and Personnel Certification |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Testing Fees | \$ | 540,000 | \$ | 540,000 | \$ | - |
| Certificate Renewals |  | 650,000 |  | 650,000 |  | - |
| Continuing Education Fees |  | 600,000 |  | 600,000 |  | - |
| Interest Income Allocation |  | 4,060 |  | 4,873 |  | 814 |
| Total | \$ | 1,794,060 | \$ | 1,794,873 | \$ | 814 |
| Event Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workshops | \$ | 40,000 | \$ | 40,000 | \$ | 0 |
| Interest Income Allocation |  | 7,794 |  | 14,620 |  | 6,825 |
| Total | \$ | 47,794 | \$ | 54,620 | \$ | 6,825 |
| Situation Awareness |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income Allocation | \$ | 3,897 | \$ | 7,310 | \$ | 3,413 |
| Total | \$ | 3,897 | \$ | 7,310 | \$ | 3,413 |
| E-ISAC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Third Party Funding (CRISP) | \$ | 7,324,253 | \$ | 7,486,353 | \$ | 162,101 |
| Workshops |  | 70,000 |  | 70,000 |  | - |
| Interest Income Allocation |  | 24,038 |  | 55,859 |  | 31,822 |
| Total | \$ | 7,418,290 | \$ | 7,612,213 | \$ | 193,922 |
| Grand Total | \$ | 9,444,253 | \$ | 9,696,353 | \$ | 252,101 |

- Interest Income Allocation - The aggregate $\$ 90 \mathrm{k}$ increase is the result of higher anticipated interest rates in 2019.
- Third Party Funding (CRISP) - The \$162k increase is due to the increase in NERC costs, which are funded equally by participants in CRISP and through assessments.

Table B-4 - Personnel

| Personnel | Budget <br> 2018 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries | \$ | 31,791,098 | \$ | 33,810,276 | \$ | 2,019,179 | 6.4\% |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 1,949,557 |  | 2,044,880 |  | 95,324 | 4.9\% |
| Benefits |  | 3,988,886 |  | 4,673,208 |  | 684,322 | 17.2\% |
| Retirement |  | 3,239,565 |  | 3,423,826 |  | 184,261 | 5.7\% |
| Total | \$ | 40,969,105 | \$ | 43,952,190 | \$ | 2,983,085 | 7.28\% |
| FTEs |  | 199.28 |  | 204.92 |  | 5.64 | 2.8\% |
| Cost per FTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 159,530 | \$ | 164,993 | \$ | 5,463 | 3.4\% |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 9,783 |  | 9,979 |  | 196 | 2.0\% |
| Benefits |  | 20,016 |  | 22,805 |  | 2,789 | 13.9\% |
| Retirement |  | 16,256 |  | 16,708 |  | 452 | 2.8\% |
| Total | \$ | 205,586 | \$ | 214,485 | \$ | 8,899 | 4.33\% |

Below is additional information on the components of personnel expense:

- Salaries - Total salary expense is comprised of base salaries, incentive compensation, deferred compensation, employment agency fees, and temporary office expenses. The 2019 budget for base salaries assumes a 3\% increase over actual 2018 base salaries and is inclusive of market adjustments and promotions. The 2019 budget for incentive compensation is based on historical actuals and is comparable to prior years. The 2019 budgets for deferred compensation, employment agency fees, and temporary office expenses are generally consistent with 2018.
- Benefits are budgeted to increase $17.2 \%$ based on (1) a $7.5 \%$ increase in health and dental premiums and (2) an increase in training expenses to support staff development.
- There have been no changes to NERC's retirement plans.


## Table B-5 - Meetings

|  |  |  | Variance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meetings | Budget | Budget | 2019 Budget <br> v 2018 Budget | Variance \% |  |  |

## Table B-6 - Consultants and Contracts

NOTE: This table has been replaced by Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract Costs

## Table B-7 - Rent

| Office Rent | Budget 2018 |  | Budget 2019 |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Rent | \$ | 2,819,554 | \$ | 3,122,808 | \$ | 303,254 | 10.8\% |
| Maintenance |  | 272,250 |  | 212,250 |  | $(60,000)$ | -22.0\% |
| Total | \$ | 3,091,804 | \$ | 3,335,058 | \$ | 243,254 | 7.9\% |

- The $\$ 303 \mathrm{k}$ increase in office rent is attributed to facility expansion for the Atlanta office to provide additional meeting space in order to reduce future offsite meeting expenses.
- The $\$ 60 \mathrm{k}$ decrease in maintenance costs is due to a historical trend of lower facility maintenance costs.


## Table B-8 - Office Costs

| Office Costs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telephone | \$ | 422,387 | \$ | 312,851 | \$ | $(109,536)$ | -25.9\% |
| Telephone Answering Service |  | 2,750 |  | 1,200 |  | $(1,550)$ | -56.4\% |
| Internet |  | 383,966 |  | 241,500 |  | $(142,466)$ | -37.1\% |
| Office Supplies |  | 190,750 |  | 175,700 |  | $(15,050)$ | -7.9\% |
| Computer Supplies |  | 106,100 |  | 183,500 |  | 77,400 | 73.0\% |
| Software License and Support* |  | 2,954,942 |  | 4,140,834 |  | 1,185,892 | 40.1\% |
| Subscription and Publications |  | 194,970 |  | 228,420 |  | 33,450 | 17.2\% |
| Dues |  | 66,911 |  | 69,611 |  | 2,700 | 4.0\% |
| Postage |  | 15,540 |  | 10,540 |  | $(5,000)$ | -32.2\% |
| Express Shipping |  | 26,992 |  | 28,992 |  | 2,000 | 7.4\% |
| Copying |  | 115,842 |  | 117,642 |  | 1,800 | 1.6\% |
| Audio/Visual and Hardware Lea |  | 640,336 |  | 752,529 |  | 112,193 | 17.5\% |
| Equipment Repair/Service Cont |  | 132,497 |  | 132,497 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Bank Charges |  | 25,000 |  | 25,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Merchant Card Fees |  | 86,100 |  | 86,100 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Total | \$ | 5,365,084 | \$ | 6,506,917 | \$ | 1,141,833 | 21.3\% |

*Combined Software and Maintenance/Service Agreement accounts to streamline accounting activities
**Combined Audio/Visual and Hardware Lease accounts to streamline accounting activities

- Telephone - The $\$ 110 \mathrm{k}$ decrease is primarily related to lower conference call expenses due to a change in service providers.
- Internet - The $\$ 142 \mathrm{k}$ decrease is the result of cost reductions through vendor negotiation.
- Computer Supplies - The $\$ 77 \mathrm{k}$ increase, which is partially offset by the decrease in costs for office supplies, is due to higher spending than budget.
- Software License and Support - The $\$ 1.2 \mathrm{M}$ increase is primarily the result of annual software subscription and support costs of $\$ 459 \mathrm{k}$ for the new CMEP software tool, and a higher historical trend than previously budgeted in non-capital software and support expenses. The increase in 2019 is partially offset by a lower capital expenditure budget in NERC software costs.
- Audio/Visual and Hardware Lease - The $\$ 112 \mathrm{k}$ increase is the result of anticipated leases of new computer and hardware equipment.


## Table B-9 - Professional Services

| Professional Services | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ 2019 \text { Budget } \\ \text { v } 2018 \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Independent Trustee Fees | \$ | 1,237,500 | \$ | 1,410,000 | \$ | 172,500 | 13.9\% |
| Trustee Search Fees |  | 100,000 |  | 100,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Outside Legal |  | 595,500 |  | 645,500 |  | 50,000 | 8.4\% |
| Lobbying |  | 72,000 |  | 72,000 |  |  | 0.0\% |
| Accounting and Auditing Fees |  | 128,000 |  | 128,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Insurance Commercial |  | 231,000 |  | 225,000 |  | $(6,000)$ | -2.6\% |
| Outside Services |  | 173,500 |  | 177,100 |  | 3,600 | 2.1\% |
| Total | \$ | 2,537,500 | \$ | 2,757,600 | \$ | 220,100 | 8.7\% |

- Independent Trustee Fees - The $\$ 172 \mathrm{k}$ increase in independence trustees fees is due to (1) the results of the 2018 annual review and periodic independent study of trustee compensation, which recommended, subject to approval by the Board, a $\$ 5,000$ increase per trustee every year for 2019-2021, and (2) the addition of a trustee per the Board's decision to search for this new trustee in 2018 instead of 2019. This decision was made to reduce the number of trustee searches that would need to be conducted in 2019 as a result of the coinciding term expirations of two current trustees.
- Outside Legal - The $\$ 50 \mathrm{k}$ increase is primarily due to support costs for the E-ISAC long-term strategy.


## Table B-10 - Miscellaneous

| Miscellaneous Expenses | Budget | Budget | Variance <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ Budget |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{v 2 0 1 8}$ Budget | Variance \% |

- Employee Rewards and Recognition - The $\$ 22 \mathrm{k}$ increase is due to additional budgeting for staff spot awards as part of the employee recognition program.
- Sponsorships - The $\$ 20 \mathrm{k}$ increase is the result of a reclassification of expenses formerly budgeted under meetings that are more appropriately categorized as sponsorships.


## Table B-11 - Other Non-Operating Expenses

| Other Non-Operating Expenses | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property and Other Tax Expense | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 120,000 | \$ | 70,000 | 140.0\% |
| Interest Expense |  | 88,878 |  | 94,171 |  | 5,293 | 6.0\% |
| Total | \$ | 138,878 | \$ | 214,171 | \$ | 75,293 | 54.2\% |

- Property and Other Tax Expense - The \$70k increase is due to federal excise taxes for parking and mass transit expenses, which is a new expense item and is based on recent changes to federal tax laws.
- Interest Expense - Budgeted interest expense is calculated based on expected draws on the capital financing loans and the projected interest rate on the loans. Refer to Exhibit C Capital Financing for additional information related to debt repayment and the interest expense calculation.


## Table B-12 - Fixed Assets

| Fixed Assets | Budget | Budget | Variance <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ Budget <br> v 2018 Budget |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Variance \% |  |  |  |

As discussed in the Introduction and Executive Summary, expenditures for fixed assets, excluding the reversal of depreciation expense, are budgeted to be $\$ 904 \mathrm{k}$ more in 2019 compared to 2018. This increase is primarily due to increased expenditures on ERO Enterprise software projects and leasehold improvements for the E-ISAC.

## Table B-13-2019-2020 Projections NOTE: Refer to the Executive Summary section on page 18



## Section C - Non-Statutory Activity

NERC has no non-statutory activities.

# Exhibit A - Application of NERC Section 215 Criteria 

# DISCUSSION OF HOW THE NERC MAJOR ACTIVITIES <br> IN THE 2019 BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET <br> MEET THE NERC WRITTEN CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHETHER A <br> RELIABILITY ACTIVITY IS ELIGIBLE TO BE FUNDED UNDER FEDERAL POWER ACT SECTION 215 

## I. Introduction

This Exhibit discusses how the major activities in NERC's 2019 Business Plan and Budget meet the NERC written criteria for determining whether a reliability activity is eligible to be funded under $\S 215$ of the Federal Power Act ("FPA §215"). This Exhibit is intended to satisfy Recommendation No. 38 resulting from the financial performance of NERC conducted by the Commission's Division of Audits ("DA") in 2012-2013 and adopted by the Commission in its November 2, 2012 order on NERC's 2013 Business Plan and Budget. ${ }^{37}$ NERC submitted the written criteria to the Commission in a compliance filing dated February 21, 2013 in Docket No. FA11-21-000. ${ }^{38}$ The Commission approved the NERC written criteria, with modifications, in an order issued in that docket on April 18, 2013. ${ }^{39}$ The NERC written criteria as used in this Exhibit incorporate the modifications specified in the Compliance Order. ${ }^{40}$

## II. Reliability Standards Program 2018 Major Activities

The major activities of the Reliability Standards Program are described at pages 20-22 of the 2019 Business Plan and Budget. The Reliability Standards Program carries out the ERO's responsibility to develop, adopt, obtain approval of, and modify as and when appropriate, mandatory Reliability Standards to assure the Bulk Electric System (BES) is planned, operated, maintained, and secured to minimize risks of cascading failures, avid damages to major equipment, or limit interruptions. The major activity areas for this program include (1) providing project management and leadership to the reliability standard development process to deliver high-quality, continent-wide reliability standards, both new and modified, to address reliability risks identified through the Reliability Risk Management Process (RRMP), including standard development outreach activities, facilitation of drafting team activities, drafting support, assisting drafting teams in adhering to the processes in the Standard Processes Manual, and ensuring that the quality of documents produced are appropriate for approval by industry and the NERC Board; (2) facilitating continent-wide industry engagement in the standard development processes; and (3) conducting industry balloting on standards, disseminating information on standards and the standard development processes, and supporting regulatory filings and proceedings relating to standards. Additionally, the Reliability Standards Program provides technical advice and final quality review for Regional Entity standards development processes, presents proposed regional standards to the NERC Board, and prepares submissions for approval of regional standards to the applicable regulatory authorities in the U.S. and Canada.

[^20]For 2019, the major activities of the Reliability Standards Program will continue to focus on (1) selection of standards projects to be undertaken based on the nature of the reliability issue, and whether a standard or another solution is most appropriate to address the issue; (2) addressing Commission directives and responding to Commission orders as necessary through the standards process; (3) implementing the results of the comprehensive review of standards conducted in 2017 and completed in 2018 by initiating projects to modify or retire standards; and (4) facilitating smooth transitions to new standards, including by working with the NERC Compliance Assurance, Compliance Enforcement, Organization Registration, Reliability Assurance, Reliability Assessment and System Analysis (RASA), and Performance Analysis groups to develop guidelines, webinars, and other activities to support auditor and industry training for new standards. In 2019, the Reliability Standards Program, in conjunction with stakeholders, will determine whether there is a need to make further improvements to Reliability Standards through periodic reviews that include a measured review of the contents of standards, considering whether the requirements could more effectively mitigate risks to the Bulk Power System (BPS); whether the standards are results-based and drafted with high quality; whether the standards are concise or if the number of requirements could be reduced; and whether compliance expectations are clear.

The major activities of the Reliability Standards Program satisfy the following criteria:
I.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for Reliability Standards development projects pursuant to the NERC Rules of Procedure (ROP)?
I.B: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for providing guidance and assistance to Regional Entities in carrying out Regional Reliability Standards development activities?
I.C: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information for Reliability Standards development, including for purposes of identifying areas in which new Reliability Standards could be developed, existing Reliability Standards could be revised, or existing Reliability Standards could be eliminated?
I.D: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training and education concerning Reliability Standards development processes, procedures, and topics for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, (iii) industry personnel?
II.F.1: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training, education and dissemination of information for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, and (ii) industry personnel with respect to compliance monitoring and enforcement topics and topics concerning reliability risks identified through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities, such as (1) Requirements of Reliability Standards, including how to comply and how to demonstrate compliance? This includes development of guidance and interpretation documents.

IV: Is the activity one that was required or directed by a Commission order issued pursuant to §215? (Reliability Standards development projects are often initiated in response to directives in Commission orders).

V: Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)? (The applicable ROP
provisions for the Reliability Standards Program are §300 and Appendix 3A.)
VI: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the supervision and oversight of Regional Entities in the performance of their delegated responsibilities in accordance with FPA §215, 18 C.F.R. Part 39, the Commission-approved delegation agreement between NERC and the Regional Entity, the NERC ROP, and applicable provisions of Commission orders?
IX. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for NERC and Regional Entity committees, subcommittees and working groups engaged in activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria?
X. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the analysis and evaluation of activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria for the purpose of identifying means of performing the activities more effectively and efficiently?

## III. Compliance Assurance, Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, and Compliance Enforcement Program Area 2019 Major Activities

The major activities of the Compliance Assurance, Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, and Compliance Enforcement Program Area are described on pages 24-27, 29-31, and 3337 of the 2019 Business Plan and Budget. This Program Area is comprised of three operational groups: (1) Compliance Assurance, (2) Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, and (3) Compliance Enforcement.

The Compliance Assurance group works collaboratively with the Regional Entities to ensure effective implementation of risk-based compliance monitoring under the Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program ("CMEP") across the entire ERO Enterprise. This group's activities include the following major activities and functions: (1) oversight of the Regional Entities' implementation of the risk-based compliance monitoring program and the NERC Rules of Procedure (ROP), including ensuring that Regional Entities monitor registered entities for compliance according to their specific facts and circumstances, developing customized compliance oversight plans (COPs) for each registered entity based on its inherent risk assessment (IRA), evaluation of controls in place to mitigate the inherent risks, and other factors; (2) overseeing Regional Entities' IRAs of registered entities; (3) oversight of the quality implementation of the risk-based compliance monitoring program; (4) development and execution of the annual CMEP Implementation Plan; (5) oversight of use of necessary compliance-related processes, procedures, IT platforms, tools and templates; (6) development and delivery of education and training for ERO Enterprise staff; (7) training and outreach activities for the Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Reliability Standards; (8) coordinating with the NERC Standards department to assist in smoot transition for standards from development to enforceability and to provide feedback on risks seen in the field that are not addressed by a standard, as well as information on whether a standard is too broad; and (9) supporting Regional Entity and industry committees, working groups and task forces, such as the ERO Compliance Monitoring Group, NERC Compliance and Certification Committee (CCC) and NERC Critical Infrastructure Protection Committee (CIPC). Compliance Assurance provides training to Regional Entity staff on the important elements of risk-based compliance monitoring. Compliance Assurance is also participating, in conjunction with the Regional Entities, on the development and implementation of a common CMEP tool through the CMEP Technology Project.

The ongoing and new major activities of the Compliance Assurance group for 2019 will include: (1) continuing to mature the risk-based compliance program, including ongoing oversight of the risk-based

CMEP, IRAs, internal controls, coordinated oversight of Multi-Region Registered Entities, and ensuring that COPs are addressing the relevant risks; (2) working with NERC Enforcement and IT and with Regional Entity staffs on development of the CMEP Process tool; (3) supporting the continued successful implementation of CIP V5 standards and subsequent enhancements as they become effective; (4) monitoring and supporting effective implementation and monitoring of the Physical Security Reliability Standard; (5) enhancing and implementing training to support monitoring of compliance with Reliability Standards, integrating principles from the Compliance Monitoring Competency Guide; (6) continuing to provide feedback to the Standards Program through integration of the standards and compliance functions for clear stakeholder implementation, and feedback on risks seen on the field that are not addressed by a standard or where a standard is too broad, supporting this effort through a common set of Reliability Standard Audit Worksheets (RSAWs), guidance, and outreach; (7) supporting international CMEP activities including reliability and security subject matter expertise and outreach; and (8) providing support and leadership to applicable committees and subcommittees including the CIPC and the CCC. Additionally, in conjunction with the dissolution of the SPP Regional Entity, NERC, through the Compliance Assurance Group, will take responsibility for the Compliance Enforcement Authority (CEA) activities with respect to the SPP Regional Transmission Organization (RTO) registered functions. NERC expects to assume responsibility as the CEA for the SPP RTO in the second half of 2018, and anticipates that this responsibility will continue for at least the ensuing two years.

Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification is comprised of two groups: Registration and Reliability Assurance (the latter group includes Compliance Analysis and Organization Certification). These groups are responsible for a range of requirements and activities embodied in Section 500 and Appendices 5A and 5B of the NERC ROP, including providing technical resource support to the standards development, compliance monitoring, and enforcement functions. Major activities of these groups include: (1) Registration - identifying and registering BES users, owners, and operators that are responsible for compliance with Commission-approved Reliability Standards; (2) Certification - evaluation and certification of the competency of Reliability Coordinators (RC), Balancing Authorities (BA), and Transmission Operators (TOP) to perform their respective responsibilities and that they continue to maintain these capabilities; (3) Reliability assurance - conducting activities to reasonably assure the ERO that certain actions have been taken as reported in response to NERC Alerts or guidance to industry; (4) Oversight - providing oversight of Regional Entity implementation of regional registration, compliance, certification, investigation, and complaint programs and processes; (5) Investigations - conducting investigations to identify possible violations of Reliability Standards in response to complaints, BES disturbances, or other triggers, including participating on all Regional Entity-led investigations and as observers as requested on Commission-led reliability investigations and inquiries; (6) Compliance evaluations - working with Regional Entity staff to confirm that qualified events and disturbances are evaluated against the relevant Reliability Standards and to ensure formal compliance monitoring occurs if indicated; and (7) Complaints - addressing formal complaints that allege violations of Reliability Standards. Specific major activities of Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification for 2018 will include continuing to conduct NERC-led panels on registration requests; continuing to implement registration program improvements and certification program improvements identified in prior years, including conducting training as necessary; and evaluating BES disturbances and events for potential gaps in compliance monitoring or reliability standards.

The Registration group continues to implement areas for improvement in registration processes identified in 2016, including conducting NERC-led Review Panels on registration requests and identifying process improvements; changes to applicable provisions of the NERC ROP; reviewing the Coordinated Functional Registration processes and model efficiencies; supporting the entity registration xRM data base (a centralized entity registration system) initiative; conducting a thorough review of the NERC website for
registration-related modifications; and continuing regional Entity oversight activities. In addition, the Registration group is assisting in managing the transition of registered entities formerly in the SPP Regional Entity (SPP RE) to SERC and Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO), due to the termination of the SPP Regional Delegation Agreement and dissolution of the SPP RE.

During 2019, the Registration and Reliability Assurance groups will continue to conduct NERC-led Panel Reviews on registration requests; continue to implement Registration program improvements including conducting additional actions identified by this project; begin the registration xRM initiative; continue to monitor the transition of registered entities from the SPP RE to SERC and MRO; monitor and support changing footprints, functional relationships, and model changes in the Western interconnection, especially with respect to the RC role; ensure proper oversight of Regional Entities for the Certification program; respond to industry changes requiring certification review, with emphasis on control center relocations, Energy Management System replacements, and RC, BA and TOP footprint changes; evaluate BES disturbances and events for potential gaps in compliance monitoring or Reliability Standards; and support the ongoing joint Commission, NERC and Regional Entity restoration and recovery initiatives.

The Compliance Enforcement group is responsible for overseeing enforcement processes, the application of Penalties or sanctions, and activities to mitigate and prevent recurrence of noncompliance with Reliability Standards. This group works collaboratively with the Regional Entities to ensure consistent and effective implementation of the risk-based CMEP. It also focuses on ensuring that the ERO Enterprise dedicates resources to the matters that pose the greatest risk to reliability. The Compliance Enforcement group monitors Regional Entities' enforcement processes and provides oversight over the outcomes of such processes, to ensure due process, identify best practices and process efficiency opportunities, and promote consistency among Regional Entities' business practices; collects and analyzes compliance enforcement data and trends to assist with identification of emerging risks and help to inform development of enforcement policy and processes; files Notices of Penalty ("NOP") and other submittals associated with noncompliance discovered through Regional Entity compliance monitoring and enforcement activities; processes and files NOPs and other submittals discovered through NERC-led investigations and audits; collaborates with other NERC departments, including Reliability Assurance, Reliability Standards, and Event Analysis; and delivers training to ERO Enterprise staff and registered entities. Compliance Enforcement also conducts other outreach activities that focus on self-logging, compliance exceptions, and risk assessment of noncompliances.

Compliance Enforcement continues to identify areas for improvement and promotion of consistency through training, guidance, or other adjustments. Compliance Enforcement performs oversight of the Regional Entity enforcement programs through review of the processes, supporting evidence and other information provided by the Regional Entities, and communicates findings and recommendation to the Regional Entities to ensure consistent implementation of the CMEP. Compliance Enforcement provides training to Regional Entity staffs on the most important elements of risk-based enforcement. In addition, Compliance Enforcement is participating in developing and implementing a common CMEP tool through the CMEP Technology Project. During 2019, the major activities of the Compliance Enforcement group will include continuing to refine and improve the risk-based CMEP processes; continuing to implement in a transparent manner the risk-focused ERO Enterprise enforcement philosophy; expanding the feedback loop of information from Compliance Enforcement to Standards and other program areas; and working with Compliance Assurance, IT, and Regional Entities to develop application business requirements and test business functionality for the new CMEP tool.
The major activities of the Compliance Assurance, Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, and Compliance Enforcement Program Area satisfy the following criteria:
I.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for Reliability Standards development projects pursuant to the NERC ROP?
I.C: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information for Reliability Standards development, including for purposes of identifying areas in which new Reliability Standards could be developed, existing Reliability Standards could be revised, or existing Reliability Standards could be eliminated?
II.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the identification and registration of users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System that are required to comply with Requirements of Reliability Standards applicable to the reliability functions for which they are registered?
II.B: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the Certification of Reliability Coordinators, Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as having the requisite personnel, qualifications and facilities and equipment needed to perform these reliability functions in accordance with the applicable Requirements of Reliability Standards?
II.D: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for conducting, participating in or overseeing compliance monitoring and enforcement activities pursuant to the NERC ROP and (through the Regional Entities) the Commission-approved delegation agreements?
II.E: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information to monitor and enforce compliance with Reliability Standards, including evaluating the effectiveness of current compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, the need for new or revised compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, and the need for new or different means of training and education on compliance with Reliability Standards.
II.F: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training, education and dissemination of information for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, and (iii) industry personnel with respect to compliance monitoring and enforcement topics and topics concerning reliability risks identified through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities, such as: (1) Requirements of Reliability Standards, including how to comply and how to demonstrate compliance? This includes development of guidance and interpretation documents. (2) Compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, including how to conduct them, how to participate in them, and the expectations for the process? This includes development of guidance documents. (3) Disseminating, through workshops, webinars, Advisories/Recommendations/Essential Actions, and other publications, "lessons learned" information on compliance concerns and reliability risks obtained through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities, monitoring and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near miss events, and other Bulk Power System monitoring activities? (4) Registered Entity internal processes for compliance with Reliability Standards, such as development, implementation and maintenance of internal reliability compliance programs?

V: Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization

Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)? (The applicable ROP provisions for these major activities are $\S 400$ and 500 and Appendices 4B, 4C, 5A, 5B and 5C.)

VI : Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the supervision and oversight of Regional Entities in the performance of their delegated responsibilities in accordance with FPA §215, 18 C.F.R. Part 39, the Commission-approved delegation agreement between NERC and the Regional Entity, the NERC ROP, and applicable provisions of Commission orders?

IX: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for NERC and Regional Entity committees, subcommittees and working groups engaged in the activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria?

X: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the analysis and evaluation of activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria for the purpose of identifying means of performing the activities more effectively and efficiently?

## IV. Reliability Assessment and System Analysis Program 2019 Major Activities

The major activities of the Reliability Assessment and System Analysis (RASA) Program are described at pages $39-44$ of the 2019 Business Plan and Budget. The RASA Program is comprised of the Reliability Assessment, System Analysis, and Advanced Analytics and Modeling (AAM) groups. The RASA Program carries out the ERO's responsibility to conduct assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the BES to provide insight and guidance about reliability risks, which provide a foundation for development of new, or modifications to existing, Reliability Standards, or other initiatives focused on enhancing reliability. The majority of RASA's activities directly address the risk priorities established by the NERC Reliability Issues Steering Committee (RISC). RASA focuses on developing a technical framework and understanding of the emerging reliability risks facing the industry, and providing guidance and insights to stakeholders. The principal activity areas of the RASA Program include: independent assessments and reports on the overall reliability and adequacy of the BES, and associated reliability risks that could impact the short-term, midterm and long-term planning horizons and other reliability issues requiring an in-depth analysis; support for development and improvement of long-term sustainable interconnection-based power flow, dynamic and load models that exhibit the accuracy and fidelity reflecting actual BES reliability performance and dynamic conditions; interconnection-wide analysis of steady-state and dynamic conditions, including frequency, Essential Reliability Services (ERS), stability, short circuit ratio, and oscillatory behavior aspects; advancement of industry and the ERO's understanding of power system characteristics and behaviors by gathering larger phasor measurement unit datasets of data for advanced data analytics and modeling improvements; assurance oversight that electrical elements necessary for reliable operation of the BES are identified, requiring these elements to follow applicable Reliability Standards; and establishing reliability leadership and consistent, technically sound insights and recommendations that position industry and policy-makers to enhance reliability through effective outreach and communications.

The RASA Program works with industry leaders to create a reliability strategy that is relevant, timely, and effective at addressing the most important reliability risks, through reviewing and addressing key priority risks identified by the RISC; synthesizing information identified through analysis and assessment efforts; extracting and prioritizing the associated reliability risks; sharing and integrating risk analysis insights across the ERO Enterprise; and translating that knowledge into actionable guidance and recommendations for NERC management, the Board, industry, and government policy makers. RASA provides reports and recommendations regarding anticipated conditions that could impact reliability,
security and stability of the BPS. RASA conducts reliability assessments to evaluate the expected reliability of the BES through extensive deterministic and probabilistic analyses to identify potential reliability risks and mitigation approaches. Key assessments include the Long-Term Reliability Assessment (supplemented by the Probabilistic Assessment), Summer and Winter Reliability Assessments, and Special Reliability Assessments (selected based on high priority/high risk issues that require an independent assessment from the ERO). A significant ongoing effort focuses on the continued development of effective ERS. As part of its reliability assessment activities, RASA collects, maintains, and annually publishes the Electricity Supply and Demand database, which includes 10 -year projections for the North American BPS.

The System Analysis group of RASA focuses on understanding the technical behavior of the North American grid, as the foundation for identifying crucial aspects of performance that are important for sustaining overall reliability. The System Analysis Group focuses on power system analysis to understand and evaluate BPS characteristics, behavior and performance due to the changing resource mix and integration of new technology; the use of advance software capabilities to conduct power system analysis; and providing technical support, implementation and outreach to industry. The System Analysis activities also support the following objectives: leading and improving NERC's analytical capabilities to address a broad range of engineering topics; conducting analysis and assessments in response to Commission directives; supporting Reliability Standards development with subject matter expertise; supporting and leading technical analysis of emerging risks requiring advanced analytics and interconnection-wide assessment; and conducting detailed forensic analyses of significant system disturbances.

The AAM group of RASA focuses on emerging reliability risks to the BPS through advanced system analysis techniques and modeling capabilities, working collaboratively with NERC stakeholders including the Planning Committee (PC), Operating Committee (OC), and technical subgroups. The AAM's key focus areas include: the State of Modeling Report; inverter-based resource performance; integration of increased levels of distributed energy resources; synchrophasor technology; power plant modeling verification; dynamic load modeling; analysis of the changing nature of end-use loads; assessments of case quality and fidelity for interconnection-wide cases released by Reliability Standard MOD-032 designees; addressing deficiencies in interconnection-wide models and providing industry education on key modeling topics; and coordinating with the PC's Methods for Establishing IROLs Task Force and supporting improvements to methods, practices and tools used for establishing Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits.

RASA coordinates and administers the activities of the NERC PC and its subgroups. RASA also coordinates with Regional Entity counterparts through the ERO Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis Group to collaborate on and provide oversight for reliability assessment and reliability risk analysis functions. RASA also works closely with other organizations such as the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Department of Energy (DOE), Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO), North American Transmission Forum (NATF), North American Generation Forum (NAGF), Canadian Electricity Association (CEA), Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, and Natural Gas Supply Association, on a number of energy industry reliability issues such as geomagnetic disturbances, vegetation management, variable generation integration, and interdependency of gas and electric systems.

The ongoing and new major activities of the RASA Program for 2019, in support of goals and objectives in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, include: (1) ensuring that the Inverter-Based Resource Performance Task Force completes its scope of work on schedule and implements the recommendations needed to maintain reliability, including addressing any gaps in Reliability Standards; collaborating with Planning

Coordinators to expand development of interconnection-wide models with expected dispatches to support effective long-term planning assessments; working with stakeholders to develop and share knowledge and information supporting BPS resilience; improving resource adequacy assessments with increased probabilistic and risk analysis; conducting interconnection-wide analysis of steady-state and dynamic conditions, including frequency, ERS, stability, short circuit ratio, and oscillatory behavior aspects to support NERC's reliability assessments and improve industry planning; performing model validations at the interconnection level and comparing with internal transmission owner models; gathering additional system performance data (e.g., on balancing and frequency performance, renewables, and ERS) to advance analytics and improve modeling; increasing the focus of technical analysis and assessment on natural gas, wind, and solar resources and fuel availability; developing technical references and guidelines that advance and improve reliability using new technologies; and developing quality and fidelity assessments of interconnection models.

The major activities of the RASA Program satisfy the following criteria:
I.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for Reliability Standards development projects pursuant to the NERC ROP?
I.C.1: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information for Reliability Standards development, including for purposes of identifying areas in which new Reliability Standards could be developed, existing Reliability Standards could be revised, or existing Reliability Standards could be eliminated, such as: (1) Measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks?
II.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the identification and registration of users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System that are required to comply with Requirements of Reliability Standards applicable to the reliability functions for which they are registered?
III.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the preparation or dissemination of long-term, seasonal, and special assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the Bulk Power System?
III.B: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks?
III.F: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the development and dissemination of Advisories/Recommendations/Essential Actions regarding lessons learned and potential reliability risks to users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System?

IV: Is the activity one that was required or directed by a Commission order issued pursuant to $\S 215$ ? (FERC orders directed NERC to develop and implement a revised definition of
"Bulk Electric System" and a procedure for requesting and receiving exceptions from the BES definition, and subsequently approved NERC's proposed revised BES definition and its proposed BES exception procedure.)
V. Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)? (The applicable ROP provisions for major activities of the RASA Program are $\S 801-806$, §809-810, and Appendix 5C.)

VI: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the supervision and oversight of Regional Entities in the performance of their delegated responsibilities in accordance with FPA §215, 18 C.F.R. Part 39, the Commission-approved delegation agreement between NERC and the Regional Entity, the NERC ROP, and applicable provisions of Commission orders?

IX: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for NERC and Regional Entity committees, subcommittees and working groups engaged in activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria?

X: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the analysis and evaluation of activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria for the purpose of identifying means of performing the activities more effectively and efficiently?

## V. Reliability Risk Management (Situation Awareness, Event Analysis and Performance Analysis) 2019 Major Activities

The major activities of the Reliability Risk Management (RRM) group, which is comprised of the Situation Awareness Department, the Event Analysis Department, and the Performance Analysis (PA) group, are described at pages 47-49, 51-52, and 54-58 of the 2019 Business Plan and Budget. The RRM group carries out the ERO's responsibility to perform assessments (including real-time and near-real-time continual awareness, detailed analysis of significant events, and longer-term broad performance assessments) of the reliability and adequacy of the BPS, including identifying potential issues of concern relating to system, equipment, entity, and human performance. The RRM groups have five primary functions: (1) BPS awareness, (2) event and root cause analysis, (3) assessment of human performance challenges that affect reliability and identification of improvement opportunities, (4) continent-wide analysis and reporting of BPS performance, and (5) support of the NERC OC. Through awareness and continuous assessment, RRM identifies potential reliability risks, analyzes events in detail, ensures that industry is well informed of system events, emerging trends, risk analysis, and lessons learned, and provides data and analysis to inform other aspects of NERC's statutory functions.

The Situation Awareness department along, with the Regional Entities, monitors BPS conditions, significant occurrences and emerging risks, and threats across the 14 Reliability Coordinator regions in North America, to maintain an understanding of conditions and situations that could impact reliable operations. Situation Awareness also supports development and publication of NERC Alerts and awareness products, and facilitates information sharing among industry, Regional Entities and government during crisis situations and major system disturbances. Situation Awareness is engaged in enhancement, replacement, streamlining or modification of several reliability-related situation awareness and monitoring tools, including the SAFNR software application; operation and maintenance pending replacement of the current secure NERC Alert tool; refreshing the Reliability Coordinator Information

System application; and continuing to set conditions to bring limited Synchrophasor data into NERC for wide-area situational awareness and event triage applications. The Situation Awareness Department uses the following reliability-related tools to support its activities: Resource Adequacy (Area Control Error Frequency) Tool; Inadvertent Interchange; Frequency Monitoring and Analysis Tool; Intelligent Alarms Tool; Genscape (PowerIQ and PowerRT tools); and the Process Information (PI) Historian System.

The ongoing and new major activities of the Situation Awareness department for 2019 include: ensuring that the ERO is aware of all BES events above a threshold of impact; enabling the sharing of information and data to facilitate wide-area situational awareness; during crisis situations, facilitating the exchange of information among industry, Regions, and U.S. and Canadian governments; keeping the industry informed of emerging reliability threats and risks, including any expected actions; conducting the annual NERC Monitoring and Situational Awareness Conference and Human Performance Conference; administering the NERC Alerts process as specified in $\S 810$ of the ROP to issue Advisory (Level 1) Alerts on significant and emerging reliability and security related topics, and facilitate the tracking of actions specified in Recommendation (Level 2) and Essential Action (Level 3) Alerts; and performing oversight as per the Situation Awareness Oversight Plan of the activities and performance of the Regional staffs. Situation Awareness will also continue to focus on the upgrade to the SAFNR application.

The Event Analysis department performs assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the BES to identify potential issues of concern related to system, equipment, entity, and human performance that may indicate a need to develop remediation strategies, action plans, or data used to revise or retire Reliability Standards or consider new Reliability Standards. Event Analysis analyzes and determines the causes of events, promptly assures tracking of corrective actions to prevent recurrence, and provides lessons learned to the industry. Event Analysis analyzes all reportable events for sequence of events, root cause, risks to reliability, and mitigation and keeps the industry well-informed of system events, emerging trends, risk analysis, lessons learned, and expected actions. Event Analysis conducts in-depth analyses of approximately 150 events per year on average. Event Analysis ensures that reporting and analysis of events are consistent, to allow for wide-area assessment of trends and risks. Additionally, Event Analysis identifies human error risks and precursor factors that allow human error to affect BES reliability, and educates industry regarding such risks, precursors, and related mitigation methods. Event analysis also supports compliance and standards training initiatives and trending and analysis to identify emerging reliability risks. Event Analysis works in collaboration with and supports the activities of other groups involved in human performance analysis including the NERC OC's Event Analysis Subcommittee, the WECC Human Performance Working Group, and others. Event Analysis also collaborates with industry groups including the NATF, NAGF, and trade associations.

The ongoing and new major activities for 2019 for the Event Analysis group include: (1) Working with Regional Entities to obtain and review information from registered entities on qualifying events and disturbances in order to advance awareness of events above a threshold level; facilitating analysis of root and contributing causes, risks to reliability, wide-area assessments and remediation efforts; and disseminating information regarding events in a timely manner. (2) Ensuring that all reportable events are analyzed for sequence of events, root cause, risk to reliability, and mitigation. (3) Continuing to refine riskbased methodologies to support better identification of reliability risks, including use of more sophisticated cause codes for analysis. (4) Conducting training (webinars, workshops and conference support) to inform industry and the ERO of lessons learned, root cause analysis, trends, human performance, and extreme weather preparedness and recommendations. (5) Developing reliability recommendations and Alerts as needed, and tracking industry accountability for critical reliability recommendations. (6) Ensuring that industry is well informed of system events, emerging trends, risk analysis, lessons learned, and expected actions. (7) Conducting major event analysis and reporting of
major findings and recommendations that will improve reliability. (8) Performing oversight of the event-analysis-related activities and performance of the Regional Entities. The Event Analysis department will also support several top priority reliability risk projects being led by the Performance Analysis group. Additionally, in 2019, the System Analysis group will focus on analysis in the area of inverters and inverter technologies, due to the rapid increase in renewable resources using these technologies.

Performance Analysis, which consists of Balancing and Frequency Control (BF\&C) and Data Analytics (DA), provides statistical analysis and support to the ERO Enterprise, as well as outreach for the ERO Enterprise to electric industry organizations. Trends, findings, and recommendations from PA serve as technical input to Reliability Standards and standards project prioritization, compliance process improvements, event analyses, reliability assessment, and critical infrastructure protection efforts. PA's analyses of BES performance offer analytical insights that lead toward the prioritization of specific actionable risk control steps for industry. PA's analyses and results are summarized in the annual State of Reliability (SOR) report, which provides guidance and recommendations for enhanced BPS reliability. PA has added Generator Availability Data System (GADS) wind data to the data collected under ROP $\S 1600$, requiring the development of a new software tool to enable this. In 2019, the DA group will begin development of the system for solar data collection.

BF\&C provides support and services necessary for the real-time operation of the BPS in the areas of balancing resources and demand, interconnection frequency, interchange scheduling, and control performance. BF\&C provides technical assistance in the development and administration of the NERC Balancing (BAL) standards, including BAL-001, BAL-002, BAL-003, BAL-004 and BAL-006, as well as in performing analysis and developing annual reports and informational filings required by Commission directives in its orders that approved BAL standards. BF\&C performs the ongoing tasks assigned to the ERO in Attachment A to Reliability Standard BAL-003-1, Frequency Response and Frequency Bias Setting, and the Procedure for ERO Support, including calculation and posting of Minimum Frequency Bias Settings for each Balancing Authority (BA) and, calculation and assignment of BA Frequency Response Obligations for the upcoming year, and calculation and assignment of BA annual Frequency Bias Settings and L10 values for implementation into BA control systems. BF\&C supports the NERC OC's Resources Subcommittee (RS), Frequency Working Group, Inadvertent Exchange Working Group and Reserves Working Group, including through maintaining the RS website and the Balancing Authority Submittal Site, which provide operational information and a submittal mechanism for requirements under the BAL standards; and through webinars, technical white papers, reliability guidelines, and other outreach. BF\&C also provides data collection, analysis and reporting for five ESR measures to support the OC's ESR Working Group. BF\&C participated in the specification, development and installation of a PI Historian system that allows NERC to retrieve, analyze and report on data that is hosted and analyzed by external parties. BF\&C continues to participate in the implementation and enhancement of, including obtaining data maintained by third parties for, the PI Historian System.

DA is responsible for collection, management and analysis of data related to the performance of five areas of BPS operations: transmission, conventional generation, wind generation, protection system misoperations and demand response. DA provides application training and end-user support to reporting entities and Regional Entity staffs. DA works with stakeholders through working groups associated with industry sectors reporting performance data, to define and revise reporting requirements and related applications. DA performs analysis to identify potential risks relating to system, equipment, entity or organizational performance that may indicate, among other things, a need to develop remediation strategies, improvements to reporting applications, new data collection or analysis tools, or creation, revision or retirement of Reliability Standards. DA's analyses provide the foundation for the annual SOR Report, the annual Misoperations report, and technical papers for industry. During 2019, DA will
participate in several Information Technology projects, including: planning and deployment of the solar data collection system; continued refinement and implementation of the data sharing process to comply with Order No. 824; and continued planning and collection of ROP $\S 1600$ data requests, including but not limited to Geomagnetic disturbance studies and cyber and physical security data.

New and ongoing major activities for Performance Analysis in 2019 will include: issuing the annual SOR Report and guidelines, recommendations and Alerts as needed (including verification and validation of data and information through Regional Entities and technical committees); providing support and leadership to the NERC OC, Operating Reliability Subcommittee and the RS and its working groups, with emphasis on balancing operations and analysis, administration of BAL standards, and performance-based outreach to functional entities responsible for real-time BPS reliability; continuing administration of the BAL standards; providing technical assistance to NERC Compliance and Enforcement, emphasizing BAL-003-1 Frequency Response; providing technical assistance to Compliance Assurance and Compliance Enforcement with emphasis on BAL-003-1 for the BA performance requirements that became effective in 2017; developing the Frequency Response Annual Analysis Report; developing quarterly BPS performance reports using PI Historian data and functionality to support the OC and the RS; overseeing and evaluating reliability trends that identify reliability risks, by analyzing data contained in the GADS, Transmission Availability Data System (TADS), and Demand Response Availability Data System (DADS); supporting Reliability Standards development by providing subject matter expertise; continuing to provide leadership and support to the NERC PC's subcommittees, working groups, and task forces, including the Performance Analysis Subcommittee and its subgroups; assisting in development of approaches to registration and providing input to NERC staff in support of development of CMEP risk elements; conducting major event investigations, analyses, and reporting of major findings, recommendations and lessons learned that will improve reliability; and providing insight on merging system protection issues, and handing off any issues with future implications to RASA. Additionally, major efforts in 2019 will include development of the technical report to be filed with the Commission in accordance with directives in Order No. 794; and expansion of the PI Historian to include high speed frequency data from the University of Tennessee and interconnection inertia data to support the RS and the ERSWG.

The major activities of the RRM group satisfy the following criteria:
I.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for Reliability Standards development projects pursuant to the NERC ROP?
I.C.1: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information for Reliability Standards development, including for purposes of identifying areas in which new Reliability Standards could be developed, existing Reliability Standards could be revised, or existing Reliability Standards could be eliminated, such as: (1) Measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks? (2) Monitoring, event analysis and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near miss events?
I.C.2: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information for Reliability Standards development, including for purposes of identifying areas in which new Reliability Standards could be developed, existing Reliability Standards could be revised, or existing Reliability Standards could be
eliminated, such as: (2) Monitoring, event analysis and investigations of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near-miss events?
II.E: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information to monitor and enforce compliance with Reliability Standards, including evaluating the effectiveness of current compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, the need for new or revised compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, and the need for new or different means of training and education on compliance with Reliability Standards, such as: (1) Measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks? (2) Monitoring, event analysis and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences, and near miss events?
II.F.3: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training, education and dissemination of information for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, and (iii) industry personnel with respect to compliance monitoring and enforcement topics and topics concerning reliability risks identified through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities, such as: (3) Disseminating, through workshops, webinars, Advisories, Recommendations, Essential Actions, and other publications; "lessons learned" information on compliance concerns and reliability risks obtained through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities; monitoring and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near miss events, and other Bulk Power System monitoring activities?
II.G: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the development and provision of tools and services that are useful for the provision of adequate reliability, because they relate specifically to compliance with existing Reliability Standards and they proactively help avert Reliability Standard violations and Bulk Power System disturbances?
III.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the preparation or dissemination of long-term, seasonal, and special assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the Bulk Power System?
III.B: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks?
III.C: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for investigating, analyzing, evaluating, and disseminating information concerning, the causes of major events and off-normal occurrences, and/or providing coordination assistance, technical expertise and other assistance to users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System in connection with Bulk Power System major events and off-normal occurrences, but not real-time operational control of the Bulk Power System?
III.D: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for awareness of circumstances on the Bulk Power

System and to contribute to understanding risks to reliability?
III.E: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for gathering, analyzing and sharing with and among industry and government participants, information regarding the physical or cyber security of the Bulk Power System?
III.F: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the development and dissemination of Advisories/Recommendations/Essential Actions regarding lessons learned and potential reliability risks to users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System?
III.G: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for data collection and analysis of information regarding Bulk Power System reliability matters mandated by the Commission?

IV: Is the activity one that was required or directed by a Commission order issued pursuant to FPA $\S 215$ ? (The applicable Commission orders include Order Nos. 794 and 824 which require data collection, availability and reporting.)

V : Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)? (The applicable ROP provisions for these major activities are §801-811 and 1001 and Appendix 8.)
IX. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for NERC and Regional Entity committees, subcommittees and working groups engaged in activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria?

## VI. Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center 2019 Major Activities

The major activities of the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center ("E-ISAC") are described at pages 60-65 of the 2019 Business Plan and Budget. The primary function of E-ISAC is to reduce cyber and physical risk to the electricity industry across North America by providing unique insights, leadership and coordination, and to be the trusted, timely, actionable resource of grid risk information and analysis to enhance electric reliability. The E-ISAC strategy has three primary focus areas: (1) Sharing information on cyber and physical threats to the reliability and security of the BPS with electric industry stakeholders; (2) analysis of threat information; and (3) engagement with electric sector and other stakeholders concerning security risk identification and mitigation. E-ISAC staff routinely engages stakeholders through monthly briefings and threat workshops covering timely cyber and physical security topics. E-ISAC manages and executes NERC's responsibilities in the Cybersecurity Risk Information Sharing Program ("CRISP") and acts as the program manager for CRISP. CRISP delivers real-time, relevant, and actionable cybersecurity risk information to E-ISAC member electricity asset owners and operators. E-ISAC also supports an annual grid security conference and a biennial Grid Security Exercise. In addition to voluntary reporting of security and threat information by industry participants, registered entities subject to Reliability Standard CIP-008-5 with High Impact and Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems are required to have processes in place for identifying Cyber Security Incidents, determining if a Cyber Security Incident is a Reportable Cyber Security Incident, and if so, notifying the E-ISAC. Further, in its Order No. 848 issued July 19, 2018 ( 164 FERC 961,033 ), FERC directed NERC to develop and submit modifications to Reliability Standards to provide for mandatory reporting to the E-ISAC (and other organizations) of Cyber Security Incidents that compromise, or attempt to compromise, a responsible entity's Electronic Security Perimeter or associated Electronic Access Control or Monitoring Systems."

The major activities of the E-ISAC satisfy the following criteria:
I.C.1: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information for Reliability Standards development, including for purposes of identifying areas in which new Reliability Standards could be developed, existing Reliability Standards could be revised, or existing Reliability Standards could be eliminated, such as: (1) Measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks? (2) Monitoring, event analysis and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near-miss events?
III.D: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for awareness of circumstances on the Bulk Power System and to contribute to understanding risks to reliability.
III.E: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for gathering, analyzing and sharing with and among industry and government participants, information regarding the physical or cyber security of the Bulk Power System.
III.F: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the development and dissemination of Advisories/Recommendations/Essential Actions regarding lessons learned and potential reliability risks to users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System?

V: Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)? (The applicable ROP provisions for these major activities are $\S 810$ and 1003.)
IX. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for NERC and Regional Entity committees, subcommittees and working groups engaged in activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria?

## VII. Training, Education, and Personnel Certification Program 2019 Major Activities

The major activities of the Training, Education, and Personnel Certification Program are described at pages 67-69 of the 2019 Business Plan and Budget. The major activities of this program include oversight and coordination of the delivery of training programs to ERO Enterprise staff supporting statutory and delegation-related activities; as well as training and education for BPS industry participants consistent with ERO functional program requirements. The Training and Education Program supports the ERO's responsibilities to develop, adopt, and obtain approval of Reliability Standards and to monitor, enforce and achieve compliance with the mandatory standards. Additionally, the Continuing Education program approves continuing education providers that meet NERC guidelines and standards

The Training and Education Program also supports NERC's System Personnel Certification Program, which ensure that personnel operating the BPS have the skills, training and qualifications needed to operate the BPS reliably. This Program maintains the credentials required to work in various industry areas across North America for over 7,500 system operators. NERC's System Operator Certification exam tests specific knowledge of job skills and Reliability Standards and prepares operators for complying with requirements
of Reliability Standards and appropriately operating the BES during normal and emergency operations. The Training and Education program provides learning materials, resources and activities to assist industry and ERO Enterprise staff in their understanding of key program areas including Reliability Standards; riskbased compliance monitoring and enforcement; organization registration and certification; event analysis, cause analysis, performance analysis and lessons learned; Reliability Assessment and System Analysis; and continuing education for system operators.

The major activities of the Training and Education Program for 2019 include implementing the annual NERC and ERO Enterprise Learning Priorities Plan which articulates and prioritizes the accumulated learning needs of the ERO Enterprise and the potential delivery vehicles supporting achievement of the goals of the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan. The focus for 2019 (and beyond) includes educating industry on managing risk to the reliability of the BPS based on results of technical assessment and analysis, standards development, and human performance knowledge; enhancing ERO Enterprise compliance monitoring personnel performance through a deeper understanding of ERO Enterprise compliance monitoring processes and technical aspect of BPS operations; and improving NERC employee's understanding of NERC functions and core technical knowledge of the BPS. Training and education will be delivered through workshops, webinars, and computer-based and instructor-led training courses. The Continuing Education program will evaluate and revise current program criteria as reflected in the Continuing Education program manual. The Continuing Education Program will remain focused on NERC System Operator credential maintenance. The Personnel Certification Program will continue to implement Linear on the Fly Testing, which dynamically creates an exam each time an exam is initiated by a candidate, and will work with industry stakeholders and the exam development vendor to create certification exams that promote BPS reliability. The Exam Working Group of the NERC Personnel Certification Governance Committee (PCGC) will continue to develop and analyze new items for future certification exams and work to ensure relevance to current Reliability Standards. The PCGC will continue to focus on further development of the System Operator Certification program strategic plan to ensure reliable operation of the BPS, including continuing annual analysis of the System Operator Certification Exam Item Bank; identification of new exam items; developing enhancements to the credential maintenance tool; and other program enhancements.

The major activities of the Training, Education, and Personnel Certification Program satisfy the following criteria:
I.D: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training and education concerning Reliability Standards development processes, procedures and topics for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, and (iii) industry personnel?
II.C: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the Certification of system operating personnel as qualified to carry out the duties and responsibilities of their positions in accordance with the Requirements of applicable Reliability Standards?
II.F: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training, education and dissemination of information for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, and (iii) industry personnel with respect to compliance monitoring and enforcement topics and topics concerning reliability risks identified through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities, such as: (1) Requirements of Reliability Standards, including how to comply and how to demonstrate compliance? This includes development of guidance and interpretation documents. (2) Compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, including how to conduct them, how to participate in them, and the expectations for the
processes? This includes development of guidance documents. (3) Disseminating, through workshops, webinars, Advisories/Recommendations/Essential Actions, and other publications, "lessons learned" information on compliance concerns and reliability risks obtained through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities, monitoring and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near miss events, and other Bulk Power System monitoring activities. (4) Registered Entity internal processes for compliance with Reliability Standards, such as development, implementation and maintenance of internal reliability compliance programs?

V : Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)? (The applicable ROP provision for the major activities of the Training, Education and Personnel Certification Program are §600 and §900.)

VI: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the supervision and oversight of Regional Entities in the performance of their delegated responsibilities in accordance with FPA §215, 18 C.F.R. Part 39, the Commission-approved delegation agreement between NERC and the Regional Entity, the NERC ROP, and applicable provisions of Commission orders?

## VIII. Administrative Services 2019 Major Activities

NERC's Administrative Services Departments are Technical Committees and Member Forums (for which no funding for activities is budgeted for 2019), General and Administrative, Legal and Regulatory, Information Technology ("IT"), Human Resources \& Administration, and Finance and Accounting. The major activities of these departments are described at pages 72-81 of the 2019 Business Plan and Budget.

General and Administrative is responsible for the administration and general management of the organization and includes the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Reliability Officer, Board of Trustees costs, communications, external affairs and government relations, and Office Rent.

Legal and Regulatory provides legal support to the organization, including to management, and the Reliability Standards, Compliance Analysis, Organization Registration and Certification, RASA, and Reliability Risk Management Programs, as well as general corporate legal support in areas including antitrust, corporate, commercial, insurance, contracts, employment, real estate, copyright, tax, and other areas, and legal and regulatory support in connection with delegation agreements with Regional Entities. Legal and Regulatory also includes the internal audit and corporate risk management functions.

IT supports, builds, configures, and enhances applications that serve registered entities, Regional Entities, and NERC staff, including ERO Enterprise data analysis and ongoing NERC and E-ISAC internal operations. IT's budgeted activities for 2019 are in the following categories: (1) ERO Enterprise new functionality; (2) maintaining ERO Enterprise infrastructure and support; and (3) maintaining NERC infrastructure and support. The focus of IT's budgeted activities is applications designed to better support effectiveness and consistency across the ERO Enterprise in the areas of Reliability Standards, Compliance Monitoring, Enforcement, Registration and the associated assessment of reliability risk. These applications include the CMEP Technology Project and complementary solutions for entity registration and standards data. IT's budgeted activities for 2019 also include improvements to NERC's public-facing website, funding for solar and wind data in the Generator Availability Data System, and a rewrite or replacement of the Resource Adequacy Application. IT is also responsible for certain Office Costs including telephone,
internet, computer supplies, software licenses and support, subscriptions and publications, and audio/visual and hardware leases.

Human Resources \& Administration includes NERC's human resources and facilities and meeting planning functions, including staffing, benefits administration, employee relations, performance and compensation management, succession planning, and management and professional and administrative staff training and development. Under the direction of the NERC Board Corporate Governance and Human Resources Committee, Human Resources \& Administration also develops compensation strategy and performs or obtains (through consultants) compensation studies, effectiveness studies, and other compensation and staffing related studies as needed.

Finance and Accounting manages all finance and accounting functions of NERC, including employee payroll, 401(k), 457(b) and 457(f) plans, travel and expense reporting, monthly financial reporting, sales and use tax, insurance, and development of the annual business plan and budget.

The major activities of NERC's Administrative Services Departments satisfy the following criteria:
I.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for Reliability Standards development projects pursuant to the NERC ROP?
II.A: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the identification and registration of users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System that are required to comply with Requirements of Reliability Standards applicable to the reliability functions for which they are registered?
II.D: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for conducting, participating in or overseeing compliance monitoring and enforcement activities pursuant to the NERC ROP and (through the Regional Entities) the Commission-approved delegation agreements?
III.C: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for investigating, analyzing, evaluating, and disseminating information concerning, the causes of major events and off-normal occurrences, and/or providing coordination assistance, technical expertise and other assistance to users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System in connection with Bulk Power System major events and off-normal occurrences, but not real-time operational control of the Bulk Power System?

V: Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)? (The applicable ROP provision for the major activities of Finance and Accounting is $\S 1100$. )

VI: Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the supervision and oversight of Regional Entities in the performance of their delegated responsibilities in accordance with FPA §215, 18 C.F.R. Part 39, the Commission-approved delegation agreement between NERC and the Regional Entity, the NERC ROP, and the applicable provisions of Commission orders.
IX. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for NERC and Regional Entity committees,
subcommittees and working groups engaged in activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria?

XI: Is the activity a governance or administrative/overhead function, activity or service necessary or appropriate for the activities encompassed by the other criteria and, in general, necessary and appropriate to operate a functioning organization?

## NERC WRITTEN CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHETHER AN ACTIVITY IS ELIGIBLE TO BE FUNDED UNDER SECTION 215 OF THE FEDERAL POWER ACT

For purposes of internal management approval of a proposed new activity or group of related activities ("major activity"), the proposed activity or major activity must be shown to fall within at least one of the criteria listed below. When sub-criteria are listed below a roman numeral numbered major criterion, the proposed activity should be a positive answer to at least one of the sub-criteria. Conversely, an activity that falls under a sub-criterion should pertain to the subject matter of the major criterion.
NERC's annual business plan and budget will describe how each major activity falls within one or more of the criteria listed below. If the major activity is substantially the same as a major activity that was shown to fall within the criteria in a previous year's business plan and budget, the current year's business plan and budget can refer to the prior year business plan and budget.

A determination that an activity falls within FPA §215 does not necessarily mean that NERC will propose or undertake such activity. The determination of whether an activity falling under FPA $\S 215$ should or will be undertaken in a given budget year will be addressed in the context of the applicable business plan and budget and will include opportunities for stakeholder input.
The criteria listed below are not necessarily each distinct from the others. An activity or major activity may fall within more than one of the criteria listed below.
I. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the development of Reliability Standards?
A. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for Reliability Standards development projects pursuant to the NERC ROP?
B. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for providing guidance and assistance to Regional Entities in carrying out Regional Reliability Standards development activities?
C. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information for Reliability Standards development, including for purposes of identifying areas in which new Reliability Standards could be developed, existing Reliability Standards could be revised, or existing Reliability Standards could be eliminated, such as:

1. Measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System ${ }^{41}$ based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks?

[^21]2. Monitoring, event analysis and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near miss events?
D. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training and education concerning Reliability Standards development processes, procedures and topics for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, and (iii) industry personnel?
II. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the monitoring and enforcement of compliance with Reliability Standards?
A. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the identification and registration of users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System that are required to comply with Requirements of Reliability Standards applicable to the reliability functions for which they are registered?
B. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the Certification of Reliability Coordinators, Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities as having the requisite personnel, qualifications and facilities and equipment needed to perform these reliability functions in accordance with the applicable Requirements of Reliability Standards?
C. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the Certification of system operating personnel as qualified to carry out the duties and responsibilities of their positions in accordance with the Requirements of applicable Reliability Standards? ${ }^{42}$
D. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for conducting, participating in or overseeing compliance monitoring and enforcement activities pursuant to the NERC ROP and (through the Regional Entities) the Commission-approved delegation agreements?
E. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for information gathering, collection and analysis activities to obtain information to monitor and enforce compliance with Reliability Standards, including evaluating the effectiveness of current compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, the need for new or revised compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, and the need for new or different means of training and education on compliance with Reliability Standards, such as:

1. Measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks?
2. Monitoring, event analysis and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences, and near miss events?
F. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the provision of training, education and dissemination of information for/to (i) NERC personnel, (ii) Regional Entity personnel, and (iii) industry personnel with respect to compliance monitoring and enforcement topics and topics concerning reliability risks identified through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities, such as:
[^22]1. Requirements of Reliability Standards, including how to comply and how to demonstrate compliance? This includes development of guidance and interpretation documents.
2. Compliance monitoring and enforcement processes, including how to conduct them, how to participate in them, and the expectations for the processes? This includes development of guidance documents.
3. Disseminating, through workshops, webinars, Advisories, Recommendations, Essential Actions, and other publications; "lessons learned" information on compliance concerns and reliability risks obtained through compliance monitoring and enforcement activities; monitoring and investigation of Bulk Power System major events, off-normal occurrences and near miss events, and other Bulk Power System monitoring activities?
4. Registered Entity internal processes for compliance with Reliability Standards, such as development, implementation and maintenance of internal reliability compliance programs?
G. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the development and provision of tools and services that are useful for the provision of adequate reliability, because they relate specifically to compliance with existing Reliability Standards and they proactively help avert Reliability Standard violations and Bulk Power System disturbances?
III. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for conducting and disseminating periodic assessments of the reliability of the Bulk Power System or monitoring the reliability of the Bulk Power System?
A. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the preparation or dissemination of long-term, seasonal, and special assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the Bulk Power System?
B. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for measuring reliability performance - past, present and future; publishing or disseminating the results of such measurements; analyzing the results of such measurements; identifying and analyzing risks to reliability of the Bulk Power System based on such measurements; and/or identifying approaches to mitigating or eliminating such risks?
C. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for investigating, analyzing, evaluating, and disseminating information concerning, the causes of major events and off-normal occurrences, and/or providing coordination assistance, technical expertise and other assistance to users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System in connection with Bulk Power System major events and off-normal occurrences, but not real-time operational control of the Bulk Power System?
D. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for awareness of circumstances on the Bulk Power System and to contribute to understanding risks to reliability?
E. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for gathering, analyzing and sharing with and among industry and government participants, information regarding the physical or cyber security of the Bulk Power System?
F. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the development and dissemination of Advisories/Recommendations/Essential Actions regarding lessons learned and potential reliability risks to users, owners, and operators of the Bulk Power System?
G. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for data collection and analysis of information regarding Bulk Power System reliability matters mandated by the Commission?
IV. Is the activity one that was required or directed by a Commission order issued pursuant to FPA §215? Justification of an activity as a FPA §215 activity based on this category must reference the particular Commission order and directive.
V. Is the activity one that is required or specified by, or carries out, the provisions of NERC's ROP that have been approved by the Commission as "Electric Reliability Organization Rules" (defined in 18 C.F.R. §39.1) pursuant to FPA §215(f)?
VI. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the supervision and oversight of Regional Entities in the performance of their delegated responsibilities in accordance with FPA §215, 18 C.F.R. Part 39, the Commission-approved delegation agreement between NERC and the Regional Entity, the NERC ROP, and applicable provisions of Commission orders?
VII. Is the activity necessary or appropriate to maintain NERC's certification as the Electric Reliability Organization? This Criterion includes conducting periodic assessments of NERC's and the Regional Entities' performance as the Electric Reliability Organization as required by 18 C.F.R. §39.3(c).
VIII. Does the activity respond to or is it necessary or appropriate for audits of NERC and the Regional Entities conducted by the Commission?
IX. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for NERC and Regional Entity committees, subcommittees and working groups engaged in activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria?
X. Is the activity necessary or appropriate for the analysis and evaluation of activities encompassed by one or more of the other criteria for the purpose of identifying means of performing the activities more effectively and efficiently?
XI. Is the activity a governance or administrative/overhead function, activity or service necessary or appropriate for the activities encompassed by the other criteria and, in general, necessary and appropriate to operate a functioning organization? (Should NERC perform any non-FPA §215 activities, the costs of governance and administrative/overhead functions must be appropriately allocated.)
NERC's current governance and administrative/overhead functions are carried out in the following program areas:
A. Technical Committees and Members' Forum Programs
B. General and administrative (includes, but is not limited to, executive, board of trustees, communications, government affairs, and facilities and related services).
C. Legal and Regulatory.
D. Information Technology
E. Human Resources
F. Accounting and Finance.

The following matters are excluded from the scope of FPA §215 activities. While a list of non-FPA §215 activities would be infinite, the following excluded matters are listed here because they are expressly referred to in FPA §215, the Commission's ERO regulations and/or a Commission order issued pursuant to FPA §215:
A. Developing or enforcing requirements to enlarge Bulk Power System facilities, or to construct new transmission capacity or generation capacity, or requirements for adequacy or safety of electric facilities or services.
B. Activities entailing Real-time operational control of the Bulk Power System.
C. Activities pertaining to facilities used in the local distribution of electricity.

## Exhibit B - Consultant and Contract Costs

| Consultants \& Contracts |  |  |  |  | Increase |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Exhibit C - Capital Financing

The company initiated a capital financing program in January 2014 as a funding source for major software application development projects that primarily benefit the ERO Enterprise. The total size of the original nonrevolving credit facility was $\$ 7.5 \mathrm{M}$ and was used to finance a portion of NERC's capital expenditures (including IT hardware and software application development costs) made through December 2016. A similar non-revolving credit facility was closed in November 2016, totaling $\$ 5.0 \mathrm{M}$, and is available to finance certain capital expenditures made from January 2017 to December 2019. The interest rate for both credit facilities is floating and equal to LIBOR plus 275 basis points. NERC projects the average interest rate during 2019 will be $4.5 \%$. Authorized annual borrowings under the facilities are limited to the amount approved by the Board and FERC in each year's BP\&B. Borrowings under the credit facilities are amortized over a three-year period, and can be prepaid without penalty.

As further discussed in the Introduction and Executive Summary and set forth in the table below, NERC has a 2019 proposed capital budget of approximately $\$ 4.8 \mathrm{M}$, of which it is proposing to finance $\$ 3.3 \mathrm{M}$.

| NERC Capital Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  Variance <br>  2019 Budget <br> Budget v 2018 <br> 2019 Budget |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ERO Application Development | \$ | 2,148,000 | \$ | 3,268,000 |  | 1,120,000 | 52.1\% |
| Hardware (storage, servers) |  | 805,000 |  | 565,000 |  | $(240,000)$ | -29.8\% |
| Other Equipment |  | 370,000 |  | 425,000 |  | 55,000 | 14.9\% |
| Disaster Recovery |  | 100,000 |  |  |  | $(100,000)$ | -100.0\% |
| NERC Software Licenses |  | 301,000 |  | 120,000 |  | $(181,000)$ | -60.1\% |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | 150,000 |  | 400,000 |  | 250,000 | 166.7\% |
| Total | \$ | 3,874,000 | \$ | 4,778,000 | \$ | 904,000 | 23.3\% |

In the 2019 budget, NERC plans to finance $\$ 3,268,000$ for ERO Enterprise application development projects. The tables below show projected year-end outstanding debt and the future annual payments for debt service.

|  | Year-End Outstanding Debt Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prior Years Actual |  | $2018$ <br> Projected |  | 2019 <br> Budget |  | 2020 <br> Projected |  | $2021$ <br> Projected |  |
| Prior Years (2015-2017 Borrowing) | \$ | 1,144,852 | \$ | 427,578 | \$ | 32,891 | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| 2018 Projection |  | - |  | 2,148,000 |  | 1,432,000 |  | 716,000 |  | - |
| 2019 Budgeted |  | - |  | - |  | 3,268,000 |  | 2,178,667 |  | 1,089,333 |
| 2020 Projected |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 2,007,000 |  | 1,338,000 |
| 2021 Projected |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1,300,000 |
| Total Outstanding Balance | \$ | 1,144,852 | \$ | 2,575,578 | \$ | 4,732,891 | \$ | 4,901,667 | \$ | 3,727,333 |


|  | Future Annual Payments for Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $2018$ <br> Projected |  | 2019 <br> Budget |  | 2020 <br> Projected |  | 2021 <br> Projected |  |
| Prior Years - Principal |  |  | \$ | 717,274 | \$ | 394,692 | \$ | 32,891 | \$ |  |
| 2018 Projection |  |  |  | - |  | 716,000 |  | 716,000 |  | 716,000 |
| 2019 Budgeted |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | 1,089,333 |  | 1,089,333 |
| 2020 Projected |  |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |  | 669,000 |
| 2021 Projected |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest Expense |  |  |  | 32,727 |  | 94,175 |  | 177,203 |  | 172,239 |
| Total Principal and Interest Costs | \$ | - | \$ | 750,001 | \$ | 1,204,867 | \$ | 2,015,427 | \$ | 2,646,572 |

## Exhibit D - Working Capital and Operating Reserve Amounts

In September 2015, FERC approved NERC's proposed amendments to its Working Capital and Operating Reserve Policy, which had been approved by the Board. A number of changes were made to the policy, including:

- Clarifying the definition of working capital to represent funding needed for cash flow purposes due to the timing of the receipt of funds and the payment of expenses.
- Creating four separate categories of operating reserves:

1. A Future Obligation Reserve for funds being held to satisfy obligations that will be settled in a future year. Examples include leases, certain contracts, and credit agreements. These reserves were previously included within the definition of working capital, but are more accurately classified as a form of operating reserve.
2. Continuation of a separate category of reserves for the Operator Certification Program called the System Operator Certification Reserve.
3. Elimination of the Known and Unforeseen Contingency categories of operating reserves and creating a single category of contingency reserves called the Operating Contingency Reserve.
4. Creation of a separate category of reserves for CRISP called the CRISP Reserve.

## Working Capital

Based on its 2018 cash flow projection and taking into account the historic manner in which NERC's assessments have been billed and paid, NERC does not anticipate needing access to working capital in 2019 to meet monthly cash flow needs. While individual reserve categories are increasing and decreasing based on operating needs and uses, the budget in total does not reflect additional net funding for reserves. In the unlikely event NERC experiences a temporary cash flow shortage, it has the ability to either request authorization from the FAC and Board to temporarily access operating contingency reserve funds, or draw on its $\$ 4 \mathrm{M}$ line of credit, as long as NERC is in compliance with the covenants under its bank credit agreement.

## Operating Reserves

Total operating reserves are budgeted to be $\$ 6.9 \mathrm{M}$ at December 31, 2019 among all four categories, or $\$ 6.4 \mathrm{M}$ excluding the $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$ CRISP Reserve. The Future Obligation Reserve is budgeted to be $\$ 2.0 \mathrm{M}$ and is primarily funds held to offset future liabilities under lease agreements for the Atlanta and Washington, DC, offices. System Operator Certification Reserves are budgeted at $\$ 676 \mathrm{k}$, and the Operating Contingency Reserve is budgeted for $\$ 3.8 \mathrm{M}$. The CRISP Reserve, budgeted at $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$, is held pursuant to the terms of the Master Services Agreement between NERC and participating utilities, which calls for a separate third-party funded reserve established to fund certain contingencies in connection with CRISP.

## Assessment Stabilization Reserve

In addition to the foregoing reserves, the amended policy also provides for an Assessment Stabilization Reserve. The goal of the Assessment Stabilization Reserve is to mitigate assessment volatility and have percentage changes in annual assessments track, within a reasonable band, percentage changes in the company's total annual budget, with the total budget reflecting prudent fiscal discipline and good stewardship. Assessment stabilization funds will be used when available to help stabilize assessments and mitigate year-to-year swings in assessments. Those swings primarily result from the year-to-year variations in collections of penalty funds to be applied to offset assessments, but could also result from other factors like surplus funds available from a prior period, the need to replenish the Operating Contingency Reserve, or significant but relatively short-term operating or capital spending needs. Subject to FERC approval, NERC will deposit the $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$ of penalty funds collected during the period July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018 into the Assessment Stabilization Reserve. NERC will also, subject to FERC approval, release \$550k from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve to reduce U.S. assessments for 2019.

## Exhibit E - E-I SAC Long-Term Strategy

## Executive Summary

The Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center (E-ISAC), operated by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), executed a significant improvement initiative over the past two years based on findings and recommendations developed by the Electricity Subsector Coordinating Council (ESCC) in 2015. Looking forward, the electricity industry would like the E-ISAC to become an indispensable resource for security information sharing and analysis, and to be the centerpiece for building a highly engaged community of security professionals.

To carry forth this vision, the E-ISAC must undergo continuous improvement and evolution that reflects the changing threat landscape, changing technologies and business processes inside the industry, and changing customer expectations for a highly reliable and secure electricity infrastructure that is increasingly more integrated with insecure infrastructures such as the public Internet. This will require additional resources for people, technology, and facilities above what has been budgeted in previous years.

This strategic plan builds on the ESCC's earlier recommendations and discusses improvements needed in 2017 to address current threats, a look at the mid-term range of 2018-2022 to address emerging threats, and what the EISAC might look like beyond 2023 if the forecasted issues continue to develop.

The plan was developed with guidance from the ESCC and from NERC leadership. It recognizes the need for sound fiscal planning, recognizes the growing threats to the grid from human and cyber actors, and highlights the need for a more robust security information sharing and analysis capability within NERC.

At a recent planning session with C-level executives, one utility CEO said he wanted to "transform the EISAC into an intelligence collecting and analytical capability that industry literally cannot do without," which resonated strongly among the other executives. To achieve this goal we must get the E-ISAC to a maturity level where industry completely trusts it to gather, hold, analyze, and distribute highly sensitive security information.

Specific financial projections, technology requirements, staffing, and facility improvements are being developed and will be incorporated in the NERC strategic plan and the NERC business plan and budget.

## Background

The Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center (E-ISAC) is operated by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC). ${ }^{43}$ It was established by NERC at the request of the U.S. Department of Energy in 1999 to serve as a focal point for voluntary information sharing within the electricity subsector. By 2006, the ISAC was widely used in the subsector for collecting, analyzing, and distributing voluntarily-shared security information and was a key component of NERC's overall electric reliability mission. NERC's Board of Trustees oversees the budget and activities of the E-ISAC in the same manner as other NERC divisions.

NERC assumed the role of the Electric Reliability Organization (ERO) in 2006 and began a multi-year effort to develop enforceable reliability and security standards for owners, operators, and users of the Bulk-Power System. As the standards were completed and compliance monitoring began, the ISAC remained the place where security incidents were reported, but the voluntary nature of reporting from electricity entities shifted towards mandatory reporting from entities required to be compliant with NERC's Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) standards. By 2014, voluntary sharing with the E-ISAC had greatly diminished in favor of mandatory reporting, but the desire

[^23]for voluntary sharing within the subsector remained strong. The following year a perceived problem of internal NERC cross-sharing of security information was addressed when NERC implemented the employee code of conduct that bars voluntarily shared security information from being forwarded to NERC's compliance and enforcement teams. Also in 2015 the E-ISAC finished a separation project that includes physical and electronic barriers to protect the information voluntarily shared by industry members.

In late 2014, the Electricity Subsector Coordinating Council (ESCC) initiated a strategic review of the E-ISAC. In June 2015, the ESCC published its key findings and recommendations, which fell into four major areas of improvement for the E-ISAC:

- Strengthen the governance structure and processes to increase effectiveness and responsiveness
- Improve the quality and value of the products by identifying member needs and expectations
- Advance the analysis capabilities by continuing to upgrade operational and staff capabilities
- Advance the information collection capabilities through enhanced member engagement, better tools or sensors, and an improved portal

A C-level advisory team from the ESCC (the Member Executive Committee, or MEC) was established in 2015 to help enable the implementation of the ESCC's recommendations, which included a new vision for the E-ISAC to become the electricity industry's leading, trusted source for analysis and sharing of security information. As of April 2017, much progress has been made toward realizing this vision and now we look forward to the next five years and beyond while asking the question, "how do we transform the E-ISAC into an intelligence collecting and analytical capability industry cannot do without?" To begin this process, the following section looks back at known threats and ahead at the anticipated evolving nature of future threats targeting the electricity industry.

## The Changing Threat Landscape

A study conducted for the ESCC by the Chertoff Group in $2014^{44}$ found that a range of threats target the electric power grid. These threats can be approximately related to each other by using a likelihood versus consequence plotting. We feel that the E-ISAC's "sweet spot" is roughly along the 45 -degree line as depicted in the graphic below.

[^24]

Industry by itself cannot protect the grid from all hazards, and likewise neither can the government. A strong partnership between industry and government for security is required, and in fact has been in place for many years. At the center of this partnership is the ESCC, which serves as a bridge between the public and private sectors for strategic security policy coordination and to develop unity of messaging during a crisis. In addition, timely and actionable information sharing, collaboration, and analysis are the cornerstones of good security practices within the electricity industry. The E-ISAC's role is to facilitate voluntary sharing and collaboration, and to provide unique insights into emerging security issues that are affecting the sector. In January 2017 the E-ISAC and the MEC met in person to discuss the future of the E-ISAC relative to changing threats, changing industry dynamics, and a changing environment. While physical threats resulting in theft, vandalism, disruption, or destruction will always be present, the group recognized that cyber threats and other types of threats are evolving and will require adaptive change throughout industry and especially with respect to the E-ISAC. The group agreed that future threats industry needed to monitor and mitigate included:

- Near-term (0-2 years)
- Nation state threats, advanced persistent threats, the Internet of Things (IOT), Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks, and ransomware
- Data breaches and intellectual property theft
- Insiders, physical damage, coordinated attacks, and third-party risks
- Mid-term (3-5 years)
- Increased reliance on gas generation
- Distribution system vulnerabilities via networked control systems
- Growth of demand response technologies with low security
- Distributed energy resources
- Reliability of communications networks
- Long-term (5-10 years)
- Higher replacement rate of components and systems
- Increased cost of operations due to higher security costs
- Ability to run manually might be lost
- Computers attacking computers

The remainder of this plan discusses improvements needed in 2017 to address current threats, a look at the midterm range of 2018-2022 to address emerging threats, and what the E-ISAC might look like beyond 2023 if the forecasted issues continue to develop.

## The Need for a Strategic Plan

Given that quite a bit of work was accomplished over the past two years to improve the E-ISAC, it is reasonable to ask why a long-term strategic plan is needed. Looking externally, there are three primary drivers:

- Security threats continue to evolve and become more dangerous
- Ukraine, loT, and ransomware attacks are indicators
- Geopolitical tensions and changing societal trends make North America a target
- Customer expectations for highly reliable energy continue to increase
- Electricity entities need to be more agile and responsive to real-time risks
- Rapid technology changes also increase the risk landscape
- More robust understanding and measurement of grid resiliency and security
- Need new tools for collecting and analyzing grid security metrics data

Since the publication of the ESCC's strategic review in 2015, the E-ISAC has solidified vision, mission, values and goals statements as shown in the graphic below. The three "goals" columns represent parts of a rising spiral of membership engagements: bringing in more information improves the analytical process, which in turn drives more engagement, which then brings in more information, which improves analytics, and so forth.


This process takes the E-ISAC to new levels as it gets better at information collection, analysis, and dissemination and represents the core capabilities of the E-ISAC. The MEC and the E-ISAC developed a related strategy for the improvement of the E-ISAC's products and services that builds upon the pillars shown in the graphic above, and is working on a technology roadmap in partnership with NERC's Information Technology team that also follows this method. Both of these more tactical plans support the goals and objectives of the E-ISAC's long-term strategic plan.

## Transforming the E-ISAC: 2017 and Beyond

In the coming years, NERC should build on the foundation of the 2015 ESCC recommendations, and position the E-ISAC to provide more robust security information for better understanding of security weaknesses and strengths across the ERO. By addressing the three primary drivers outlined above, NERC can transform the E-ISAC into a world-class intelligence collecting and analytical capability for the electricity industry. To accomplish this, the E-ISAC must achieve a maturity level where industry completely trusts it to gather, hold, analyze, and distribute highly sensitive security information, with no fear that information voluntarily submitted to the E-ISAC would ever be used for a compliance enforcement action or investigation.

As we strengthen the foundation built over the past two years, the E-ISAC should undertake a comprehensive multi-year transformation to build capabilities that include trusted, secure, multidirectional networks and a movement from a hub/spoke model to a very active multi-level engagement. The E-ISAC strives to be the industry's most credible source for actionable, big picture information. This roadmap is illustrated in the graphic below.


2015 and 2016 were foundation-building years, set in motion by the ESCC strategic review and the publication of the findings and recommendations. In 2015, NERC implemented an employee code of conduct, completed a physical and logical separation of the E-ISAC from other parts of NERC, hired strategic leadership and key industry experts, and rebuilt the organization with new internal functional groups. Also that year, the name was changed from the ES-ISAC to the E-ISAC and new logos, color schemes, and branding were launched. In 2016, the old web portal was upgraded with the intention of setting in motion a completely new platform capability that will launch later in 2017. Over the past two years, membership engagement and information sharing grew rapidly, new products and services were launched, and the third Grid Security Exercise (GridEx III) was successfully administered by the E-ISAC. The impact of these initial changes on the E-ISAC's capability to respond to real-world incidents was validated by the Ukraine grid attacks in December 2015, denial of service attacks from Internet of Things (IoT) devices in October 2016, and the second Ukraine event along with the Grizzly Steppe incident at the end of December 2016.

As was pointed out frequently in the past two years, the "IS" and the " $A$ " in "ISAC" define the two primary strategic themes that must be in place for the organization to be successful. In 2017, the E-ISAC is deploying new information sharing and analysis tools such as the Cyber Automated Information Sharing System (CAISS) and an Event Visualization Tool (EVT) to increase the speed and ease of sharing cyber threat information. While the Cybersecurity Risk Information Sharing Program (CRISP) has enhanced visibility and understanding of cyber threats for the electricity industry, processing classified information takes time. As information comes in from CRISP sensors and goes to the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, the E-ISAC will leverage a new unclassified data storage and analytics capability inside the E-ISAC so that more actionable information can be sent to industry on a timelier basis. Later this year we anticipate that alerts and technical information will flow securely between CAISS and CRISP in our efforts to expand our data collection beyond the current participant pool and to achieve a more comprehensive picture of industry threats than we have today.

The major technical effort in 2017 is a planned replacement of the current web portal with a new "platform" that will enable automatic information sharing, the creation of private discussion groups, data visualization, and many other features that the E-ISAC's members requested. To support the new tools and the needs of the sector,
additional analysts will be hired in 2017. In addition, new partnerships are envisioned with organizations like the Computer Emergency Response Team Coordination Center (CERT/CC), and at the end of 2017, the E-ISAC will host the GridEx IV. In mid-April 2017, the internal structure of the E-ISAC was modified to align the staff to better serve the industry. There are now two major groups-one focused on operations and analysis and the other on programs and member engagement. Some minor facility improvements are also planned for 2017.

Looking forward, the next five years (2018-2022) will focus on transforming the E-ISAC into a world-class intelligence collecting and analytical capability for the electricity industry. To achieve this goal, the E-ISAC should increase its capability to collect security intelligence; increase the number of specialized analysts; acquire additional data storage, management, and sharing technologies; and increase the E-ISAC's access to classified networks and facilities.

## New Intelligence Collection - To Support Better Unclassified Information Sharing

Some new collection capabilities coming online in 2017 such as CAISS and the Department of Energy's CYOTE project will bring additional intelligence, but the E-ISAC should also consider more active monitoring of public and private networks for new threats, perhaps collecting data from sensors in Operational Technology (OT) networks, and increasing the ability to monitor social media and other open sources. Some of that new collection could be done by others as a service that the E-ISAC would pay for.

## Access to Classified Networks and Facilities - To Improve Sharing of Highly Sensitive Information

While the majority of the E-ISAC's staff hold US government security clearances, the facility inside of NERC operates at the unclassified level. This requires E-ISAC staff to travel to government facilities in order to view and analyze classified data. On the industry side, very few entities have access to classified facilities and most do not have staff with appropriate clearances. To support the strategic goal of better information sharing, both the EISAC and industry members should have increased access to classified data and classified information sharing networks. Relationships with government partners need to be leveraged to make valuable classified data and analysis rapidly available to asset owners and operators.

## More Analysts - To Improve the E-ISAC's Analytical Capabilities

The E-ISAC should hire technical analysts with specializations in fields such as industrial control system security, end-point (host) security, network security, cloud security, and penetration testing. Over the next three to five years an estimated ten or more analysts should be hired at a rate of two or three per year so that the annual increase of NERC's budget is minimized.

## Acquisition of New Technologies - To Improve Industry Engagement

As more data is collected, the E-ISAC should acquire additional data storage, management, and sharing technologies. These technologies must be as secure as possible, given that the risk of a targeted data breach will increase as the E-ISAC improves its capability to give early warning to industry about threats and vulnerabilities discovered via data analysis. Specific technologies needed in the next five years include event visualization via the new platform, predictive analysis based on artificial intelligence, real-time threat feeds to members, a customized platform experience for each user, and federated information sharing.

Beyond 2023 security challenges will continue to expand, requiring additional resources and perhaps a different relationship across the energy industry. Due to commonality of threats across all energy companies, rapid growth of vulnerable control systems, and a convergence of lines of business within the industry, we must consider whether or not the E-ISAC should remain focused only on electricity, or if it should expand to include all energy owners/operators (electricity, gas, oil, and natural gas).

Other items to consider beyond 2023 include the size and location of the E-ISAC facility and potential partnerships with the research community. Due to limitations of the NERC budget, some of these new capabilities would need outside funding from the government or perhaps grants from large industry companies.

## Other MEC Guidance

Several questions were presented to the MEC membership about the long-term future of the E-ISAC. Most of the questions were answered in the discussion paragraphs above. The remaining questions not previously discussed and the MEC's summarized responses are below.

## Should the E-ISAC move to 24/7 operations?

Not immediately but the decision should be based on changing situations and activity levels. This response is driven by the reality of the cost for the additional staff, and by the reality that very little data is submitted to the E-ISAC for analysis outside of normal business hours. But, as the E-ISAC's capabilities and data collection grow, there will likely be a point in the next $3-5$ years when it might be necessary to move to round-the-clock operations.

## What is the E-ISAC's relationship with other ISACs?

There is concern that other ISACs (the Financial Services ISAC, or FS-ISAC, is a recent example) will attempt to recruit electric utilities to pay for special analytical services in order to cover expanding costs. The consensus view of the MEC is that the E-ISAC should not discourage members from taking advantage of services offered by other ISACs, and should try to learn about those new capabilities with an eye towards developing them organically within the E-ISAC when appropriate. Services offered by other ISACs should be viewed as additional intelligence sources. Additionally, the E-ISAC should develop stronger information sharing partnerships with other ISACs and increase the level of cross-sector engagement.

## Should the E-ISAC have an international relationship?

The E-ISAC, as part of NERC, currently has members in Canada and Mexico. The MEC recommended that the EISAC consider establishing formal information sharing relationships with other countries such as Japan or the United Kingdom. Because no other countries are interconnected with the North American grid beyond the US, Canada, and Mexico, any future information sharing relationship with entities in other countries would be at a very high level and must preserve the privacy of North American entities that are voluntarily sharing with the EISAC.

## Should the E-ISAC accept funding from sources beyond NERC assessments?

Government funding may be necessary to cover costs of the recommended expansions of technical capabilities, staff, and facilities. MEC members cautioned about any potential "attached strings" that come with government grants. Beyond 2018, some member companies have expressed interest in a model like CRISP where companies can pay for additional services, or perhaps moving to a tierbased pricing model.

## Conclusion and Next Steps

The next several years present an opportunity to transform the E-ISAC into a world-class intelligence collecting and analytical capability for the electricity industry; and an opportunity to support NERC's overall initiatives to better understand the current security posture of the North American grid. As threats, technologies, and business process change, the E-ISAC, in order to be as valuable as it can to the industry, must evolve to a maturity level where industry completely trusts it to gather, hold, analyze, and distribute highly sensitive security information. Specific financial projections, technology requirements, staffing, and facility improvements are being developed and will be incorporated in the NERC strategic plan and the NERC business plan and budget.
Towards this transformation, for the near term (remainder of 2017 and all of 2018), the E-ISAC plans to:

- Hire additional analysts
- Increase the in-house data storage and analysis capabilities
- Grow the CRISP and CAISS programs
- Deliver a world-class information sharing platform well before GridEx IV
- Grow membership engagement via the new platform
- Increase engagement with other ISACs and information sharing partners
- Increase engagement with Canada and Mexico
- Provide higher quality grid security metrics data to support NERC's data collection initiatives


## Attachment <br> Expanding E-ISAC Operations to Include 24x7 Onsite Operations

At the request of the ESCC's MEC, the E-ISAC evaluated the benefits of and requirements for expanding operations to include certain $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities. The purpose of this document is to outline: (1) the value of expanding the E-ISAC's operations to include $24 \times 7$ on-site capabilities; (2) a recommendation as to the level of $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities the E-ISAC should implement; and (3) the staffing and other requirements necessary to implement such capabilities.

This document is organized as follows:

- Section I provides an executive summary of the E-ISAC's proposal for expanding its operations to $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities.
- Section II provides an overview of the E-ISAC's existing organization structure, hours of operation, and staffing levels.
- Section III discusses the value of expanding E-ISAC operations to include $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities.
- Section IV provides the E-ISAC's proposal with respect to the level of $24 \times 7$ capabilities it should offer.
- Section $V$ discusses staffing requirements for expanded operations.


## Section I: Executive Summary

As discussed further below, the E-ISAC recommends expanding its operations to include certain $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities. Specifically, the E-ISAC would incrementally expand its operations to have one to two E-ISAC personnel onsite at all times to monitor data feeds, respond to member inquiries, and conduct physical and cyber security analysis. $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities could provide significant benefits to members, including (1) timely analysis and information sharing regarding developing physical or cyber security incidents that are discovered or occur outside of normal hours, and (2) the continued development of actionable intelligence during the overnight and weekend hours to enhance industry's preparation for, and response to, any potential physical or cyber security threat or incident.

As the value of expanding E-ISAC operations to include $24 \times 7$ capabilities depends, in large part, on increasing the flow of data into the E-ISAC to warrant the additional resources, the E-ISAC recommends accomplishing the expansion to $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities in stages through 2020 . Using a phased approach would (1) allow the expansion to $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities to move in parallel with the E-ISAC's plans to increase data flow and deploy additional analytical tools and capabilities, and (2) provide the E-ISAC the ability to reassess the timing of additional projected resources needs on an annual basis during its budget approval process based on data flow and work demands.

The E-ISAC proposes that during 2019, the E-ISAC expand its Monday-Friday operations from 6:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. to a full $24 \times 5$ (minus weekends and holidays), with one watch officer assigned to each after-hours period (see Table 1). In 2020, the E-ISAC proposes to move to a full $24 \times 7$ operations by adding onsite staff during weekends and holidays. This proposed plan and resources needs for future years (beyond 2020) will continue to be subject to review and approval in the context of NERC's annual budget approval process, and will primarily augment the $24 \times 7$ nature of the watch.

# Section II: E-ISAC Organization Structure, Hours of Operation, and Staffing Levels 

## E-I SAC Organizational Structure

The E-ISAC is separated into two components: (1) Partnerships and Engagement, and (2) Operations. Partnerships and Engagement consists of cross-sector coordination, member outreach, and policy and coordination. The Operations component is the interface for all information sharing and analysis. Operations consists of three teams: Watch Operations, Cyber Analysis and Context, and Physical Security Analysis.

Watch Operations - All information the E-ISAC receives is routed through the Watch Operations team, which performs initial analysis and then passes the information for detailed action to the respective analysis teams. Watch Operations monitors the operations email account for member and cross-sector sharing, manages the EISAC portal, reviews and edits (when necessary, to remove attribution) member postings on the portal, and has primary responsibility for all E-ISAC postings on the portal.

Cyber Analysis and Context - The E-ISAC Cyber Analysis and Context team performs detailed analysis on the cyber security-related information shared by E-ISAC members and partners. The team's goal is to analyze that information to develop and share actionable indicators and the cyber security "big picture" with members and partners. This effort includes vetting information shared by government and cross-sector partners for validity to include the "so what" factor on how certain indicators would apply to a sector. Additionally, the Cyber Analysis and Context team performs analysis of malware samples submitted to the E-ISAC to identify and disseminate indicators that can be used to detect infections or mitigate malware command and control communications.

Physical Security Analysis - The Physical Security Analysis team performs detailed analysis on all physical security events shared with the E-ISAC. When a report is received, the Physical Security Analysis team reviews the information and, as necessary, contacts the relevant entity to seek more detailed information, to determine if there is a bigger threat to the sector. This is especially important in instances of sabotage, vandalism, and explosive devices. The Physical Security Analysis team engages with law enforcement and state fusion centers to help build situational awareness and identify adversary tools, techniques, and procedures that can be shared with industry physical security teams to increase their awareness and protect against similar activity.

## E-I SAC Watch Operations Hours of Operation and Staffing Levels

The E-ISAC Watch Operations currently operates with personnel onsite (at 1325 G Street, NW Suite 600, Washington, DC 20005) Monday through Friday from 6 a.m. to 6 p .m. Unless there is an event the necessitates increased after-hours staffing, the only after-hours support to members is provided by a Watch Operations duty officer, rotated through the Watch Operations team on a weekly basis, who monitors the 24 -hour incident reporting line. The Watch Operations duty officer is not located onsite outside of normal operating hours. The E-ISAC Watch Operations is currently staffed as follows:

- One (1) Chief, Watch Operations
- Five (5) Watch Officers:

1. Watch Manager - Supervisor-level oversight of Watch Officers
2. Watch Officer: Daily Operations - Watch Floor facility maintenance, tour scheduling, morning situation awareness products, etc.
3. Watch Officer: Metrics and Reporting (Vacant) - Provides metrics on Watch Operations to NERC and E-ISAC leadership (portal visitors and usage, support ticket tracking, etc.)
4. Watch Officer: Technical Assessments - Quick-hit, but deeper-dive analysis of cyber event reporting
5. Watch Officer: Open Source Intelligence (Vacant) - Development and production of all analytical products produced by Watch Operations

The E-ISAC's 2019 budget includes the augmentation of existing capabilities with the following additional personnel:

1. Watch Officer: Security Analysis - Specializes in analyzing and information sharing of physical securityspecific events
2. Watch Officer: Interagency Liaison - Rotates between the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (NCCIC) watch floor or other entities with standing information-sharing programs

## Section III: Value of Expanding to Include $\mathbf{2 4 x} \mathbf{7}$ Onsite Capabilities

As noted above, the E-ISAC does not operate on a $24 \times 7$ basis. As the E-ISAC continue to mature, however, there are benefits to be gained by expanding operations to include certain $24 \times 7$ onsite operations. The following is a discussion of the benefits of having $24 \times 7$ capabilities.

Increased Capability to Address Events Outside of Normal Hours - To date, there have been only a few events that have occurred outside of normal business hours that required substantive analysis and immediate communication with stakeholders. Such events, however, could become more common as the risk to the nation's critical infrastructure increases. ${ }^{45}$ Business hours in many of the nation states that pose the greatest cyber threats to U.S. interests - e.g., Russia, China, Iran, and Democratic People's Republic of Korea ${ }^{46}$ - are generally opposite those in North America. Hackers may also target members and partners in North America during reduced staffing periods (e.g. overnight, holidays, and weekends). ${ }^{47}$ With an onsite $24 \times 7$ staffing presence, the E-ISAC would improve its ability to timely analyze and respond to potential events that occur outside of normal business hours.

Development of Actionable Intelligence for Daytime Staff - As the E-ISAC continues to develop and establish new data sources, $24 \times 7$ onsite staffing would allow the E-ISAC additional time to perform analysis to develop and share actionable intelligence with member night shift personnel or to have reports available for daytime staff to assess at the beginning of their work day. Rapid access to information is critical when network defenders are working through the Cyber Kill Chain model to remediate cyber-attacks. ${ }^{48}$

The value of and need for $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities is dependent on increased flow of data into the E-ISAC. Without increased data and additional tools and capabilities to analyze the data, the move towards $24 \times 7$ may not provide the intended benefits described above or warrant the additional expenditure of resources. To that end, the E-ISAC is already taking steps to increase data sharing from members and seeking new data sources to which it has access:

- Member Engagement - The E-ISAC is currently engaging in a number of efforts to improve the data flow from E-ISAC members. Among other things, the E-ISAC expects increased data flow from: (1) the Industry Augmentation Program; (2) expanding the number of CRISP companies to provide additional insight in the classified threats facing our members' information technology systems, ${ }^{49}$ and (3) developing advanced analytics capabilities (e.g., the Cyber Automated Information Sharing System). The E-ISAC is also taking steps to increase membership overall.

[^25]- Government Partnerships - The E-ISAC is renewing and expanding relationships with federal government partners (e.g., Departments of Energy and Homeland Security, FBI, Canadian Cyber Incident Response Centre) to increase information sharing and data flows, and gaining additional credentialed access where appropriate. These relationships will expand access to government-informed information and analysis.
- International Partnerships - The E-ISAC is expanding partnerships with international counterparts. During the June 2017 cyberattacks that began in the Ukraine and spread across Europe, the E-ISAC worked with analysts at the National Cyber Security Centre in the U.K. to assess the tactics, techniques, and procedures being used by the adversary and to provide updated information to members. ${ }^{50}$ The E-ISAC is also fostering a relationship with the nascent Japan Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center, and the Canadian Cyber Incident Response Center. The information gained from these international engagements will help provide a more complete assessment of, and ability to act on, attacks against international electricity sector partners which could also threaten the North American grid.
- Strategic Vendor Partnerships - The E-ISAC is focused on developing strategic relationships with intelligence-reporting providers to provide insight into threats facing the sector's industrial control system technologies. ${ }^{51}$


## Section IV: Recommended Level of 24x7 Onsite Capabilities

Given the value that $24 \times 7$ operations could provide to its members and partners, the E-ISAC recommends expanding the role of the Watch Operations team to include certain $24 \times 7$ onsite capabilities. Depending on the level of data flow into the E-ISAC, the goal is to have always have one-to-two E-ISAC Watch Officers onsite outside normal business hours.

The responsibilities of the Watch Officers onsite after normal business hours would shift slightly from the duties traditionally conducted by Watch Officers during normal business hours (i.e., monitor and respond to incoming information and perform a "quick hit" initial analysis of incoming data). For Watch Officers that staff the night, weekend and holiday hours, the nature of their responsibilities shift more towards analysis. Baring a substantial security event, after-hours communication and data flow from members and partners-including international partners-is not expected to be as extensive as that received during normal business hours. As such, while a primary focus would continue to be monitoring data feeds and responding to member and partner inquiries, the after-hours onsite Watch Officer would focus more on analysis of data and the development of actionable intelligence reports for daytime staff.

## Section V: Staffing Requirements for Expanded Operations

The E-ISAC recommends that expansion to $24 \times 7$ capabilities to the level discussed in the previous section be accomplished in stages through 2020 and beyond. Using a phased approach will allow the expansion to move in parallel with the E-ISAC's plans to increase data flow and deploy additional analytical tools and capabilities. As noted, the value of expanding operations to include $24 \times 7$ capabilities depends, in large part, on increasing the data flow in order to warrant the additional resources. A phased approach would provide the ability to reassess the timing of additional projected resource needs on an annual basis during NERC's budget approval process. The E-ISAC recommends that the expansion proceed as outlined below.

[^26]Table 1: Watch Officer Assignments and Coverage

| Year | Monday-Friday <br> 6:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. | Monday-Friday <br> 2:30-11:00 p.m. | Monday-Friday <br> 10:00 p.m.-6:30 a.m. | Weekends/Holidays <br> 12:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2018 | Maintain current <br> planned staffing levels | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2019 | Add two watch officers <br> from 2018 levels | Add one watch officer | Add one watch <br> officer | N/A |
| 2020 | Add one watch officer <br> from 2019 levels | Maintain staffing level <br> from 2019 | Maintain staffing <br> level from 2019 | Add two watch officers |
| 2021 | Add one watch officer <br> from 2020 levels | Add one watch officer <br> from 2020 levels | Add one watch <br> officer from 2020 <br> levels | Maintain staffing level <br> from 2020 |

The table below provides the recommended phase-in plan for additional personnel required to meet the expanded operations for each of the next three years.

| Table 2: Watch Officer Totals and Cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Increased Watch Personnel for Regular Hours (2018 LongTerm Strategy) | Proposed <br> Additional Watch Personnel for $\mathbf{2 4 x 7}$ Coverage (Incremental to 2018 Long-Term Strategy) | Total <br> Proposed Watch Staffing, including 24x7 Watch Capabilities | Estimated Incremental Cost (including salary, incentive, benefits) (24x7 Watch Capabilities) | Running Total for Estimated Incremental Cost (24x7 Watch Capabilities) |
| 2018 | 1 | 0 | 6 | N/A | - |
| 2019 | 2 | 2 | 10 | \$370,000 | \$370,000 |
| 2020 | 1 | 2 | 13 | \$370,000 | \$740,000 |
| 2021 | 1 | 2 | 16 | \$370,000 | \$1,110,000 |

As noted above, this proposed plan and resources needs for future years (2020 and beyond) will be subject to review and approval in the context of NERC's annual budget approval process.

## Exhibit F - CMEP Technology Project

## What is it?

As the ERO Enterprise matured to a risk-based approach in its regulatory posture, a more comprehensive system to manage and analyze compliance monitoring and enforcement information became necessary. The CMEP Technology Project began in 2014 to meet that need with the goal of improving and standardizing processes in the Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program (CMEP) across the ERO Enterprise. The new project will align the business processes of NERC and the Regional Entities on a single platform; improve documentation, sharing and analysis of compliance work activities; and make CMEP activities more effective and efficient across the ERO Enterprise; thus enhancing the reliability and security of the grid.

## Why are we doing it?

The CMEP Technology Project is designed to promote greater efficiencies in compliance monitoring and enforcement work, better using ERO Enterprise resources and lowering costs, while offering alignment on a single platform across the Enterprise based on a commercial product designed specifically for managing risk and verifying compliance. NERC and the Regional Entities evaluated the benefits of unifying processes and systems to ensure consistency in monitoring compliance with NERC Reliability Standards and judged this effort as a necessary step in the evolution of the ERO model. The NERC Board of Trustees approved the project at their quarterly meeting on November 9, 2017. Benefits include:

- Consistency. Moving to a common platform with a single common way for registered entities to interact with the ERO Enterprise on compliance and enforcement will aid significantly in addressing potential gaps in consistency.
- Cost Management. By moving to a common platform, economies of scale can significantly reduce, by almost $50 \%$, annual cash expenses incurred for procurement of tools and services that support implementation of the CMEP across the ERO Enterprise.
- Productivity. Because of the large number of staff both within the ERO Enterprise and at registered entities that are working to assure reliability through verification of compliance with the Reliability Standards, there is a significant potential for improvements in productivity. These enhancements will reduce the effort of documenting compliance and allow for more focus on ensuring reliability.

- Effectiveness. In addition to the benefits provided by implementing consistent processes across the ERO Enterprise, moving to a product specifically designed to support management of risk and verifying compliance will help ensure focus is kept on those things that matter most to reliability. Fine tuning of our processes to align more closely with industry standard best practices and guidelines will also improve the quality of our work.
- Cyber Security. As threats against critical infrastructure have grown, a continuously improving cyber security posture has become an essential part of operations. This implementation will elevate our information protection strategy to ensure we continue to provide the high levels of confidentiality demanded by our industry.


## How are we doing it?

In the past several years, a number of companies have developed sets of tools to support the three areas of Governance, Risk, and Compliance (GRC). These tools align well with our mission as the ERO Enterprise: assisting in ensuring information can be shared across a large and geographically dispersed leadership team, supporting the analysis and management of risks and threats, and having robust mechanisms for documenting and tracking compliance with both regulations and internal policies and procedures.


While the various products, tools, templates and file transfers in use today across the ERO Enterprise have been effective for ensuring reliability and verifying compliance, the amount of manual work that is required to maintain and share the information contained within them is intensive. The time is appropriate to bring everything together within a single suite of tools. To help ensure that the organizational change required is scoped to a manageable size, NERC and the Regions are planning the implementation as a set of three defined functional releases.

## When is this happening?

Work has already begun on implementing this vision. Initial feasibility workshops were conducted with NERC and Regional Entity leaders in 2014 and 2015, leading to the development of a long-term roadmap and a Request for Information to vendors, which led to a Request for Proposal and selection of a vendor earlier in 2018.

Work in progress includes several cycles of process harmonization intended to ensure alignment between NERC and each of the Regional Entities prior to implementation. While consistency between Regions is a core element of this effort, the accommodation of appropriate regional differences is intended to be addressed within the tool as well. As processes are aligned and confirmed, elements of those processes will be built and
 tested within the tool, leading to structured releases of functionality.

Additional development to centralize the management and administration of information related to NERC Reliability Standards and registered entities will be undertaken. Integration to transfer data will also be developed. Information security will be a key design consideration for both systems, which will provide high levels of confidentiality and access control.

## Who is working on this?

NERC and the Regional Entities began this effort by evaluating consultants with experience implementing GRC systems. Deloitte, identified by Gartner as a "visionary leader" in Risk Management Consulting Services, was selected to assist the ERO Enterprise with this effort. Deloitte has extensive knowledge of the electric utility industry and the ERO through prior projects and engagements. Next, NERC and the Regions developed and issued an RFP that resulted in the review of a number of potential tools to determine both their organizational and technical capabilities to meet the unique needs of the ERO Enterprise. Nasdaq BWise was selected as the vendor and tool of choice for the CMEP Technology Project.

## How can I get involved?

The project team is working with the Compliance and Certification Committee and their Alignment Working Group to ensure the perspectives of registered entities are considered. In addition to reaching out to the members of the CCC, feel free to contact anyone with the ERO Enterprise with questions, concerns, or suggestions.

For more information, go to https://www.nerc.com/ResourceCenter/Pages/CMEPTechnologyProject.aspx.

# Exhibit G - Situation Awareness for FERC, NERC, and the Regional Entities (SAFNR) 

## Overview

The Situation Awareness for FERC, NERC, and the Regional Entities (SAFNR) tool, initiated in February 2010, is a system composed of hardware, software, and communication (network) capabilities, providing near real-time information about the current operating conditions of the BPS. SAFNR provides valuable information from a widearea view about BPS impacts from hurricanes, hot and cold weather extremes, and varying system conditions. However, NERC's Bulk Power System Awareness (BPSA) staff's ability to accurately understand BPS current conditions has declined over the years as the technology has aged. Enhancing SAFNR will incorporate functionality elements piloted during GridEx IV and address the recommendations from both the GridEx IV Executive Tabletop and GridEx IV Distributed Play Lessons Learned Report.

## Background

NERC and the Regional Entities monitor operating conditions on the BPS in North America to maintain an awareness of situations that may impact or have the potential to impact the reliable operation of the grid. As called for in the ROP, ${ }^{52}$ the Situation Awareness program enables NERC to initiate timely communications with key stakeholders, including Reliability Coordinators, FERC, Canadian and Mexican governmental agencies, the DHS, and the E-ISAC. Awareness of system events also enables NERC to identify risks for mitigation through its Events Analysis process, permits and promotes the development of lessons learned, and contributes to the ability to trend reliability performance. Similarly, FERC monitors conditions on the BPS in the United States for comparable purposes. Situation Awareness has three essential elements: the ability to perceive, comprehend, and then project that understanding into the future. More simply stated, it is the "What?", "So what?", and finally, "Now what?" regarding the status of the grid.

The system has the capability to include data for electric system facilities operating at 230 kV and above and generation units at 500 MW and above and provides near-real time situational awareness information, with data provided by Reliability Coordinators, Balancing Authorities, and Transmission Operators. SAFNR provides the ability to monitor and be aware of the current conditions and assess forecasted conditions on the BPS. The tool also supports the ability to understand and clearly communicate normal system conditions (or conditions of heightened risk to reliability) among Reliability Coordinators, Regional Entities, NERC and FERC.

SAFNR was procured using specifications and technology from 2010, making the technology platform quite dated relative to the latest available tools. With the insights and experience gained from the years of successful use, enhancements and advanced capabilities are envisioned for rapid and accurate situational awareness that protects the proprietary nature of the information while maximizing the understanding of the system conditions, especially during emergencies.

While a successful tool deployment has been maintained and used successfully for more than eight years, NERC BPSA staff cannot efficiently or cost effectively update the underlying power system information or real-time data feeds on risks to reliability, such as severe weather, flooding, and wildfires, as well as available information on interconnection frequency, Balancing Authority ACE, and aggregated customer outages. The tool has been used to support the GridEx exercise, but also demonstrated its shortcomings when aiming for a more precise wide-area view of system conditions. Enhancing SAFNR will incorporate functionality elements piloted during GridEx IV that provided the E-ISAC and the ESCC with more timely and understandable information. Further, these

[^27]improvements address the GridEx IV Executive Tabletop Report recommendation that states that NERC and the EISAC should enhance their ability to provide reliable, timely, and accurate information regarding the state of grid reliability and security threats and events.

## Next Steps

NERC IT's Project Management Office will guide this project through the normal process, including development of a business case, managing the RFP, negotiating with vendors and developers, and ultimately ensuring the successful implementation of the new tool This approach can be summarized as follows:

- Development of a business opportunity and assessment analysis
- Current state and future state
- Financial analysis
- Capital and operational costs
- Return on investment
- Project governance and gated approvals
- Executive sponsorship
- Tollgates
- Leadership review (e.g., ERO TLT)
- Monthly financial review
- Project execution
- Project management oversight
- Project communications
- Project scheduling and resource management
- Contract/vendor management
- Change management and training
- Regional and registered entity engagement and communications
- Business value analysis and benefits realization


## Appendix 1 - NERC Staff Organization Chart

See subsequent pages for NERC's Organization Chart.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{array}{\|} \text { \% of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1074 | Alachua, City of | u.s. | 135,500 | 135,500 |  |  | 0.058\% | 0.058\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1075 | Bartow, City of | u.s. | 295,000 | 295,000 |  |  | 0.127\% | 0.127\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1076 | Chattahoochee, City of | u.s. | 36,900 | 36,900 |  |  | 0.016\% | 0.016\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1077 | Florida Keys Electric Cooperative Assn | u.s. | 750,000 | 750,000 |  |  | 0.322\% | 0.322\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.019\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1078 | Florida Power \& Light Co. | u.s. | 114,357,000 | 114,357,000 |  |  | 49.139\% | 49.139\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 2.570\% | 2.570\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 2.906\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1079 | Florida Public Utilities Company | u.s. | 350,000 | 350,000 |  |  | 0.150\% | 0.150\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% |
| 2017 | frcc | 1080 | Gainesville Regional Utilities | u.s. | 1,811,300 | 1,811,300 |  |  | 0.778\% | 0.778\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.041\% | 0.041\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.046\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1081 | Homestead, City of | u.s. | 596,000 | 596,000 |  |  | 0.256\% | 0.256\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% |
| 2017 | frcc | 1082 | JEA | u.s. | 12,520,000 | 12,520,000 |  |  | 5.380\% | 5.380\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.281\% | 0.281\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.318\% |
| 2017 | frcc | 1083 | Lakeland Electric | u.s. | 3,086,000 | 3,086,000 |  |  | 1.326\% | 1.326\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.069\% | 0.069\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.078\% |
| 2017 | frcc | 1626 | Lee County Electric Cooperative, Inc | u.s. | 4,068,000 | 4,068,000 |  |  | 1.748\% | 1.748\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.091\% | 0.091\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.103\% |
| 2017 | frcc | 1661 | City of Lake Worth | u.s. | 470,000 | 470,000 |  |  | 0.202\% | 0.202\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.012\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1084 | Mount Dora, City of | u.s. | 91,900 | 91,900 |  |  | 0.039\% | 0.039\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1085 | New Smyrna Beach, Utilities Commission of | u.s. | 434,000 | 434,000 |  |  | 0.186\% | 0.186\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1086 | Orlando Utilities Commission | u.s. | 6,101,300 | 6,101,300 |  |  | 2.622\% | 2.622\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.137\% | 0.137\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.155\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1087 | Duke Energy Florida | u.s. | 40,748,100 | 40,748,100 |  |  | 17.510\% | 17.510\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.916\% | 0.916\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.036\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1088 | Quincy, City of | u.s. | 130,700 | 130,700 |  |  | 0.056\% | 0.056\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1089 | Reedy Creek Improvement District | u.s. | 1,211,000 | 1,211,000 |  |  | 0.520\% | 0.520\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.027\% | 0.027\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.031\% |
| 2017 | fric | 1090 | St. Cloud, City of (OUC) | u.s. | 769,000 | 769,000 |  |  | 0.330\% | 0.330\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.020\% |
| 2017 | fric | 1091 | Tallahassee, City of | u.s. | 2,758,000 | 2,758,000 |  |  | 1.185\% | 1.185\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.062\% | 0.062\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.070\% |
| 2017 | frec | 1092 | Tampa Electric Company | u.s. | 20,296,000 | 20,296,000 |  |  | 8.721\% | 8.721\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.456\% | 0.456\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.516\% |
| 2017 | fric | 1603 | City of Vero Beach | u.s. | 757,000 | 757,000 |  |  | 0.325\% | 0.325\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.019\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1093 | Wauchula, City of | u.s. | 65,000 | 65,000 |  |  | 0.028\% | 0.028\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | fric | 1094 | Williston, City of | u.s. | 36,200 | 36,200 |  |  | 0.016\% | 0.016\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1095 | Winter Park, City of | u.s. | 442,100 | 442,100 |  |  | 0.190\% | 0.190\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | frec | 1724 | Moore Haven, City of | u.s. | 15,000 | 15,000 |  |  | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1072 | Florida Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 5,984,400 | 5,984,400 |  |  | 2.572\% | 2.572\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.134\% | 0.134\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.152\% |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1073 | Seminole Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 14,404,000 | 14,404,000 |  |  | 6.189\% | 6.189\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.324\% | 0.324\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.366\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL FRCC |  | 232,719,400 | 232,719,400 | - |  | 100.000\% | 100.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 5.229\% | 5.229\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 5.914\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1199 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 19,376,180 | 19,376,180 | - |  | 3.992\% | 3.992\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.435\% | 0.435\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.492\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1201 | Central lowa Power Cooperative (CIPCO) | u.s. | 2,831,165 | 2,831,165 | - |  | 0.583\% | 0.583\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.064\% | 0.064\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.072\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1204 | Corn Belt Power Cooperative | u.s. | 1,969,812 | 1,969,812 | - |  | 0.406\% | 0.406\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.044\% | 0.044\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.050\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1207 | Dairyland Power Coooperative | u.s. | 5,509,070 | 5,509,070 | - |  | 1.135\% | 1.135\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.124\% | 0.124\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.140\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1210 | Great River Energy | u.s. | 13,144,443 | 13,144,443 | - |  | 2.708\% | 2.708\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.295\% | 0.295\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.334\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1222 | Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 3,832,290 | 3,832,290 | - |  | 0.790\% | 0.790\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.086\% | 0.086\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.097\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1230 | Nebraska Public Power District | u.s. | 13,689,668 | 13,689,668 | - |  | 2.820\% | 2.820\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.308\% | 0.308\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.348\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1232 | Omaha Public Power District | u.s. | 11,172,502 | 11,172,502 | - |  | 2.302\% | 2.302\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.251\% | 0.251\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.284\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1240 | Western Area Power Administration (UM) | u.s. | 9,268,980 | 9,268,980 | - |  | 1.910\% | 1.910\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.208\% | 0.208\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.236\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1239 | Western Area Power Administration (LM) | u.s. | 45,883 | 45,883 | - |  | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1217 | Manitoba Hydro | can | 23,893,599 |  | 23,893,599 |  | 4.923\% | 0.000\% | 4.923\% | 0.000\% | 0.537\% | 0.000\% | 0.537\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1235 | SaskPower | can | 24,779,000 |  | 24,779,000 |  | 5.105\% | 0.000\% | 5.105\% | 0.000\% | 0.557\% | 0.000\% | 0.557\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1195 | Alliant Energy (Alliant East - WPL \& Alliant West IPL) | u.s. | 29,095,886 | 29,095,886 | - |  | 5.994\% | 5.994\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.654\% | 0.654\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.739\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1710 | Dahlberg Electric Company | u.s. | 111,972 | 111,972 | - |  | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1216 | Madison, Gas and Electric | u.s. | 3,383,670 | 3,383,670 | - |  | 0.697\% | 0.697\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.076\% | 0.076\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.086\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1220 | MidAmerican Energy Company | u.s. | 25,664,492 | 25,664,492 | - |  | 5.287\% | 5.287\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.577\% | 0.577\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.652\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1221 | Minnesota Power | u.s. | 12,915,759 | 12,915,759 | - |  | 2.661\% | 2.661\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.290\% | 0.290\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.328\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1226 | Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. | u.s. | 3,251,539 | 3,251,539 | - |  | 0.670\% | 0.670\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.073\% | 0.073\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.083\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1711 | North Central Power Company | u.s. | 37,156 | 37,156 | - |  | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |

[^28]| Data <br> Year | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | MRO | 1231 | NorthWestern Energy | u.s. | 1,557,326 | 1,557,326 | - |  | 0.321\% | 0.321\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.035\% | 0.035\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.040\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1712 | NorthWestern Wisconsin | u.s. | 185,796 | 185,796 | - |  | 0.038\% | 0.038\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1233 | Otter Tail Power Company | u.s. | 4,975,311 | 4,975,311 | - |  | 1.025\% | 1.025\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.112\% | 0.112\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.126\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1664 | Wisconsin Public Service (WPS) | u.s. | 11,692,550 | 11,692,550 | - |  | 2.409\% | 2.409\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.263\% | 0.263\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.297\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1665 | Upper Peninsula Power Company (UPPCO) | u.s. | 683,680 | 683,680 | - |  | 0.141\% | 0.141\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% | 0.015\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1244 | Xcel Energy Company (NSP) | u.s. | 43,456,066 | 43,456,066 | - |  | 8.953\% | 8.953\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.976\% | 0.976\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.104\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1196 | Ames Municipal Electric System | u.s. | 756,072 | 756,072 | - |  | 0.156\% | 0.156\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.019\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1604 | Atlantic Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 81,220 | 81,220 |  |  | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1713 | Bloomer Electric \& Water Co. | u.s. | 55,261 | 55,261 | - |  | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1714 | Village of Caddott | u.s. | 13,720 | 13,720 | - |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1200 | Cedar Falls Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 517,738 | 517,738 | - |  | 0.107\% | 0.107\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1477 | Central Minnesota Municipal Power Agency (CMMPA) | u.s. | 390,178 | 390,178 | - |  | 0.080\% | 0.080\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1716 | Eldridge Electric and Water Utilities | u.s. | 42,377 | 42,377 | - |  | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1203 | City of Escanaba | u.s. | 137,824 | 137,824 | - |  | 0.028\% | 0.028\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1205 | Falls City Water \& Light Department | u.s. | 58,855 | 58,855 | - |  | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1206 | Fremont Department of Utilities | u.s. | 432,646 | 432,646 | - |  | 0.089\% | 0.089\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1208 | Geneseo Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 64,636 | 64,636 | - |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1209 | Grand Island Utilities Department | u.s. | 759,468 | 759,468 | - |  | 0.156\% | 0.156\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.019\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1717 | Great Lakes Utilities | u.s. | 1,476,412 | 1,476,412 |  |  | 0.304\% | 0.304\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.033\% | 0.033\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.038\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1718 | City of Guttenberg | u.s. | 18,847 | 18,847 | - |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1606 | Harlan Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 16,813 | 16,813 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1211 | Hastings Utililies | u.s. | 429,051 | 429,051 | - |  | 0.088\% | 0.088\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1212 | Heartland Consumers Power District | u.s. | 434,617 | 434,617 | - |  | 0.090\% | 0.090\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1213 | Hutchinson Utilities Commission | u.s. | 290,592 | 290,592 | - |  | 0.060\% | 0.060\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1719 | City of Kasota | u.s. | 3,249 | 3,249 | - |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1215 | Lincoln Electric System | u.s. | 3,204,566 | 3,204,566 | - |  | 0.660\% | 0.660\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.072\% | 0.072\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.081\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1223 | Missouri River Energy Services | u.s. | 2,695,437 | 2,695,437 | - |  | 0.555\% | 0.555\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.061\% | 0.061\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.068\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1224 | MN Municipal Power Agency (MMPA) | u.s. | 1,554,303 | 1,554,303 | - |  | 0.320\% | 0.320\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.035\% | 0.035\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.039\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1607 | Montezuma Municipal Light \& Power | u.s. | 25,244 | 25,244 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1227 | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska | u.s. | 943,023 | 943,023 | - |  | 0.194\% | 0.194\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.021\% | 0.021\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.024\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1228 | Muscatine Power and Water | u.s. | 878,182 | 878,182 | - |  | 0.181\% | 0.181\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.020\% | 0.020\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.022\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1229 | Nebraska City Utilities | u.s. | 129,117 | 129,117 | - |  | 0.027\% | 0.027\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1720 | Resale Power Group of Iowa | u.s. | 563,492 | 563,492 | - |  | 0.116\% | 0.116\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1721 | Rice Lake Utilities | u.s. | 165,419 | 165,419 | - |  | 0.034\% | 0.034\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1234 | Rochester Public Utilities | u.s. | 2,335 | 2,335 | - |  | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | mRO | 1236 | Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 2,782,217 | 2,782,217 | - |  | 0.573\% | 0.573\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.063\% | 0.063\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.071\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1722 | City of Spooner | u.s. | 31,674 | 31,674 | - |  | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | MRO | 1241 | Willmar Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 249,549 | 249,549 | - |  | 0.051\% | 0.051\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% |
| 2017 | mRo | 1242 | Wisconsin Public Power, Inc. (East and West regions) | u.s. | 5,292,675 | 5,292,675 | - |  | 1.090\% | 1.090\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.119\% | 0.119\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.135\% |
| 2017 | MRO |  | Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative | u.s. | 35,850 | 35,850 |  |  | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO-SERC |  | Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation | u.s. | 3,792,311 | 3,792,311 |  |  | 0.781\% | 0.781\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.085\% | 0.085\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.096\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1246 | American Electric Power | u.s. | 37,025,653 | 37,025,653 |  |  | 7.628\% | 7.628\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.832\% | 0.832\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.941\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1707 | AEP-VEmCo | u.s. | 646,206 | 646,206 |  |  | 0.133\% | 0.133\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% | 0.015\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1247 | Board of Public Utilities (Kansas City KS) | u.s. | 2,421,483 | 2,421,483 |  |  | 0.499\% | 0.499\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.054\% | 0.054\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.062\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1620 | Board of Public Utilities, City of McPherson, Kansas | u.s. | 1,059,362 | 1,059,362 |  |  | 0.218\% | 0.218\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.024\% | 0.024\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.027\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1647 | Carthage City Water \& Light | u.s. | 301,124 | 301,124 |  |  | 0.062\% | 0.062\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1469 | Central Valley Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 818,642 | 818,642 |  |  | 0.169\% | 0.169\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.018\% | 0.018\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.021\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1556 | City of Bentonville | u.s. | 694,607 | 694,607 |  |  | 0.143\% | 0.143\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% | 0.016\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.018\% |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1709 | City of Nixa | U.S. | 161,277 | 161,277 |  |  | 0.033\% | 0.033\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1703 | City of Chanute | u.s. | 503,616 | 503,616 |  |  | 0.104\% | 0.104\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1248 | Independence Power \& Light (Independence, MO) | u.s. | 1,041,162 | 1,041,162 |  |  | 0.215\% | 0.215\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.026\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1436 | City Utilities of Springfield, MO | U.S | 3,108,521 | 3,108,521 |  |  | 0.640\% | 0.640\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.070\% | 0.070\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.079\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1437 | East Texas Electric Coop, Inc. | u.s. | 430,647 | 430,647 |  |  | 0.089\% | 0.089\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1250 | The Empire District Electric Company | U.S. | 5,156,586 | 5,156,586 |  |  | 1.062\% | 1.062\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.116\% | 0.116\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.131\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1470 | Farmers' Electric Coop | u.s. | 287,916 | 287,916 |  |  | 0.059\% | 0.059\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1438 | Golden Spread Electric Coop | u.s. | 4,970,209 | 4,970,209 |  |  | 1.024\% | 1.024\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.112\% | 0.112\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.126\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1251 | Grand River Dam Authority | u.s. | 5,213,255 | 5,213,255 |  |  | 1.074\% | 1.074\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.117\% | 0.117\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.132\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1252 | Kansas City Power \& Light (KCPL) | U.S. | 15,476,525 | 15,476,525 |  |  | 3.189\% | 3.189\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.348\% | 0.348\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.393\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1439 | Kansas Electric Power Coop., Inc | U.S. | 2,109,123 | 2,109,123 |  |  | 0.435\% | 0.435\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.047\% | 0.047\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.054\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1440 | Kansas Municipal Energy Agency (KCPL) | U.S. | 1,576,773 | 1,576,773 |  |  | 0.325\% | 0.325\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.035\% | 0.035\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.040\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1637 | Kansas Power Pool | u.s. | 874,058 | 874,058 |  |  | 0.180\% | 0.180\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.020\% | 0.020\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.022\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1598 | KCP\&L GMOC (Greater Missouri Operations Company) | u.s. | 8,505,620 | 8,505,620 |  |  | 1.752\% | 1.752\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.191\% | 0.191\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.216\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1472 | Lea County Electric Coop | u.s. | 1,212,968 | 1,212,968 |  |  | 0.250\% | 0.250\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.027\% | 0.027\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.031\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1441 | Midwest Energy Inc. | u.s. | 1,788,935 | 1,788,935 |  |  | 0.369\% | 0.369\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.040\% | 0.040\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.045\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO-SERC |  | Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission | u.s. | 445,643 | 445,643 |  |  | 0.092\% | 0.092\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1442 | Northeast Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc. | U.S. | 3,129,216 | 3,129,216 |  |  | 0.645\% | 0.645\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.070\% | 0.070\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.080\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1255 | Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. | u.s. | 28,455,704 | 28,455,704 |  |  | 5.863\% | 5.863\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.639\% | 0.639\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.723\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1444 | Oklahoma Municipal Power Auth | u.s. | 2,846,675 | 2,846,675 |  |  | 0.586\% | 0.586\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.064\% | 0.064\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.072\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1651 | Paragould Light, Water \& Cable | u.s. | 585,598 | 585,598 |  |  | 0.121\% | 0.121\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1725 | People's Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 494,865 | 494,865 |  |  | 0.102\% | 0.102\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1473 | Roosevelt County Electric Coop | u.s. | 151,197 | 151,197 |  |  | 0.031\% | 0.031\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1257 | Xcel Energy Company (Southwerstern Public Service) | u.s. | 21,489,392 | 21,489,392 |  |  | 4.427\% | 4.427\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.483\% | 0.483\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.546\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1256 | Sunflower Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 4,504,839 | 4,504,839 |  |  | 0.928\% | 0.928\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.101\% | 0.101\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.114\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1445 | Tex - La Electric Cooperative of Texas | u.s. | 488,582 | 488,582 |  |  | 0.101\% | 0.101\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.012\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1475 | Tri County Electric Coop | u.s. | 350,534 | 350,534 |  |  | 0.072\% | 0.072\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1260 | Westar Energy, Inc. | u.s. | 21,019,021 | 21,019,021 |  |  | 4.330\% | 4.330\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.472\% | 0.472\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.534\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1259 | Western Farmers Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 8,403,689 | 8,403,689 |  |  | 1.731\% | 1.731\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.189\% | 0.189\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.214\% |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1501 | West Texas Municipal Power Agency | U.S. | 2,782,892 | 2,782,892 |  |  | 0.573\% | 0.573\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.063\% | 0.063\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.071\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL MRO |  | 485,380,880 | 436,708,281 | 48,672,599 |  | 100.000\% | 89.972\% | 10.028\% | 0.000\% | 10.906\% | 9.812\% | 1.094\% | 0.000\% | 11.098\% |
| 2017 | NPCC | 1336 | New England | u.s. | 121,220,000 | 121,220,000 |  |  | 20.033\% | 20.033\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 2.724\% | 2.724\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 3.081\% |
| 2017 | NPCC | 1339 | New York | u.s. | 156,370,000 | 156,370,000 |  |  | 25.842\% | 25.842\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 3.514\% | 3.514\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 3.974\% |
| 2017 | NPCC | 1337 | Ontario | Canada | 132,091,000 |  | 132,091,000 |  | 21.830\% | 0.000\% | 21.830\% | 0.000\% | 2.968\% | 0.000\% | 2.968\% | 0.000\% |  |
| 2017 | NPCC |  | Quebec | Canada | 170,703,000 |  | 170,703,000 |  | 28.211\% | 0.000\% | 28.211\% | 0.000\% | 3.836\% | 0.000\% | 3.836\% | 0.00\%\% |  |
| 2017 | NPCC | 1705 | New Brunswick | Canada | 13,796,000 |  | 13,796,000 |  | 2.280\% | 0.000\% | 2.280\% | 0.000\% | 0.310\% | 0.000\% | 0.310\% | 0.000\% |  |
| 2017 | NPCC | 1340 | Nova Scotia | Canada | 10,917,000 |  | 10,917,000 |  | 1.804\% | 0.000\% | 1.804\% | 0.000\% | 0.245\% | 0.000\% | 0.245\% | 0.000\% |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL NPCC |  | 605,097,000 | 277,590,000 | 327,507,000 |  | 100.000\% | 45.875\% | 54.125\% | 0.000\% | 13.596\% | 6.237\% | 7.359\% | 0.000\% | 7.054\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1102 | Cannelton Utilities | u.s. | 14,171 | 14,171 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1106 | City of Croswell | u.s. | 39,270 | 39,270 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1490 | City of Lansing | u.s. | 2,178,494 | 2,178,494 |  |  | 0.250\% | 0.250\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.049\% | 0.049\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.055\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1120 | Cloverland Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 744,657 | 744,657 |  |  | 0.085\% | 0.085\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.019\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1122 | CMS ERM Michigan LLC | u.s. | 176,076 | 176,076 |  |  | 0.020\% | 0.020\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1124 | Constellation New Energy (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 1,202,920 | 1,202,920 |  |  | 0.138\% | 0.138\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.027\% | 0.027\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.031\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1123 | Constellation New Energy (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 1,349,692 | 1,349,692 |  |  | 0.155\% | 0.155\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.030\% | 0.030\% | 0.000\% | 0.000 | 0.034\% |


| Data <br> Year | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{gathered}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | Mexico Total | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | RF | 1126 | Consumers Energy Company | u.s. | 33,248,491 | 33,248,491 |  |  | 3.814\% | 3.814\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.747\% | 0.747\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.845\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1128 | Detroit Edison Company | u.s. | 44,587,232 | 44,587,232 |  |  | 5.114\% | 5.114\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.002\% | 1.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.133\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1166 | Duke Energy Indiana | u.s. | 29,452,371 | 29,452,371 |  |  | 3.378\% | 3.378\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.662\% | 0.662\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.748\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1135 | Ferdinand Municipal Light \& Water | U.s. | 49,598 | 49,598 |  |  | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1646 | FirstEnergy Solutions (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 857,115 | 857,115 |  |  | 0.098\% | 0.098\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.019\% | 0.019\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.022\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1549 | FirstEnergy Solutions (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 1,033,511 | 1,033,511 |  |  | 0.119\% | 0.119\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.026\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1145 | Hoosier Energy | u.s. | 7,476,941 | 7,476,941 |  |  | 0.858\% | 0.858\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.168\% | 0.168\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.190\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1148 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (DUKE CIN) | u.s. | 3,044,276 | 3,044,276 |  |  | 0.349\% | 0.349\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.068\% | 0.068\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.077\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1485 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (NIPSCO) | U.S. | 423,172 | 423,172 |  |  | 0.049\% | 0.049\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1486 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (SIGE) | u.s. | 589,177 | 589,177 |  |  | 0.068\% | 0.068\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1149 | Indianapolis Power \& Light Co. | u.s. | 13,798,463 | 13,798,463 |  |  | 1.583\% | 1.583\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.310\% | 0.310\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.351\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1553 | Integrys Energy Services (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 437,574 | 437,574 |  |  | 0.050\% | 0.050\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1554 | Integrys Energy Services (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 626,251 | 626,251 |  |  | 0.072\% | 0.072\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1666 | Integrys Energy Services | u.s. | 295,628 | 295,628 |  |  | 0.034\% | 0.034\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1614 | Just Energy (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 8,535 | 8,535 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1154 | Michigan Public Power Agency | u.s. | 3,781,218 | 3,781,218 |  |  | 0.434\% | 0.434\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.085\% | 0.085\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.096\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1155 | Michigan South Central Power Agency | u.s. | 705,981 | 705,981 |  |  | 0.081\% | 0.081\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% | 0.016\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.018\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1158 | MidAmerican Energy Company Retail | u.s. | 16,970 | 16,970 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1163 | Northern Indiana Public Service Co. | u.s. | 17,514,746 | 17,514,746 |  |  | 2.009\% | 2.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.394\% | 0.394\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.445\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1164 | Ontonagon County Rural Electrification Assoc. | u.s. | 27,798 | 27,798 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1265 | PJM Interconnnection, LLC | u.s. | 664,258,237 | 664,258,237 |  |  | 76.195\% | 76.195\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 14.925\% | 14.925\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 16.881\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1172 | Calpine Energy Solutions (k.n.a.a.Noble Americas Energy Solutions (MECS-CONS)) | u.s. | 383,129 | 383,129 |  |  | 0.044\% | 0.044\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1171 | Calpine Energy Solutions (k.n.a.Noble Americas Energy Solutions (MECS-DET)) | u.s. | 602,634 | 602,634 |  |  | 0.069\% | 0.069\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1176 | Direct Energy (fka:Strategic Energy,LLC) (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 191,510 | 191,510 |  |  | 0.022\% | 0.022\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1174 | Direct Energy (fka:Strategic Energy,LLC) (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 908,353 | 908,353 |  |  | 0.104\% | 0.104\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.020\% | 0.020\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1581 | Spartan Renewable Energy | u.s. | 91,331 | 91,331 |  |  | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | RF |  | Spartan Renewable Energy (MI UP) | u.s. | 55,228 | 55,228 |  |  | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1180 | Thumb Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 180,092 | 180,092 |  |  | 0.021\% | 0.021\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1662 | Ohio Valley Electric Corporation | u.s. | 405,145 | 405,145 |  |  | 0.046\% | 0.046\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1181 | Vectren Energy Delivery of IN | u.s. | 5,080,806 | 5,080,806 |  |  | 0.583\% | 0.583\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.114\% | 0.114\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.129\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1184 | Wabash Valley Power Association Inc. (DUKE CIN) | u.s. | 2,815,495 | 2,815,495 |  |  | 0.323\% | 0.323\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.063\% | 0.063\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.072\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1488 | Wabash Valley Power Association Inc.(NIPSCO) | u.s. | 1,696,109 | 1,696,109 |  |  | 0.195\% | 0.195\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.038\% | 0.038\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.043\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1185 | Wisconsin Electric Power Co. | u.s. | 27,453,163 | 27,453,163 |  |  | 3.149\% | 3.149\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.617\% | 0.617\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.698\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1189 | Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative | u.s. | 757,819 | 757,819 |  |  | 0.087\% | 0.087\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.019\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1191 | Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative | u.s. | 2,671,685 | 2,671,685 |  |  | 0.306\% | 0.306\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.060\% | 0.060\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.068\% |
| 2017 | RF | 1190 | Wolverine Power Marketing Coooperative(MECS-DET) | u.s. | 558,524 | 558,524 |  |  | 0.064\% | 0.064\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL RELIABILTYFIRST |  | 871,789,589 | 871,789,589 |  |  | 100.000\% | 100.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 19.588\% | 19.588\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 22.155\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1267 | Alabama Municipal Electric Authority | u.s. | 3,358,401 | 3,358,401 |  |  | 0.326\% | 0.326\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.075\% | 0.075\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.085\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1268 | Alabama Power Company | u.s. | 56,129,688 | 56,129,688 |  |  | 5.456\% | 5.456\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.261\% | 1.261\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.426\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1269 | Ameren - Illinois | u.s. | 41,102,000 | 41,102,000 |  |  | 3.995\% | 3.995\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.924\% | 0.924\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.045\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1271 | Ameren - Missouri | u.s. | 36,180,000 | 36,180,000 |  |  | 3.517\% | 3.517\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.813\% | 0.813\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.919\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1273 | Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 18,890,793 | 18,890,793 |  |  | 1.836\% | 1.836\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.424\% | 0.424\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.480\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1582 | Beauregard Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 1,107,602 | 1,107,602 |  |  | 0.108\% | 0.108\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.025\% | 0.025\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.028\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1462 | Benton Utility District | u.s. | 250,113 | 250,113 |  |  | 0.024\% | 0.024\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1274 | Big Rivers Electric Corporation | u.s. | 3,673,173 | 3,673,173 |  |  | 0.357\% | 0.357\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.083\% | 0.083\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.093\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1275 | Black Warrior EMC | u.s. | 399,520 | 399,520 |  |  | 0.039\% | 0.039\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1276 | Blue Ridge EMC | u.s. | 1,352,829 | 1,352,829 |  |  | 0.131\% | 0.131\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.030\% | 0.030\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.034\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1628 | Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 467,620 | 467,620 |  |  | 0.045\% | 0.045\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.012\% |

[^29]| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\left.\begin{array}{\|r} \% \text { of } \mathrm{RE} \\ \text { total } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | SERC | 1463 | Canton, MS | u.s. | 128,254 | 128,254 |  |  | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1277 | Central Electric Power Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 16,725,435 | 16,725,435 |  |  | 1.626\% | 1.626\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.376\% | 0.376\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.425\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1667 | Century Aluminum - Hawesville | u.s. | 1,690,381 | 1,690,381 |  |  | 0.164\% | 0.164\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.038\% | 0.038\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.043\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1668 | Century Aluminum - Sebree | u.s. | 3,362,247 | 3,362,247 |  |  | 0.327\% | 0.327\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.076\% | 0.076\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.085\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1278 | City of Blountstown FL | u.s. | 36,190 | 36,190 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1279 | City of Camden SC | u.s. | 187,339 | 187,339 |  |  | 0.018\% | 0.018\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1280 | City of Collins MS | u.s. | 44,945 | 44,945 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1281 | City of Columbia MO | u.s. | 1,170,456 | 1,170,456 |  |  | 0.114\% | 0.114\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.026\% | 0.026\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.030\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1282 | City of Conway AR (Conway Corporation) | u.s. | 991,407 | 991,407 |  |  | 0.096\% | 0.096\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.022\% | 0.022\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.025\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1284 | City of Evergreen AL | u.s. | 54,500 | 54,500 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1285 | City of Hampton GA | u.s. | 30,711 | 30,711 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1286 | City of Hartford AL | u.s. | 31,077 | 31,077 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1287 | City of Henderson (KY) Municipal Power \& Light | u.s. | 612,803 | 612,803 |  |  | 0.060\% | 0.060\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1288 | City of North Little Rock AR (DENL) | u.s. | 922,357 | 922,357 |  |  | 0.090\% | 0.090\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.021\% | 0.021\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1289 | City of Orangeburg SC Department of Public Utilities | u.s. | 813,000 | 813,000 |  |  | 0.079\% | 0.079\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.018\% | 0.018\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.021\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1290 | City of Robertsdale AL | u.s. | 81,000 | 81,000 |  |  | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1291 | City of Ruston LA (DERS) | u.s. | 272,915 | 272,915 |  |  | 0.027\% | 0.027\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1292 | Seneca Light \& Power | u.s. | 163,978 | 163,978 |  |  | 0.016\% | 0.016\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1115 | City of Springfield (CWLP) | u.s. | 1,708,151 | 1,708,151 |  |  | 0.166\% | 0.166\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.038\% | 0.038\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.043\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1465 | City of Thayer, MO | u.s. | 19,916 | 19,916 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1293 | City of Troy AL | u.s. | 415,700 | 415,700 |  |  | 0.040\% | 0.040\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1294 | City of West Memphis AR (West Memphis Utilities) | u.s. | 380,733 | 380,733 |  |  | 0.037\% | 0.037\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1583 | Claiborne Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 640,552 | 640,552 |  |  | 0.062\% | 0.062\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1584 | Concordia Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 209,903 | 209,903 |  |  | 0.020\% | 0.020\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1726 | Cube Hydro Carolinas | u.s. | 14,458 | 14,458 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1283 | Dalton Utilities | u.s. | 1,806,387 | 1,806,387 |  |  | 0.176\% | 0.176\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.041\% | 0.041\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.046\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1585 | Dixie Electric Membership Corporation | u.s. | 2,149,385 | 2,149,385 |  |  | 0.209\% | 0.209\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.048\% | 0.048\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.055\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1295 | Dominion Virginia Power | u.s. | 85,011,366 | 85,011,366 |  |  | 8.263\% | 8.263\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.910\% | 1.910\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 2.160\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1296 | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | u.s. | 84,062,584 | 84,062,584 |  |  | 8.171\% | 8.171\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.889\% | 1.889\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 2.136\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1466 | Durant, MS | u.s. | 25,094 | 25,094 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1478 | LG\&E and KU Services Co as agent for LG\&E Co and KU Co | u.s. | 33,611,358 | 33,611,358 |  |  | 3.267\% | 3.267\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.755\% | 0.755\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.854\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1297 | East Kentucky Power Cooperative | u.s. | 13,156,334 | 13,156,334 |  |  | 1.279\% | 1.279\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.296\% | 0.296\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.334\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1298 | East Mississippi Electric Power Association | u.s. | 410,452 | 410,452 |  |  | 0.040\% | 0.040\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1669 | Electricities of North Carolina Inc | u.s. | 11,592,845 | 11,592,845 |  |  | 1.127\% | 1.127\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.260\% | 0.260\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.295\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1300 | Energy United EmC | u.s. | 2,517,130 | 2,517,130 |  |  | 0.245\% | 0.245\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.057\% | 0.057\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.064\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1301 | Entergy | u.s. | 118,406,188 | 118,406,188 |  |  | 11.509\% | 11.509\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 2.660\% | 2.660\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 3.009\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1302 | Fayetteville (NC) Public Works Commission | u.s. | 2,083,866 | 2,083,866 |  |  | 0.203\% | 0.203\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.047\% | 0.047\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.053\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1303 | Florida Public Utilities (FL Panhandle Load) | u.s. | 306,095 | 306,095 |  |  | 0.030\% | 0.030\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1304 | French Broad EMC | u.s. | 502,644 | 502,644 |  |  | 0.049\% | 0.049\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1305 | Georgia Power Company | u.s. | 84,894,745 | 84,894,745 |  |  | 8.252\% | 8.252\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.908\% | 1.908\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 2.157\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1306 | Georgia System Optns Corporation | u.s. | 38,909,099 | 38,909,099 |  |  | 3.782\% | 3.782\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.874\% | 0.874\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.989\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1479 | Greenwood (MS) Utilities Commission | u.s. | 279,403 | 279,403 |  |  | 0.027\% | 0.027\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1307 | Greenwood (SC) Commissioners of Public Works | u.s. | 316,439 | 316,439 |  |  | 0.031\% | 0.031\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1308 | Gulf Power Company | u.s. | 11,395,597 | 11,395,597 |  |  | 1.108\% | 1.108\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.256\% | 0.256\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.290\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1586 | Haywood EMC | U.S. | 306,654 | 306,654 |  |  | 0.030\% | 0.030\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | SERC |  | Hoosier Energy REC, Inc | u.s. | 401,175 | 401,175 |  |  | 0.039\% | 0.039\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1309 | Illinois Municipal Electric Agency | u.s. | 1,895,200 | 1,895,200 |  |  | 0.184\% | 0.184\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.043\% | 0.043\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.048\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1480 | Itta Bena, Ms | u.s. | 13,811 | 13,811 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1587 | Jefferson Davis Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 262,174 | 262,174 |  |  | 0.025\% | 0.025\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |


| Data <br> Year | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{gathered}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Mexico Total | $\begin{array}{\|c} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { Us Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | SERC | 1617 | Kentucky Municipal Power | u.s. | 653,191 | 653,191 |  |  | 0.063\% | 0.063\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% | 0.015\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1481 | Kosciusko, MS | u.s. | 73,119 | 73,119 |  |  | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1482 | Leland, MS | u.s. | 29,889 | 29,889 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1313 | McCormick Commission of Public Works | u.s. | 16,341 | 16,341 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.00\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1314 | Mississippi Power Company | u.s. | 10,130,093 | 10,130,093 |  |  | 0.985\% | 0.985\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.228\% | 0.228\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.257\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1630 | Mt. Carmel Public Utility | u.s. | 103,272 | 103,272 |  |  | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1315 | Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia | u.s. | 10,809,000 | 10,809,000 |  |  | 1.051\% | 1.051\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.243\% | 0.243\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.275\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1316 | N.C. Electric Membership Corp. | u.s. | 12,702,195 | 12,702,195 |  |  | 1.235\% | 1.235\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.285\% | 0.285\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.323\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1588 | Northeast Louisiana Power Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 262,464 | 262,464 |  |  | 0.026\% | 0.026\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1574 | Northern Virginia Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 4,706,854 | 4,706,854 |  |  | 0.457\% | 0.457\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.106\% | 0.106\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.120\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1319 | Old Dominion Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 4,975,189 | 4,975,189 |  |  | 0.484\% | 0.484\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.112\% | 0.112\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.126\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1618 | Osceola (Arkansas) Municipal Light and Power | u.s. | 155,810 | 155,810 |  |  | 0.015\% | 0.015\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1320 | Owensboro (KY) Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 812,635 | 812,635 |  |  | 0.079\% | 0.079\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.018\% | 0.018\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.021\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1321 | Piedmont EMC in Duke and Progress Areas | u.s. | 504,135 | 504,135 |  |  | 0.049\% | 0.049\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1323 | Piedmont Municipal Power Agency (PMPA) | u.s. | 2,338,860 | 2,338,860 |  |  | 0.227\% | 0.227\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.053\% | 0.053\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.059\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1589 | Pointe Coupee Electric Memb. Corp. | u.s. | 259,826 | 259,826 |  |  | 0.025\% | 0.025\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1266 | PowerSouth Energy | u.s. | 8,636,599 | 8,636,599 |  |  | 0.839\% | 0.839\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.194\% | 0.194\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.219\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1330 | Prairie Power, Inc. | u.s. | 1,535,015 | 1,535,015 |  |  | 0.149\% | 0.149\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.034\% | 0.034\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.039\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1706 | Duke Energy Progress | u.s. | 45,904,781 | 45,904,781 |  |  | 4.462\% | 4.462\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.031\% | 1.031\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.167\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1325 | Rutherford EMC | u.s. | 1,306,902 | 1,306,902 |  |  | 0.127\% | 0.127\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.029\% | 0.029\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.033\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1631 | Sam Rayburn G\&T Electric Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 1,783,514 | 1,783,514 |  |  | 0.173\% | 0.173\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.040\% | 0.040\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.045\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1326 | South Carolina Electric \& Gas Company | u.s. | 23,114,816 | 23,114,816 |  |  | 2.247\% | 2.247\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.519\% | 0.519\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.587\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1327 | South Carolina Public Service Authority | u.s. | 8,588,567 | 8,588,567 |  |  | 0.835\% | 0.835\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.193\% | 0.193\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.218\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1590 | South Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association | u.s. | 577,068 | 577,068 |  |  | 0.056\% | 0.056\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1328 | Cooperative Energy (formerly SMEPA) | u.s. | 9,616,043 | 9,616,043 |  |  | 0.935\% | 0.935\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.216\% | 0.216\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.244\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1329 | Southern Illinois Power Cooperative | u.s. | 1,570,438 | 1,570,438 |  |  | 0.153\% | 0.153\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.035\% | 0.035\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.040\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1591 | Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation | u.s. | 2,449,955 | 2,449,955 |  |  | 0.238\% | 0.238\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.055\% | 0.055\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.062\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1619 | Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 419,781 | 419,781 |  |  | 0.041\% | 0.041\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1331 | Tennessee Valley Authority | u.s. | 155,211,406 | 155,211,406 |  |  | 15.086\% | 15.086\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 3.487\% | 3.487\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 3.944\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1632 | Tex-La Electric Coooperative of Texas, Inc | u.s. | 208,469 | 208,469 |  |  | 0.020\% | 0.020\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1332 | Tombigbee Electric Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 121,131 | 121,131 |  |  | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1594 | Town of Sharpsburg, N.C. | u.s. | 19,458 | 19,458 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1595 | Town of Stantonsburg, N.C. JRO | u.s. | 55,573 | 55,573 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1333 | Town of Waynesville NC | u.s. | 92,379 | 92,379 |  |  | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1334 | Town of Winnsboro SC | u.s. | 62,000 | 62,000 |  |  | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1335 | Town of Winterville NC | u.s. | 54,003 | 54,003 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1597 | Washington-St.Tammany Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 1,029,251 | 1,029,251 |  |  | 0.100\% | 0.100\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.026\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1435 | Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation | u.s. | 10,250,834 | 10,250,834 |  |  | 0.996\% | 0.996\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.230\% | 0.230\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.261\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1557 | City of Clarksdale, Mississippi | u.s. | 156,418 | 156,418 |  |  | 0.015\% | 0.015\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1708 | City of Abbeville | u.s. | 137,537 | 137,537 |  |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1558 | Hope Water \& Light (HWL) | u.s. | 294,430 | 294,430 |  |  | 0.029\% | 0.029\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1559 | City of Minden | u.s. | 138,210 | 138,210 |  |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1249 | Cleco Power LLC | u.s. | 11,205,486 | 11,205,486 |  |  | 1.089\% | 1.089\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.252\% | 0.252\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.285\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1648 | Jonesboro City Water \& Light | u.s. | 1,389,314 | 1,389,314 |  |  | 0.135\% | 0.135\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.031\% | 0.031\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.035\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1649 | Kennett Board of Public Works | u.s. | 136,607 | 136,607 |  |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1471 | Lafayette Utilities System | u.s. | 2,054,903 | 2,054,903 |  |  | 0.200\% | 0.200\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.046\% | 0.046\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.052\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1253 | Louisiana Energy \& Power Authority (LEPA) | u.s. | 957,078 | 957,078 |  |  | 0.093\% | 0.093\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.022\% | 0.022\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.024\% |
| 2017 | serc | 1650 | Malden Board of Public Works | u.s. | 49,737 | 49,737 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1443 | Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission | u.s. | 2,072,115 | 2,072,115 |  |  | 0.201\% | 0.201\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.047\% | 0.047\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.053\% |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{gathered}$ | US Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | SERC | 1639 | OzMo Ozark Missouri, West Plains MO | u.s. | 188,693 | 188,693 |  |  | 0.018\% | 0.018\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1652 | Piggott Municipal Light, Water \& Sewer | u.s. | 36,524 | 36,524 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1653 | Poplar Bluff Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 371,235 | 371,235 |  |  | 0.036\% | 0.036\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1636 | City of Prescott | u.s. | 81,986 | 81,986 |  |  | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1561 | Public Service Commission of Yazoo City of Mississippi | u.s. | 116,966 | 116,966 |  |  | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | SERC | 1654 | Sikeston Board of Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 372,304 | 372,304 |  |  | 0.036\% | 0.036\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% |
|  |  |  | TOTAL SERC |  | 1,028,836,571 | 1,028,836,571 | - |  | 100.000\% | 100.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 23.117\% | 23.117\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 26.146\% |



| 2017 | WECC | Alberta Electric System Operator | Canada | 62,244,032 |  | 62,244,032 |  | 7.173\% | 0.000\% | 7.173\% | 0.000\% | 1.399\% | 0.000\% | 1.399\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | WECC | British Columbia Hydro \& Power Authority | Canada | 63,896,653 |  | 63,896,653 |  | 7.364\% | 0.000\% | 7.364\% | 0.000\% | 1.436\% | 0.000\% | 1.436\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Centro Nacional de Control de Energia | Mexico | 13,232,487 |  |  | 13,232,487 | 1.525\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.525\% | 0.297\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.297\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | wecc | Ajo Improvement District | u.s. | 10,917 | 10,917 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | wecc | Arizona Public Service Company | u.s. | 29,054,370 | 29,054,370 |  |  | 3.348\% | 3.348\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.653\% | 0.653\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.738\% |
| 2017 | wecc | City of Williams | u.s. | 44,759 | 44,759 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Electrical Districts 3 | u.s. | 85,237 | 85,237 |  |  | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Aguila Irrigation District - APS | u.s. | 33,128 | 33,128 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Buckeye Water Conservation and Drainage District - APS | u.s. | 22,444 | 22,444 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Electrical District No. 6 of Pinal County - APS | u.s. | 2,153 | 2,153 |  |  | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Electrical District No. 7 of Maricopa County - APS | u.s. | 50,354 | 50,354 |  |  | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Electrical District No. 8 of Maricopa County - APS | u.s. | 361,508 | 361,508 |  |  | 0.042\% | 0.042\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Harquahala Valley Power Districts - APS | u.s. | 114,457 | 114,457 |  |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation Dist No. 1-APS | u.s. | 51,680 | 51,680 |  |  | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | McMullen Valley Water Conservation \& Drainage District - APS | u.s. | 124,395 | 124,395 |  |  | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Roosevelt Irrigation District - APS | u.s. | 40,913 | 40,913 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Tonopah Irrigation District - APS | u.s. | 27,165 | 27,165 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Navajo Tribal Utility Authority-Arizona | u.s. | 50,356 | 50,356 |  |  | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Tohono O'Odham Utility Authority | u.s. | 61,695 | 61,695 |  |  | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Town of Wickenburg | u.s. | 26,553 | 26,553 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Avista Corporation | u.s. | 9,675,178 | 9,675,178 |  |  | 1.115\% | 1.115\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.217\% | 0.217\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.246 |
| 2017 | WECC | Kaiser Aluminum Fabricated Products LLC | U.S. | 309,947 | 309,947 |  |  | 0.036\% | 0.036\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Pend Oreille County PUD No. 1 | u.s. | 1,017,642 | 1,017,642 |  |  | 0.117\% | 0.117\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.026\% |
| 2017 | WECC | PUD No. 2 of Grant County | U.S. | 92,247 | 92,247 |  |  | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Bonneville Power Administration-Power Services | u.s. | 6,362,959 | 6,362,959 |  |  | 0.733\% | 0.733\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.143\% | 0.143\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.162\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Bonneville Power Administration-Hydro | U.S. | 202,705 | 202,705 |  |  | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Bonneville Power Administration-Transmission | U.S. | 51,706,599 | 51,706,599 |  |  | 5.959\% | 5.959\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.162\% | 1.162\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.314\% |
| 2017 | WECC | City of Redding | u.s. | 798,841 | 798,841 |  |  | 0.092\% | 0.092\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.018\% | 0.018\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.020\% |
| 2017 | WECC | City of Roseville | U.S. | 1,249,280 | 1,249,280 |  |  | 0.144\% | 0.144\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.028\% | 0.028\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.032\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Modesto Irrigation District | u.s. | 2,623,552 | 2,623,552 |  |  | 0.302\% | 0.302\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.059\% | 0.059\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.067\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Sacramento Municipal Utility District | u.s. | 11,598,647 | 11,598,647 |  |  | 1.337\% | 1.337\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.261\% | 0.261\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.295\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Western Area Power Administration-Sierra Nevada Region | u.s. | 1,987,830 | 1,987,830 |  |  | 0.229\% | 0.229\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.045\% | 0.045\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.051\% |
| 2017 | WECC | California Independent System Operator | U.S. | 229,121,130 | 229,121,130 |  |  | 26.406\% | 26.406\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 5.148\% | 5.148\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 5.823\% |
| 2017 | WECC | El Paso Electric Company | u.s. | 8,426,939 | 8,426,939 |  |  | 0.971\% | 0.971\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.189\% | 0.189\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.214\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Idaho Power Company | U.S. | 15,787,953 | 15,787,953 |  |  | 1.820\% | 1.820\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.355\% | 0.355\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.401\% |
| 2017 | WECC | Imperial Irrigation District | u.s. | 3,743,508 | 3,743,508 |  |  | 0.431\% | 0.431\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.084\% | 0.084\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.095\% |


| Data <br> Year | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{gathered}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | Mexico Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | u.s. | 28,793,447 | 28,793,447 |  |  | 3.318\% | 3.318\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.647\% | 0.647\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.732\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Henderson | u.s. | 41,152 | 41,152 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of Las Vegas | u.s. | 41,677 | 41,677 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of North Las Vegas | U.S. | 23,469 | 23,469 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Clark County Water Reclamation District | u.s. | 81,468 | 81,468 |  |  | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Colorado River Commission of Nevada | U.S. | 472,536 | 472,536 |  |  | 0.054\% | 0.054\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.012\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Las Vegas Valley Water District | u.s. | 108,278 | 108,278 |  |  | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy | u.s. | 31,306,340 | 31,306,340 |  |  | 3.608\% | 3.608\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.703\% | 0.703\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.796\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | MGM Resorts International | u.s. | 936,357 | 936,357 |  |  | 0.108\% | 0.108\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.021\% | 0.021\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.024\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Switch-North | u.s. | 5,780 | 5,780 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Switch-South | u.s. | 296,619 | 296,619 |  |  | 0.034\% | 0.034\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Wynn Las Vegas | u.s. | 183,596 | 183,596 |  |  | 0.021\% | 0.021\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Overton Power District No. 5 | u.s. | 395,749 | 395,749 |  |  | 0.046\% | 0.046\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Southern Nevada Water Authority | u.s. | 120,912 | 120,912 |  |  | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | U.S. | 799,330 | 799,330 |  |  | 0.092\% | 0.092\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.018\% | 0.018\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.020\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Big Horn County Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 38,434 | 38,434 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | NorthWestern Corp. dba NorthWestern Energy, LLC | u.s. | 9,441,724 | 9,441,724 |  |  | 1.088\% | 1.088\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.212\% | 0.212\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.240\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region | u.s. | 8,002 | 8,002 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Pacificorp West (PACW) | u.s. | 21,567,018 | 21,567,018 |  |  | 2.486\% | 2.486\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.485\% | 0.485\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.548\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Constellation New Energy | u.s. | 349,466 | 349,466 |  |  | 0.040\% | 0.040\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | 3 Phases Renewables | U.S. | 220 | 220 |  |  | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Avangrid Renewables | u.s. | 103,249 | 103,249 |  |  | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Calpine Energy Solutions, LLC./Noble Americas Energy Solutions, LLC | u.s. | 1,636,654 | 1,636,654 |  |  | 0.189\% | 0.189\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.037\% | 0.037\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.042\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Pacificorp (IPC) | u.s. | 2,086 | 2,086 |  |  | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Pacificorp (EasternBalAuth) | U.S. | 49,834,039 | 49,834,039 |  |  | 5.743\% | 5.743\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.120\% | 1.120\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.266\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Pacificorp (Portland) | u.s. | 4,445 | 4,445 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Pacificorp (WAPA-CO-MO) | u.s. | 116,076 | 116,076 |  |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Portland General Electric Company | u.s. | 17,596,703 | 17,596,703 |  |  | 2.028\% | 2.028\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.395\% | 0.395\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.447\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Shell Energy North America | u.s. | 74,824 | 74,824 |  |  | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Arkansas River Power Authority (ARPA) | u.s. | 267,593 | 267,593 |  |  | 0.031\% | 0.031\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Black Hills Colorado Electric | u.s. | 2,055,374 | 2,055,374 |  |  | 0.237\% | 0.237\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.046\% | 0.046\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.052\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Burlington | u.s. | 31,202 | 31,202 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Colorado Springs Utilities | u.s. | 60,450 | 60,450 |  |  | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Grand Valley Power | u.s. | 248,669 | 248,669 |  |  | 0.029\% | 0.029\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Holy Cross Energy | u.s. | 1,036,635 | 1,036,635 |  |  | 0.119\% | 0.119\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.026\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Intermountain Rural Electric Association | u.s. | 2,232,568 | 2,232,568 |  |  | 0.257\% | 0.257\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.050\% | 0.050\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.057\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska | u.s. | 170,398 | 170,398 |  |  | 0.020\% | 0.020\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Platte River Power Authority | u.s. | 3,228,640 | 3,228,640 |  |  | 0.372\% | 0.372\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.073\% | 0.073\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.082\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Public Service Company of Colorado (Xcel) | u.s. | 30,398,462 | 30,398,462 |  |  | 3.503\% | 3.503\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.683\% | 0.683\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.773\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Public Service Company of Colorado (Xcel)-(WAPA-CO-MO) | U.S. | 115,284 | 115,284 |  |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Raton Public Service | u.s. | 43,612 | 43,612 |  |  | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Town of Center | u.s. | 14,886 | 14,886 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Tri-State Generation \& Transmission Assoc. Inc - Reliability | U.S. | 2,641,443 | 2,641,443 |  |  | 0.304\% | 0.304\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.059\% | 0.059\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.067\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Western Area Power - Loveland, co | u.s. | 169,011 | 169,011 |  |  | 0.019\% | 0.019\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Yampa Valley Electric Association | U.S. | 560,999 | 560,999 |  |  | 0.065\% | 0.065\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of Aztec Electric Dept | U.S. | 36,550 | 36,550 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of Gallup | U.S. | 221,471 | 221,471 |  |  | 0.026\% | 0.026\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Jicarilla Apache Nation Power Authority | U.S. | 23,054 | 23,054 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Kit Carson Electric Inc | u.s. | 294,677 | 294,677 |  |  | 0.034\% | 0.034\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |


| Data <br> Year | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total NEL (MWh) | U.S. NEL | Canada NEL | Mexico NEL | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of RE } \\ \text { total } \end{array}$ | US Total | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of ERO } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | US Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Canada } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mexico } \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of ERO- } \\ \text { US Only } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Navajo Tribal Utility Authority-New Mexico | u.s. | 198,362 | 198,362 |  |  | 0.023\% | 0.023\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Public Service Company of New Mexico | u.s. | 9,141,458 | 9,141,458 |  |  | 1.054\% | 1.054\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.205\% | 0.205\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.232\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | The Incorporated County of Los Alamos | u.s. | 612,170 | 612,170 |  |  | 0.071\% | 0.071\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Tri-State Generation \& Transmission Association, Inc. | u.s. | 2,769,627 | 2,769,627 |  |  | 0.319\% | 0.319\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.062\% | 0.062\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.070\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | US Dept of Energy - Kirtland AFB | u.s. | 425,052 | 425,052 |  |  | 0.049\% | 0.049\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.010\% | 0.010\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.011\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County | u.s. | 1,859,763 | 1,859,763 |  |  | 0.214\% | 0.214\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.042\% | 0.042\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.047\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Okanogan PUD | u.s. | 663,971 | 663,971 |  |  | 0.077\% | 0.077\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.015\% | 0.015\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.017\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | PUD No. 1 of Douglas County | u.s. | 917,441 | 917,441 |  |  | 0.106\% | 0.106\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.021\% | 0.021\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.023\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Douglas Palisades / PUD No. 1 of DC | u.s. | 20,468 | 20,468 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | PUD No. 2 of Grant County | u.s. | 4,771,009 | 4,771,009 |  |  | 0.550\% | 0.550\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.107\% | 0.107\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.121\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Puget Sound Energy, Inc. | u.s. | 24,489,796 | 24,489,796 |  |  | 2.822\% | 2.822\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.550\% | 0.550\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.622\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Salt River Project | u.s. | 29,902,054 | 29,902,054 |  |  | 3.446\% | 3.446\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.672\% | 0.672\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.760\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Seattle City light | u.s. | 9,963,742 | 9,963,742 |  |  | 1.148\% | 1.148\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.224\% | 0.224\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.253\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. | u.s. | 1,387,742 | 1,387,742 |  |  | 0.160\% | 0.160\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.031\% | 0.031\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.035\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Fallon | u.s. | 92,245 | 92,245 |  |  | 0.011\% | 0.011\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Mt. Wheeler Power | u.s. | 552,994 | 552,994 |  |  | 0.064\% | 0.064\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Truckee Donner Public Utility District | u.s. | 161,518 | 161,518 |  |  | 0.019\% | 0.019\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Beartooth Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 77,005 | 77,005 |  |  | 0.009\% | 0.009\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of Tacoma DBA Tacoma Power | u.s. | 5,006,565 | 5,006,565 |  |  | 0.577\% | 0.577\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.112\% | 0.112\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.127\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Tucson Electric Power Company | u.s. | 14,848,416 | 14,848,416 |  |  | 1.711\% | 1.711\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.334\% | 0.334\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.377\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Merced Irrigation District | u.s. | 519,312 | 519,312 |  |  | 0.060\% | 0.060\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.012\% | 0.012\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.013\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Turlock Irrigation District | u.s. | 2,179,005 | 2,179,005 |  |  | 0.251\% | 0.251\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.049\% | 0.049\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.055\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 2,319,412 | 2,319,412 |  |  | 0.267\% | 0.267\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.052\% | 0.052\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.059\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Black Hills Colorado Electric/Cheyenne Light Fuel \& Power | u.s. | 4,386,123 | 4,386,123 |  |  | 0.505\% | 0.505\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.099\% | 0.099\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.111\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Black Hills state University South Dakota | u.s. | 20,948 | 20,948 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of Page | u.s. | 72,314 | 72,314 |  |  | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.002\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Colorado Springs Utilities | u.s. | 4,607,995 | 4,607,995 |  |  | 0.531\% | 0.531\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.104\% | 0.104\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.117\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Deseret Generation \& Transmission Cooperative | u.s. | 116,200 | 116,200 |  |  | 0.013\% | 0.013\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.033\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Farmington | u.s. | 993,038 | 993,038 |  |  | 0.114\% | 0.114\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.022\% | 0.022\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.025\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska | u.s. | 630,349 | 630,349 |  |  | 0.073\% | 0.073\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.014\% | 0.014\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.016\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navajo Tribal Utility Authority-Colorado | u.s. | 216,337 | 216,337 |  |  | 0.025\% | 0.025\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navajo Agricultural Products Industry (NAPI) | u.s. | 3,279 | 3,279 |  |  | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.00\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Nebraska Public Power Marketing | u.s. | 6,603 | 6,603 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Francis E. Warren Air Force Base | u.s. | 12,103 | 12,103 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Town of Fredonia | u.s. | 10,451 | 10,451 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Tri-State Generation \& Transmission Assoc. Inc - Reliability | u.s. | 7,866,215 | 7,866,215 |  |  | 0.907\% | 0.907\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.177\% | 0.177\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.200\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration - CRSP | u.s. | 1,918,249 | 1,918,249 |  |  | 0.221\% | 0.221\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.043\% | 0.043\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.049\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Western Area Power - Loveland, co | u.s. | 1,834,005 | 1,834,005 |  |  | 0.211\% | 0.211\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.041\% | 0.041\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.047\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Wyoming Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 219,215 | 219,215 |  |  | 0.025\% | 0.025\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.005\% | 0.005\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 147,139 | 147,139 |  |  | 0.017\% | 0.017\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.004\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. | u.s. | 22,738 | 22,738 |  |  | 0.003\% | 0.003\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | NorthWestern Corp. dba NorthWestern Energy, LLC | u.s. | 302,542 | 302,542 |  |  | 0.035\% | 0.035\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% | 0.007\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region | u.s. | 355,785 | 355,785 |  |  | 0.041\% | 0.041\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.008\% | 0.008\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.009\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Aha Macav Power Service | u.s. | 14,656 | 14,656 |  |  | 0.002\% | 0.002\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Desalter) - c/o DSW EMMO | u.s. | 109 | 109 |  |  | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Wellfield) | u.s. | 6,874 | 6,874 |  |  | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Central Arizona Water Conservation District | u.s. | 2,279,451 | 2,279,451 |  |  | 0.263\% | 0.263\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.051\% | 0.051\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.058\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of Mesa | u.s. | 267,299 | 267,299 |  |  | 0.031\% | 0.031\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.006\% | 0.006\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.007\% |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Needles Public Utilities Authority | u.s. | 31,707 | 31,707 |  |  | 0.004\% | 0.004\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% | 0.001\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.001\% |



|  |  |  |  |  | Total ERO Assessments (NERC, RE \& WIRAB Costs) |  |  |  | Total NERC Assessments |  |  |  | Total Regional Entity Assessments (Including WIRAB Assessments) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1074 | Alachua, City of | u.s. | 5,544 | 5,544 | - | - | 2,151 | 2,151 | - | - | 3,393 | 3,393 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1075 | Bartow, City of | u.s. | 12,071 | 12,071 | - | - | 4,683 | 4,683 | - | - | 7,388 | 7,388 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1076 | Chattahoochee, City of | u.s. | 1,510 | 1,510 | - | - | 586 | 586 | - | - | 924 | 924 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1077 | Florida Keys Electric Cooperative Assn | u.s. | 30,688 | 30,688 | - | - | 11,906 | 11,906 | - | - | 18,782 | 18,782 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1078 | Florida Power \& Light Co. | u.s. | 4,679,182 | 4,679,182 | - | - | 1,815,373 | 1,815,373 | - | - | 2,863,809 | 2,863,809 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1079 | Florida Public Utilities Company | u.s. | 14,321 | 14,321 | - | - | 5,556 | 5,556 | - | - | 8,765 | 8,765 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1080 | Gainesville Regional Utilities | u.s. | 74,114 | 74,114 | - | - | 28,754 | 28,754 | - | - | 45,360 | 45,360 | - | - |
| 2017 | frcc | 1081 | Homestead, City of | u.s. | 24,387 | 24,387 | - | - | 9,461 | 9,461 | - | - | 14,925 | 14,925 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1082 | JEA | u.s. | 512,285 | 512,285 | - | - | 198,750 | 198,750 | - | - | 313,535 | 313,535 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1083 | Lakeland Electric | u.s. | 126,271 | 126,271 | - | - | 48,989 | 48,989 | - | - | 77,282 | 77,882 | - | - |
| 2017 | frec | 1626 | Lee County Electric Cooperative, Inc | u.s. | 166,452 | 166,452 | - | - | 64,578 | 64,578 | - | - | 101,874 | 101,874 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1661 | City of Lake Worth | u.s. | 19,231 | 19,231 | - | - | 7,461 | 7,461 | - | - | 11,770 | 11,770 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1084 | Mount Dora, City of | u.s. | 3,760 | 3,760 | - | - | 1,459 | 1,459 | - | - | 2,301 | 2,301 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1085 | New Smyrna Beach, Utilities Commission of | u.s. | 17,758 | 17,758 | - | - | 6,890 | 6,890 | - | - | 10,869 | 10,869 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1086 | Orlando Utilities Commission | u.s. | 249,649 | 249,649 | - | - | 96,856 | 96,856 | - | - | 152,793 | 152,793 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1087 | Duke Energy Florida | u.s. | 1,667,303 | 1,667,303 | - | - | 646,860 | 646,860 | - | - | 1,020,443 | 1,020,443 | - |  |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1088 | Quincy, City of | u.s. | 5,348 | 5,348 | - | - | 2,075 | 2,075 | - | - | 3,273 | 3,273 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1089 | Reedy Creek Improvement District | u.s. | 49,551 | 49,551 | - | - | 19,224 | 19,224 | - | - | 30,327 | 30,327 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1090 | St. Cloud, City of (OUC) | u.s. | 31,465 | 31,465 | - | - | 12,208 | 12,208 | - | - | 19,258 | 19,258 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1091 | Tallahassee, City of | u.s. | 112,850 | 112,850 | - | - | 43,782 | 43,782 | - | - | 69,068 | 69,068 | - |  |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1092 | Tampa Electric Company | u.s. | 830,458 | 830,458 | - | - | 322,191 | 322,191 | - | - | 508,267 | 508,267 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1603 | City of Vero Beach | u.s. | 30,974 | 30,974 | - | - | 12,017 | 12,017 | - | - | 18,957 | 18,957 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1093 | Wauchula, City of | u.s. | 2,660 | 2,660 | - | - | 1,032 | 1,032 | - | - | 1,628 | 1,628 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1094 | Williston, City of | u.s. | 1,481 | 1,481 | - | - | 575 | 575 | - | - | 907 | 907 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1095 | Winter Park, City of | u.s. | 18,990 | 18,090 | - | - | 7,018 | 7,018 | - | - | 11,071 | 11,071 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1724 | Moore Haven, City of | u.s. | 614 | 614 | - | - | 238 | 238 | - | - | 376 | 376 | - |  |
| 2017 | frcc | 1072 | Florida Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 244,866 | 244,866 | - | - | 95,000 | 95,000 | - | - | 149,866 | 149,866 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1073 | Seminole Electric Cooperative | U.S. | 589,373 | 589,373 | - | - | 228,658 | 228,658 | - | - | 360,715 | 360,715 | - | - |
|  |  |  | TOTAL FRCC |  | 9,522,255 | 9,522,255 | - | - | 3,694,330 | 3,694,330 | - | - | 5,827,925 | 5,827,925 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1199 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 924,946 | 924,946 | - | - | 307,589 | 307,589 | - | - | 617,357 | 617,357 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1201 | Central Iowa Power Cooperative (IIPCO) | u.s. | 135,149 | 135,149 | - | - | 44,944 | 44,944 | - | - | 90,206 | 90,206 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1204 | Corn Belt Power Cooperative | u.s. | 94,031 | 94,031 | - | - | 31,270 | 31,270 | - | - | 62,761 | 62,761 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1207 | Dairyland Power Cooperative | u.s. | 262,982 | 262,982 | - | - | 87,454 | 87,454 | - | - | 175,528 | 175,528 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1210 | Great River Energy | u.s. | 627,467 | 627,467 | - | - | 208,663 | 208,663 | - | - | 418,804 | 418,804 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1222 | Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 182,939 | 182,939 | - | - | 60,836 | 60,836 | - | - | 122,103 | 122,103 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1230 | Nebraska Public Power District | u.s. | 653,494 | 653,494 | - | - | 217,318 | 217,318 | - | - | 436,175 | 436,175 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1232 | Omaha Public Power District | u.s. | 533,333 | 533,333 | - | - | 177,359 | 177,359 | - | - | 355,974 | 355,974 | - | - |
| 2017 | mro | 1240 | Western Area Power Administration (UM) | u.s. | 442,466 | 442,466 |  | - | 147,141 | 147, 141 | - | - | 295,325 | 295,325 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1239 | Western Area Power Administration (LM) | u.s. | 2,190 1,147187 | 2,190 | - | - | 728 382641 | 728 | 382641 | - | 1,462 764546 | 1,462 | 764.546 | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1217 | Manitoba Hydro | can | 1,147,187 | - | 1,147,187 | - | 382,641 | - | 382,641 | - | 764,546 | - | 764,546 | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1235 | SaskPower | CAN | 1,189,698 | 20 | 1,189,698 | - | 396,820 | 88 | 396,820 | - | 792,877 | , | 792,877 | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1195 | Alliant Energy (Alliant East - WPL \& Alliant West IPL) | u.s. | 1,388,929 | 1,388,929 | - | - | 461,886 | 461,886 | - | - | 927,043 | 927,043 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1710 | Dahlberg Electric Company | u.s. | 5,345 | 5,345 | - | - | 1,778 507314 | 1,778 $\mathbf{5 3 7 8 1}$ | - | - | 3,568 | 3,568 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1216 | Madison, Gas and Electric | u.s. | 161,524 | 161,524 | - | - | 53,714 | 53,714 | - | - | 107,809 | 107,809 | - | - |
| 2017 | mro | 1220 | MidAmerican Energy Company | u.s. | 1,225,127 | 1,225,127 | - | - | 407,414 | 407,414 | - | - | 817,713 | 817,713 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1221 | Minnesota Power | u.s. | 616,550 | 616,550 | - | - | 205,033 | 205,033 | - | - | 411,517 | 411,517 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1226 | Montana-Dakota Utilities Co . | u.s. | 155,216 | 155,216 | - | - | 51,617 | 51,617 | - | - | 103,599 | 103,599 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1711 | North Central Power Company | u.s. | 1,774 | 1,774 | - | - | 590 | 590 | - | - | 1,184 | 1,184 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1231 | NorthWestern Energy | u.s. | 74,341 | 74,341 | - | - | 24,722 | 24,722 | - | - | 49,619 | 49,619 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1712 | NorthWestern Wisconsin | u.s. | 8,869 237,53 | 8,869 237,53 | - | - | 2,949 | $\begin{array}{r}2,949 \\ \hline 78981\end{array}$ | - | - | 5,920 | 5,920 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1233 | Otter Tail Power Company | u.s. | 237,503 | 237,503 | - | - | 78,981 | 78,981 | - | - | 158,522 | 158,522 | - | - |
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| 2017 | MRO | 1664 | Wisconsin Public Service (WPS) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | MRO | 1665 | Upper Peninsula Power Company (UPPCO) |
| 2017 | MRO | 1244 | Xcel Energy Company (NSP) |
| 2017 | mRo | 1196 | Ames Municipal Electric System |
| 2017 | mRO | 1604 | Atlantic Municipal Utilities |
| 2017 | MRO | 1713 | Bloomer Electric \& Water Co. |
| 2017 | mRO | 1714 | Village of Caddott |
| 2017 | mRO | 1200 | Cedar Falls Municipal Utilities |
| 2017 | mRo | 1477 | Central Minnesota Municipal Power Agency (CMMPA) |
| 2017 | MRO | 1716 | Eldridge Electric and Water Utilities |
| 2017 | mRo | 1203 | City of Escanaba |
| 2017 | MRO | 1205 | Falls City Water \& Light Department |
| 2017 | mRo | 1206 | Fremont Department of Utilities |
| 2017 | MRO | 1208 | Geneseo Municipal Utilities |
| 2017 | mRO | 1209 | Grand Island Utilities Department |
| 2017 | MRO | 1717 | Great Lakes Utilities |
| 2017 | mRO | 1718 | City of Guttenberg |
| 2017 | MRO | 1606 | Harlan Municipal Utilities |
| 2017 | mRO | 1211 | Hastings Utilities |
| 2017 | mRO | 1212 | Heartland Consumers Power District |
| 2017 | MRO | 1213 | Hutchinson Utilities Commission |
| 2017 | MRO | 1719 | City of Kasota |
| 2017 | mRo | 1215 | Lincoln Electric System |
| 2017 | MRO | 1223 | Missouri River Energy Services |
| 2017 | mRo | 1224 | MN Municipal Power Agency (MMPA) |
| 2017 | MRO | 1607 | Montezuma Municipal Light \& Power |
| 2017 | mRO | 1227 | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska |
| 2017 | MRO | 1228 | Muscatine Power and Water |
| 2017 | mro | 1229 | Nebraska City Utilities |
| 2017 | MRO | 1720 | Resale Power Group of Iowa |
| 2017 | mRo | 1721 | Rice Lake Utilities |
| 2017 | mRO | 1234 | Rochester Public Utilities |
| 2017 | mRo | 1236 | Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency |
| 2017 | MRO | 1722 | City of Spooner |
| 2017 | MRO | 1241 | Willmar Municipal Utilities |
| 2017 | MRO | 1242 | Wisconsin Public Power, Inc. (East and West regions) |
| 2017 | mRo |  | Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO-SERC |  | Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1246 | American Electric Power |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1707 | Aep-vemco |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1247 | Board of Public Utilities (Kansas City KS) |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1620 | Board of Public Utilities, City of McPherson, Kansas |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1647 | Carthage City Water \& Light |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1469 | Central Valley Electric Cooperative |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1556 | City of Bentonville |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1709 | City of Nixa |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1703 | City of Chanute |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1248 | Independence Power \& Light (Independence, MO) |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1436 | City Utilities of Springfield, MO |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1437 | East Texas Electric Coop, Inc. |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1250 | The Empire District Electric Company |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1470 | Farmers' Electric Coop |
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2017 NEL Calculations and Allocations to Load Serving Entities (or Designee) for the 2019 NERC and RE Assessments

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total ERO Assessments (NERC, RE \& WIRAB Costs) |  |  |  | Total NERC Assessments |  |  |  | Total Regional Entity Assessments (Including WIRAB Assessments) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1438 | Golden Spread Electric Coop | u.s. | 237,259 | 237,259 | - | - | 78,900 | 78,900 | - | - | 158,359 | 158,359 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1251 | Grand River Dam Authority | u.s. | 248,861 | 248,861 | - | - | 82,758 | 82,758 | - | - | 166,103 | 166,103 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1252 | Kansas City Power \& Light (KCPL) | u.s. | 738,791 | 738,791 | - | - | 245,684 | 245,684 | - | - | 493,108 | 493,108 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1439 | Kansas Electric Power Cooop., Inc | u.s. | 100,682 | 100,682 | - | - | 33,482 | 33,482 | - | - | 67,200 | 67,200 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1440 | Kansas Municipal Energy Agency (KCPL) | u.s. | 75,269 | 75,269 | - | - | 25,031 | 25,031 | - | - | 50,239 | 50,239 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1637 | Kansas Power Pool | u.s. | ${ }^{41,724}$ | 41,724 | - | - | 13,875 | 13,875 | - | - | 27,849 | 27,849 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-mRO | 1598 | KCP\&L GMOC (Greater Missouri Operations Company) | u.s. | 406,026 | 406,026 | - | - | 135,023 | 135,023 | - | - | 271,003 | 271,003 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1472 | Lea County Electric Coop | u.s. | 57,903 | 57,903 | - | - | 19,255 | 19,255 | - | - | 38,647 | 38,647 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1441 | Midwest Energy Inc. | u.s. | 85,397 | 85,397 | - | - | 28,399 | 28,399 | - | - | 56,998 | 56,998 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-Mro-SERC |  | Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission | u.s. | 21,273 | 21,273 | - | - | 7,074 | 7,074 | - | - | 14,199 | 14,199 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1442 | Northeast Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 149,377 | 149,377 | - | - | 49,675 | 49,675 | - | - | 99,702 | 99,702 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1255 | Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. | u.s. | 1,358,369 | 1,358,369 | - | - | 451,723 | 451,723 | - | - | 906,646 | 906,646 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1444 | Oklahoma Municipal Power Auth | u.s. | 135,890 | 135,890 | - | - | 45,190 | 45,190 | - | - | 90,700 | 90,700 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1651 | Paragould Light, Water \& Cable | u.s. | 27,954 | 27,954 | - | - | 9,296 | 9,296 | - | - | 18,658 | 18,658 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1725 | People's Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 23,623 | 23,623 | - | - | 7,856 | 7,856 | - | - | 15,767 | 15,767 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1473 | Roosevelt County Electric Coop | u.s. | 7,218 | 7,218 | - | - | 2,400 | 2,400 | - | - | 4,817 | 4,817 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1237 | Xcel Energy Company (Southwerstern Public Service) | u.s. | 1,025,823 | 1,025,823 | - | - | 341,136 | 341,136 | - | - | 684,687 | 684,687 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1256 | Sunflower Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 215,044 | 215,044 | - | - | 71,513 | 71,513 | - | - | 143,532 | 143,532 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1445 | Tex-La Electric Cooperative of Texas | u.s. | 23,323 | 23,323 | - | - | 7,756 | 7,756 | - | - | 15,567 | 15,567 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1475 | Tri County Electric Coop | u.s. | 16,733 | 16,733 | - | - | 5,565 | 5,565 | - | - | 11,169 | 11,169 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1260 | Westar Energy, Inc. | u.s. | 1,003,369 | 1,003,369 | - | - | 333,669 | 333,669 | - | - | 669,701 | 669,701 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1259 | Western Farmers Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 401,161 | 401,161 | - | - | 133,405 | 133,405 | - | - | 267,755 | 267,755 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1501 | West Texas Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 132,845 | 132,845 | - | - | 44,177 | 44,177 |  | - | 88,668 | 88,668 | , | - |
|  |  |  | TOTAL MRO |  | 23,183,705 | 20,846,820 | 2,336,885 | - | 7,712,036 | 6,932,574 | 779,462 | - | 15,471,669 | 13,914,246 | 1,557,423 | - |
| 2017 | npCC | 1336 | New England | u.s. | 5,924,309 | 5,924,309 | - | - | 1,924,320 | 1,924,320 | - | - | 3,999,989 | 3,999,989 | - | - |
| 2017 | npCC | 1339 | New York | u.s. | 7,651,580 | 7,651,580 | - | - | 2,482,313 | 2,482,313 | - | - | 5,169,267 | 5,169,267 | - | - |
| 2017 | NPCC | 1337 | Ontario | Canada | 3,582,527 | - | 3,582,527 | - | 1,418,177 | - | 1,418,177 | - | 2,164,350 | - | 2,164,350 | - |
| 2017 | NPCC |  | Quebec | Canada | 5,063,237 | - | 5,063,237 | - | 2,004,960 | - | 2,004,960 | - | 3,058,277 | - | 3,058,277 | - |
| 2017 | npCC | 1705 | New Brunswick | Canada | 502,544 | - | 502,544 | - | 148,152 | - | 148,152 | - | 354,392 | - | 354,392 | - |
| 2017 | NPCC | 1340 | Nova Scotia | Canada | 431,965 | 8 | 431,965 | - | 174,829 | , | 174,829 | - | 257,136 | - | 257,136 | - |
|  |  |  | TOTAL NPCC |  | 23,156,162 | 13,575,889 | 9,580,272 | - | 8,152,751 | 4,406,633 | 3,746,117 | - | 15,003,411 | 9,169,256 | 5,834,155 | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1102 | Cannelton Utilities | u.s. | 570 | 570 | - | - | 225 | 225 | - | - | 346 | 346 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {RF }}$ | 1106 | City of Croswell | u.s. | 1,581 | 1,581 | - | - | 623 | 623 | - | - | 957 | 957 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1490 | City of Lansing | u.s. | 87,998 | 87,698 | - | - | 34,583 | 34,583 | - | - | 53,116 | 53,116 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1120 | Cloverland Electric Coooperative | u.s. | 29,977 | 29,977 | - | - | 11,821 | 11,821 | - | - | 18,156 | 18,156 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1122 | CMS ERM Michigan LLC | u.s. | 7,088 | 7,088 | - | - | 2,795 | 2,795 | - | - | 4,293 | 4,293 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1124 | Constellation New Energy (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 48,425 | 48,425 | - | - | 19,096 | 19,096 | - | - | 29,329 | 29,329 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1123 | Constellation New Energy (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 54,334 | 54,334 | - | - | 21,426 | 21,426 | - | - | 32,908 | 32,908 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1126 | Consumers Energy Company | u.s. | 1,338,466 | 1,388,466 | - | - | 527,807 | 527,807 | - | - | 810,659 | 810,659 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1128 | Detroit Edison Company | u.s. | 1,794,924 | 1,794,924 | - | - | 707,805 | 707,805 | - | - | 1,087,119 | 1,087,119 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ | 1166 | Duke Energy Indiana | u.s. | 1,185,648 | 1,185,648 | - | - | 467,545 | 467,545 | - | - | 718,103 | 718,103 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1135 | Ferdinand Municipal Light \& Water | u.s. | 1,997 | 1,997 | - | - | 187 | 787 | - | - | 1,209 | 1,209 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1646 | FirstEnergy Solutions (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 34,504 | 34,504 | - | - | 13,606 | 13,606 | - | - | 20,898 | 20,898 |  | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1549 | FirstEnergy Solutions (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 41,605 | 41,605 | - | - | 16,407 | 16,407 | - | - | 25,199 | 25,199 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ | 1145 | Hoosier Energy | U.s. | 300,995 12252 | 300,995 122525 | - | - | 118,694 | 118,694 | - | - | 182,302 | 182,302 |  | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1148 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency ( DUKE CIN) | u.s. | 122,552 | 122,552 | - | - | 48,327 | 48,327 | - | - | 74,225 | 74,225 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1485 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (NIPSCO) | u.s. | 17,035 | 17,035 | - | - | 6,718 | 6,718 | - | - | 10,318 | 10,318 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1486 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (SIGE) | u.s. | 23,718 | 23,718 | - | - | 9,353 | 9,353 | - | - | 14,365 | 14,365 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1149 | Indianapolis Power \& Light Co. | u.s. | 555,477 | 555,477 | - | - | 219,045 | 219,045 | - | - | 336,432 | 336,432 |  | - |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Total ERO Assessments (NERC, RE \& WIRAB Costs)} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Total NERC Assessments} \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Total Regional Entity Assessments (Including WIRAB Assessments)} <br>
\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Data } \\
& \text { Year } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$ \& Regional Entity \& ID \& Entity \& Country \& Total \& us \& Canada \& Mexico \& Total \& us \& Canada \& Mexico \& Total \& us \& Canada \& Mexico <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1553 \& Integry Energy Services (MECS-CONS) \& u.s. \& 17,615 \& 17,615 \& - \& - \& 6,946 \& 6,946 \& - \& - \& 10,669 \& 10,669 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1554 \& Integrys Energy Services (MECS-DET) \& u.s. \& 25,211 \& 25,211 \& - \& - \& 9,941 \& 9,941 \& - \& - \& 15,269 \& 15,269 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1666 \& Integrys Energy Services \& u.s. \& 11,901 \& 11,901 \& - \& - \& 4,693 \& 4,693 \& - \& - \& 7,208 \& 7,208 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1614 \& Just Energy (MECS-DET) \& u.s. \& 344 \& 344 \& - \& - \& 135 \& 135 \& - \& - \& 208 \& 208 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1154 \& Michigan Public Power Agency \& u.s. \& 152,218 \& 152,218 \& - \& - \& 60,025 \& 60,025 \& - \& - \& 92,193 \& 92,193 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1155 \& Michigan South Central Power Agency \& u.s. \& 28,420 \& 28,420 \& - \& - \& 11,207 \& 11,207 \& - \& - \& 17,213 \& 17,213 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1158 \& MidAmerican Energy Company Retail \& u.s. \& 683 \& 683 \& - \& - \& 269 \& 269 \& - \& - \& 414 \& 414 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1163 \& Northern Indiana Public Service Co . \& u.s. \& 705,081 \& 705,081 \& - \& - \& 278,040 \& 278,040 \& - \& - \& 427,042 \& 427,042 \& - \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1164 \& Ontonagon County Rural Electrification Assoc. \& u.s. \& 1,119 \& 1,119 \& - \& - \& 441 \& 441 \& - \& - \& 678 \& 678 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1265 \& PJM Interconnnection, LLC \& u.s. \& 26,740,677 \& 26,740,677 \& - \& - \& 10,544,842 \& 10,544,842 \& - \& - \& 16,195,836 \& 16,195,836 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1172 \& Calpine Energy Solutions (k.n.a.Noble Americas Energy Solutions (MECS-CONS)) \& u.s. \& 15,423 \& 15,423 \& - \& - \& 6,082 \& 6,082 \& - \& - \& 9,341 \& 9,341 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1171 \& Calpine Energy Solutions (k.n.a.Noble Americas Energy Solutions (MECS-DET)) \& u.s. \& 24,260 \& 24,260 \& - \& - \& 9,567 \& 9,567 \& - \& - \& 14,693 \& 14,693 \& - \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1176 \& Direct Energy (fka:Strategic Energy,LLC) (MECS-CONS) \& u.s. \& 7,710 \& 7,710 \& - \& - \& 3,040 \& 3,040 \& - \& - \& 4,669 \& 4,669 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1174 \& Direct Energy (fka:Strategic Energy,LC) (MECS-DET) \& u.s. \& 36,567 \& 36,567 \& - \& - \& 14,420 \& 14,420 \& - \& - \& 22,147 \& 22,147 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1581 \& Spartan Renewable Energy \& u.s. \& 3,677 \& 3,677 \& - \& - \& 1,450 \& 1,450 \& - \& - \& 2,227 \& 2,227 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& \& Spartan Renewable Energy (MI UP) \& u.s. \& 2,223 \& 2,223 \& - \& - \& 877 \& 877 \& - \& - \& 1,347 \& 1,347 \& - \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1180 \& Thumb Electric Cooperative \& u.s. \& 7,250 \& 7,250 \& - \& - \& 2,859 \& 2,859 \& - \& - \& 4,391 \& 4,391 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1662 \& Ohio Valley Electric Corporation \& u.s. \& 16,310 \& 16,310 \& - \& - \& 6,432 \& 6,432 \& - \& - \& 9,878 \& 9,878 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1181 \& Vectren Energy Delivery of IN \& u.s. \& 204,535 \& 204,535 \& - \& - \& 80,656 \& 80,656 \& - \& - \& 123,879 \& 123,879 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1184 \& Wabash Valley Power Association Inc. (DUKE CIN) \& u.s. \& 113,342 \& 113,342 \& - \& - \& 44,695 \& 44,695 \& - \& - \& 68,647 \& 68,647 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1488 \& Wabash Valley Power Association Inc.(NIPSCO) \& u.s. \& 68,279 \& 68,279 \& - \& - \& 26,925 \& 26,925 \& - \& - \& 41,354 \& 41,354 \& - \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1185 \& Wisconsin Electric Power Co. \& u.s. \& 1,105,167 \& 1,105,167 \& - \& - \& 435,808 \& 435,808 \& - \& - \& 669,359 \& 669,359 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1189 \& Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative \& u.s. \& 30,507 \& 30,507 \& - \& - \& 12,030 \& 12,030 \& - \& - \& 18,477 \& 18,477 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1191 \& Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative \& u.s. \& 107,553 \& 107,553 \& - \& - \& 42,412 \& 42,412 \& - \& - \& 65,141 \& 65,141 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& RF \& 1190 \& Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative(MECS-DET) \& u.s. \& 22,484 \& 22,484 \& - \& - \& 8,866 \& 8,866 \& - \& - \& 13,618 \& 13,618 \& - \& - <br>
\hline \& \& \& TOTAL RELABILITYFIRST \& \& 35,095,152 \& 35,095,152 \& - \& - \& 13,839,321 \& 13,839,321 \& - \& - \& 21,255,831 \& 21,255,831 \& - \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1267 \& Alabama Municipal Electric Authority \& u.s. \& 110,021 \& 110,021 \& - \& - \& 53,313 \& 53,313 \& - \& - \& 56,708 \& 56,708 \& - \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1268 \& Alabama Power Company \& u.s. \& 1,838,804 \& 1,838,804 \& - \& - \& 891,037 \& 891,037 \& - \& - \& 947,767 \& 947,767 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1269 \& Ameren - Illinois \& u.s. \& 1,346,498 \& 1,346,498 \& - \& - \& 652,478 \& 652,478 \& - \& - \& 694,020 \& 694,020 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1271 \& Ameren - Missouri \& u.s. \& 1,185,254 \& 1,185,254 \& - \& - \& 574,343 \& 574,343 \& - \& - \& 610,910 \& 610,910 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1273 \& Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. \& u.s. \& 618,861 \& 618,861 \& - \& - \& 299,884 \& 299,884 \& - \& - \& 318,977 \& 318,977 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1582 \& Beauregard Electric Cooperative, Inc. \& u.s. \& 36,285 \& 36,285 \& - \& - \& 17,583 \& 17,583 \& - \& - \& 18,702 \& 18,702 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& Strc \& 1462 \& Benton Utility District \& u.s. \& 8,194 \& 8,194 \& - \& - \& 3,970 \& 3,970 \& - \& - \& 4,223 \& 4,223 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& Strc \& 1274 \& Big Rivers Electric Corporation \& u.s. \& 120,333 \& 120,333 \& - \& - \& 58,310 \& 58,310 \& - \& - \& 62,023 \& 62,023 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1275 \& Black Warrior EMC \& u.s. \& 13,088 \& 13,088 \& - \& - \& 6,342 \& 6,342 \& - \& - \& 6,746 \& 6,746 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1276 \& Blue Ridge EMC \& u.s. \& 44,319 \& 44,319 \& - \& - \& 21,476 \& 21,476 \& - \& - \& 22,843 \& 22,843 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1628 \& Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. \& u.s. \& 15,319 \& 15,319 \& - \& - \& 7,423 \& 7,423 \& - \& - \& 7,896 \& 7,896 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1463 \& Canton, MS \& u.s. \& 4,202 \& 4,202 \& - \& - \& 2,036 \& 2,036 \& - \& - \& 2,166 \& 2,166 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1277 \& Central Electric Power Coooperative Inc. \& u.s. \& 547,924 \& 547,924 \& - \& - \& 265,510 \& 265,510 \& - \& - \& 282,414 \& 282,414 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC
SERC \& 1667 \& Century Aluminum - Hawessille \& u.s. \& 55,377 \& 55,377 \& - \& - \& 26,834 \& 26,834
53,374 \& - \& - \& 28,543 \& 28,543 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1668 \& Century Aluminum - Sebree \& u.s. \& 110,147 \& 110,147 \& - \& - \& 53,374 \& 53,374 \& - \& - \& 56,773 \& 56,773 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1278 \& City of Blountstown FL \& u.s. \& 1,186 \& 1,186 \& - \& - \& 575 \& 575 \& - \& - \& 611 \& 611 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& Strc \& 1279 \& City of Camden SC \& u.s. \& 6,137 \& 6,137 \& - \& - \& 2,974 \& 2,974 \& - \& - \& 3,163 \& 3,163 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1280 \& City of Collins MS \& u.s. \& $\begin{array}{r}1,472 \\ \hline 3,344\end{array}$ \& 1,472 \& - \& - \& 713
18.581 \& 713
18581 \& - \& - \& 759

19764 \& 759
19764 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1281 \& City of Columbia MO \& u.s. \& 38,344 \& 38,344 \& - \& - \& 18,581 \& 18,581 \& - \& - \& 19,764 \& 19,764 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1282 \& City of Conway AR (Conway Corporation) \& u.s. \& 32,478 \& 32,478 \& - \& - \& 15,738 \& 15,738 \& - \& - \& 16,740 \& 16,740 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& Strc \& 1284 \& City of Evergreen AL \& u.s. \& 1,785 \& 1,785 \& - \& - \& 865 \& 865 \& - \& - \& 920 \& 920 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1285 \& City of Hampton GA \& u.s. \& 1,006 \& 1,006 \& - \& - \& 488 \& 488 \& - \& - \& 519 \& 519 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& SERC
SERC \& 1286
1287 \& City of Hartford AL
City of Henderson (KY) Municipal Power \& Light \& u.s.
u.s. \& 1,018
20,075 \& 1,018
20,075 \& $:$ \& $:$ \& 493
9,728 \& 493
9,728 \& $:$ \& - \& 525
10,347 \& 525
10,347 \& $:$ \& $:$ <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC
SERC \& 1287
1288 \& City of Henderson (KY) Municipal Power \& Light
City of North Littl Rock AR (DENL) \& u.s.
u.s. \& 20,075
30,216 \& 20,075
30,216 \& $:$ \& $:$ \& 9,728
14,642 \& 9,728
14,642 \& - \& $:$ \& 10,347
15,574 \& 10,347
15,574 \& $:$ \& $:$ <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

[^30]

| 2017 | SERC | 1289 | City of Orangeburg SC Department of Public Utilities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | serc | 1290 | City of Robertsdale AL |
| 2017 | SERC | 1291 | City of Ruston LA (DERS) |
| 2017 | SERC | 1292 | Seneca Light \& Power |
| 2017 | SERC | 1115 | City of Springfield (CWLP) |
| 2017 | SERC | 1465 | City of Thayer, MO |
| 2017 | SERC | 1293 | City of Troy AL |
| 2017 | SERC | 1294 | City of West Memphis AR (West Memphis Utilities) |
| 2017 | SERC | 1583 | Claiborne Electric Cooperative, Inc. |
| 2017 | SERC | 1584 | Concordia Electric Cooperative, Inc. |
| 2017 | SERC | 1726 | Cube Hydro Carolinas |
| 2017 | SERC | 1283 | Dalton Utilities |
| 2017 | SERC | 1585 | Dixie Electric Membership Corporation |
| 2017 | SERC | 1295 | Dominion Virginia Power |
| 2017 | SERC | 1296 | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC |
| 2017 | SERC | 1466 | Durant, MS |
| 2017 | SERC | 1478 | LG\&E and KU Services Co as agent for LG\&E Co and KU Co |
| 2017 | SERC | 1297 | East Kentucky Power Coooperative |
| 2017 | SERC | 1298 | East Mississippi Electric Power Association |
| 2017 | SERC | 1669 | Electricities of North Carolina Inc |
| 2017 | SERC | 1300 | Energy United EMC |
| 2017 | SERC | 1301 | Entergy |
| 2017 | SERC | 1302 | Fayetteville (NC) Public Works Commission |
| 2017 | SERC | 1303 | Florida Public Utilities (FL Panhandle Load) |
| 2017 | SERC | 1304 | French Broad EMC |
| 2017 | SERC | 1305 | Georgia Power Company |
| 2017 | SERC | 1306 | Georgia System Optns Corporation |
| 2017 | SERC | 1479 | Greenwood (MS) Utilities Commission |
| 2017 | SERC | 1307 | Greenwood (SC) Commissioners of Public Works |
| 2017 | SERC | 1308 | Gulf Power Company |
| 2017 | SERC | 1586 | Haywood EMC |
| 2017 | SERC |  | Hoosier Energy REC, Inc |
| 2017 | serc | 1309 | Illinois Municipal Electric Agency |
| 2017 | SERC | 1480 | Itta Bena, MS |
| 2017 | serc | 1587 | Jefferson Davis Electric Cooperative, Inc. |
| 2017 | SERC | 1617 | Kentucky Municipal Power |
| 2017 | SERC | 1481 | Kosciusko, ms |
| 2017 | SERC | 1482 | Leland, MS |
| 2017 | SERC | 1313 | McCormick Commission of Public Works |
| 2017 | SERC | 1314 | Mississippi Power Company |
| 2017 | SERC | 1630 | Mt. Carmel Public Utility |
| 2017 | SERC | 1315 | Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia |
| 2017 | SERC | 1316 | N.C. Electric Membership Corp. |
| 2017 | SERC | 1588 | Northeast Louisiana Power Cooperative, Inc. |
| 2017 | serc | 1574 | Northern Virginia Electric Cooperative |
| 2017 | SERC | 1319 | Old Dominion Electric Cooperative |
| 2017 | SERC | 1618 | Osceola (Arkansas) Municipal Light and Power |
| 2017 | SERC | 1320 | Owensboro (KY) Municipal Utilities |
| 2017 | SERC | 1321 | Piedmont EMC in Duke and Progress Areas |
| 2017 | serc | 1323 | Piedmont Municipal Power Agency (PMPA) |
| 2017 | SERC | 1589 | Pointe Coupee Electric Memb. Corp. |
| 2017 | SERC | 1266 | PowerSouth Energy |


| u.s. | 26,634 | 26,634 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| u.s. | 2,654 | 2,654 |
| u.s. | 8,941 | 8,941 |
| u.s. | 5,372 | 5,372 |
| u.s. | 55,959 | 55,959 |
| u.s. | 652 | 652 |
| u.s. | 13,618 | 13,618 |
| u.s. | 12,473 | 12,473 |
| u.s. | 20,984 | 20,984 |
| u.s. | 6,876 | 6,876 |
| u.s. | 474 | 474 |
| u.s. | 59,177 | 59,177 |
| u.s. | 70,414 | 70,414 |
| u.s. | 2,784,965 | 2,784,965 |
| u.s. | 2,753,883 | 2,753,883 |
| u.s. | 822 | 822 |
| u.s. | 1,101,105 | 1,101,105 |
| u.s. | 431,000 | 431,000 |
| u.s. | 13,446 | 13,446 |
| u.s. | 379,781 | 379,781 |
| u.s. | 82,461 | 82,461 |
| u.s. | 3,878,976 | 3,878,976 |
| u.s. | 68,267 | 68,267 |
| u.s. | 10,028 | 10,028 |
| u.s. | 16,467 | 16,467 |
| u.s. | 2,781,144 | 2,781,144 |
| u.s. | 1,274,659 | 1,274,659 |
| u.s. | 9,153 | 9,153 |
| u.s. | 10,367 | 10,367 |
| u.s. | 373,319 | 373,319 |
| u.s. | 10,046 | 10,046 |
| u.s. | 13,142 | 13,142 |
| u.s. | 62,087 | 62,087 |
| u.s. | 452 | 452 |
| u.s. | 8,589 | 8,589 |
| u.s. | 21,398 | 21,398 |
| u.s. | 2,395 | 2,395 |
| u.s. | 979 | 979 |
| u.s. | 535 | 535 |
| u.s. | 331,861 | 331,861 |
| u.s. | 3,383 | 3,383 |
| u.s. | 354,102 | 354,102 |
| u.s. | 416,123 | 416,123 |
| u.s. | 8,598 | 8,598 |
| u.s. | 154,196 | 154,196 |
| u.s. | 162,987 | 162,987 |
| u.s. | 5,104 | 5,104 |
| u.s. | 26,622 | 26,622 |
| U.S. | 16,515 | 16,515 |
| u.s. | 76,621 | 76,621 |
| u.s. | 8,512 | 8,512 |
| u.s. | 282,934 | 282,934 |


| 12,906 | 12,906 | - | - | 13,728 | 13,728 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,286 | 1,286 | - | - | 1,368 | 1,368 |
| 4,332 | 4,332 | - | - | 4,608 | 4,608 |
| 2,603 | 2,603 | - | - | 2,769 | 2,769 |
| 27,116 | 27,116 | - | - | 28,843 | 28,843 |
| 316 | 316 | - | - | 336 | 336 |
| 6,599 | 6,599 | - | - | 7,019 | 7,019 |
| 6,044 | 6,044 | - | - | 6,429 | 6,429 |
| 10,169 | 10,169 | - | - | 10,816 | 10,816 |
| 3,332 | 3,332 | - | - | 3,544 | 3,544 |
| 230 | 230 | - | - | 244 | 244 |
| 28,676 | 28,676 | - | - | 30,501 | 30,501 |
| 34,121 | 34,121 | - | - | 36,293 | 36,293 |
| 1,349,522 | 1,349,522 | - | - | 1,435,442 | 1,435,442 |
| 1,334,461 | 1,334,461 | - | - | 1,419,422 | 1,419,422 |
| 398 | 398 | - | - | 424 | 424 |
| 533,567 | 533,567 | - | - | 567,538 | 567,538 |
| 208,852 | 208,852 | - | - | 222,149 | 222,149 |
| 6,516 | 6,516 | - | - | 6,931 | 6,931 |
| 184,032 | 184,032 | - | - | 195,749 | 195,749 |
| 39,958 | 39,958 | - | - | 42,502 | 42,502 |
| 1,879,652 | 1,879,652 | - | - | 1,999,324 | 1,999,324 |
| 33,081 | 33,081 | - | - | 35,187 | 35,187 |
| 4,859 | 4,859 | - | - | 5,169 | 5,169 |
| 7,979 | 7,979 | - | - | 8,487 | 8,487 |
| 1,347,671 | 1,347,671 | - | - | 1,433,473 | 1,433,473 |
| 617,667 | 617,667 | - | - | 656,992 | 656,992 |
| 4,435 | 4,435 | - | - | 4,718 | 4,718 |
| 5,023 | 5,023 | - | - | 5,343 | 5,343 |
| 180,901 | 180,901 | - | - | 192,418 | 192,418 |
| 4,868 | 4,868 | - | - | 5,178 | 5,178 |
| 6,368 | 6,368 | - | - | 6,774 | 6,774 |
| 30,086 | 30,086 | - | - | 32,001 | 32,001 |
| 219 | 219 | - | - | 233 | 233 |
| 4,162 | 4,162 | - | - | 4,427 | 4,427 |
| 10,369 | 10,369 | - | - | 11,029 | 11,029 |
| 1,161 | 1,161 | - | - | 1,235 | 1,235 |
| 474 | 474 | - | - | 505 | 505 |
| 259 | 259 | - | - | 276 | 276 |
| 160,811 | 160,811 | - | - | 171,050 | 171,050 |
| 1,639 | 1,639 | - | - | 1,744 | 1,744 |
| 171,589 | 171,589 | - | - | 182,513 | 182,513 |
| 201,642 | 201,642 | - | - | 214,480 | 214,480 |
| 4,167 | 4,167 | - | - | 4,432 | 4,432 |
| 74,719 | 74,719 | - | - | 79,477 | 79,477 |
| 78,979 | 78,979 | - | - | 84,008 | 84,008 |
| 2,473 | 2,473 | - | - | 2,631 | 2,631 |
| 12,900 | 12,900 | - | - | 13,722 | 13,722 |
| 8,003 | 8,003 | - | - | 8,512 | 8,512 |
| 37,128 | 37,128 | - | - | 39,492 | 39,492 |
| 4,125 | 4,125 | - | - | 4,387 | 4,387 |
| 137,103 | 137,103 | - | - | 145,832 | 145,832 |

[^31]| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Yar } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total ERO Assessments (NERC, RE\& WIRAB Costs) |  |  |  | Total NERC Assessments |  |  |  | Total Regional Entity Assessments (Including WIRAB Assessments) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | SERC | 1330 | Prairie Power, Inc. | u.s. | 50,287 | 50,287 | - | - | 24,368 | 24,368 | - | - | 25,919 | 25,919 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1706 | Duke Energy Progress | u.s. | 1,503,837 | 1,503,837 | - | - | 728,721 | 728,721 | - | - | 775,116 | 775,116 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1325 | Rutherford EMC | u.s. | 42,814 | 42,814 | - | - | 20,747 | 20,747 | - | - | 22,067 | 22,067 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1631 | Sam Rayburn G\&T Electric Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 58,428 | 58,428 | - | - | 28,313 | 28,313 | - | - | 30,115 | 30,115 | - |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1326 | South Carolina Electric \& Gas Company | u.s. | 757,239 | 757,239 | - | - | 366,939 | 366,939 | - | - | 390,301 | 390,301 | - | - |
| 2017 | Strc | 1327 | South Carolina Public Service Authority | u.s. | 281,361 | 281,361 | - | - | 136,340 | 136,340 | - | - | 145,021 | 145,021 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1590 | South Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association | u.s. | 18,905 | 18,905 | - | - | 9,161 | 9,161 | - | - | 9,744 | 9,744 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1328 | Cooperative Energy (formerly SMEPA) | u.s. | 315,021 | 315,021 | - | - | 152,651 | 152,651 | - | - | 162,370 | 162,370 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1329 | Southern Illinois Power Cooperative | u.s. | 51,447 | 51,447 | - | - | 24,930 | 24,930 | - | - | 26,517 | 26,517 | - | - |
| 2017 | Strc | 1591 | Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation | u.s. | 80,260 | 80,260 | - | - | 38,892 | 38,892 | - | - | 41,368 | 41,368 | - | - |
| 2017 | Strc | 1619 | Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 13,752 | 13,752 | - | - | 6,664 | 6,664 | - | - | 7,088 | 7,088 | - |  |
| 2017 | Strc | 1331 | Tennessee Valley Authority | u.s. | 5,084,712 | 5,084,712 | - | - | 2,463,921 | 2,463,921 | - | - | 2,620,791 | 2,620,791 | - | - |
| 2017 | Strc | 1632 | Tex-La Electric Coooperative of Texas, Inc | u.s. | 6,829 | 6,829 | - | - | 3,309 | 3,309 | - | - | 3,520 | 3,520 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1332 | Tombigbee Electric Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 3,968 | 3,968 | - | - | 1,923 | 1,923 | - | - | 2,045 | 2,045 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1594 | Town of Sharpsburg, N.C. | u.s. | 637 | 637 | - | - | 309 | 309 | - | - | 329 | 329 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1595 | Town of Stantonsburg, N. .C. JRO | u.s. | 1,821 | 1,821 | - | - | 882 | 882 | - | - | 938 | 938 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1333 | Town of Waynesville NC | u.s. | 3,026 | 3,026 | - | - | 1,466 | 1,466 | - | - | 1,560 | 1,560 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1334 | Town of Winnsboro sc | u.s. | 2,031 | 2,031 | - | - | 984 | 984 | - | - | 1,047 | 1,047 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1335 | Town of Winterville NC | u.s. | 1,769 | 1,769 | - | - | 857 | 857 | - | - | 912 | 912 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1597 | Washington-St.Tammany Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 33,718 | 33,718 | - | - | 16,339 | 16,339 | - | - | 17,379 | 17,379 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1435 | Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation | u.s. | 335,816 | 335,816 | - | - | 162,728 | 162,728 | - | - | 173,088 | 173,088 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1557 | City of Clarksdale, Mississippi | u.s. | 5,124 | 5,124 | - | - | 2,483 | 2,483 | - | - | 2,641 | 2,641 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1708 | City of Abbeville | u.s. | 4,506 | 4,506 | - | - | 2,183 | 2,183 | - | - | 2,322 | 2,322 | - |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1558 | Hope Water \& Light (HWL) | u.s. | 9,646 | 9,646 | - | - | 4,674 | 4,674 | - | - | 4,972 | 4,972 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1559 | City of Minden | u.s. | 4,528 | 4,528 | - | - | 2,194 | 2,194 | - | - | 2,334 | 2,334 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1249 | Cleco Power LLC | u.s. | 367,091 | 367,091 | - | - | 177,883 | 177,883 | - | - | 189,208 | 189,208 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1648 | Jonesboro City Water \& Light | u.s. | 45,514 | 45,514 | - | - | 22,055 | 22,055 | - | - | 23,459 | 23,459 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1649 | Kennett Board of Public Works | u.s. | 4,475 | 4,475 | - | - | 2,169 | 2,169 | - | - | 2,307 | 2,307 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1471 | Lafayette Utilities System | u.s. | 67,318 | 67,318 | - | - | 32,621 | 32,621 | - | - | 34,698 | 34,698 | - |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1253 | Louisiana Energy \& Power Authority (LEPA) | u.s. | 31,354 | 31,354 | - | - | 15,193 | 15,193 | - | - | 16,161 | 16,161 | - |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1650 | Malden Board of Public Works | u.s. | 1,629 | 1,629 | - | - | 790 | 790 | - | - | 840 | 840 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1443 | Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission | u.s. | 67,882 | 67,882 | - | - | 32,894 | 32,894 | - | - | 34,988 | 34,988 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1639 | OzMo Ozark Missouri, West Plains MO | u.s. | 6,182 | 6,182 | - | - | 2,995 | 2,995 | - | - | 3,186 | 3,186 | - |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1652 | Piggott Municipal Light, Water \& Sewer | u.s. | 1,197 | 1,197 | - | - | 580 | 580 | - | - | 617 | 617 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC SRC | 1653 | Poplar Bluff Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 12,162 | 12,162 | - | - | 5,893 | 5,893 | - | - | 6,268 | 6,268 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1636 | City of Prescott | u.s. | 2,686 | 2,686 | - | - | 1,301 | 1,301 | - | - | 1,384 | 1,384 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC | 1561 | Public Service Commission of Yazoo City of Mississippi | u.s. | 3,832 | 3,832 | - | - | 1,857 | 1,857 | - | - | 1,975 | 1,975 | - | - |
|  | SERC | 1654 | Sikeston Board of Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 12,197 | 12,197 | - | - | 5,910 | 5,910 | - | - | 6,286 | 6,286 | - | - |
|  |  |  | TOTAL SERC |  | 33,704,596 | 33,704,596 | - | - | 16,332,381 | 16,332,381 | - | - | 17,372,215 | 17,372,215 | - | - |
|  |  |  | TOTAL SPP |  |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | TRE | 1019 | ERCOT | u.s. | 18,947,337 | 18,947,337 | - | - | 5,699,337 | 5,699,337 | - | - | 13,248,000 | 13,248,000 | - | - |
|  |  |  | total Ercot |  | 18,947,337 | 18,947,337 | - | - | 5,699,337 | 5,699,337 | - | - | 13,248,000 | 13,248,000 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Alberta Electric System Operator | Canada | 1,533,210 | - | 1,533,210 | - | 656,732 | - | 656,732 | - | 876,478 | - | 876,478 | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | British Columbia Hydro \& Power Authority | Canada | 3,065,465 | - | 3,065,465 | - | 1,023,265 | - | 1,023,265 | - | 2,042,199 | - | 2,042,199 | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Centro Nacional de Control de Energia | Mexico | 634,833 | 5 |  | 634,833 | 211,910 | 173 | - | 211,910 | 422,923 | 31 | - | 422,923 |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Ajo Improvement District | u.s. | 513 | 513 | - | - | 173 | 173 | - | - | 340 | 340 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Arizona Public Service Company | u.s. | 1,366,389 | 1,366,389 | - | - | 461,227 | 461,227 | - | - | 905,162 | 905,162 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Williams | u.s. | 2,105 | 2,105 | - | - | 711 | 711 | - | - | 1,394 | 1,394 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical Districts 3 | u.s. | 4,009 | 4,009 | - | - | 1,353 | 1,353 | - | - | 2,655 | 2,655 | - | - |
| Appendix 2-B, Total Assessments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |


|  |  |  |  |  | Total ERO Assessments (NERC, RE\& WIRAB Costs) |  |  |  | Total NERC Assessments |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data Year | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |



| 2017 | WECC | Aguila Irigation District - APS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 | wecc | Buckeye Water Conservation and Drainage District - APS |
| 2017 | wecc | Electrical District No. 6 of Pinal County - APS |
| 2017 | wecc | Electrical District No. 7 of Maricopa County - APS |
| 2017 | wecc | Electrical District No. 8 of Maricopa County - APS |
| 2017 | wecc | Harquahala Valley Power Districts - APS |
| 2017 | wecc | Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation Dist No. 1- APS |
| 2017 | wecc | McMullen Valley Water Conservation \& Drainage District - APS |
| 2017 | WECC | Roosevelt Irigation District - APS |
| 2017 | wecc | Tonopah Irrigation District - APS |
| 2017 | WECC | Navajo Tribal Utility Authority-Arizona |
| 2017 | wecc | Tohono O'Odham Utility Authority |
| 2017 | WECC | Town of Wickenburg |
| 2017 | wecc | Avista Corporation |
| 2017 | wecc | Kaiser Aluminum Fabricated Products LLC |
| 2017 | wecc | Pend Oreille County PUD No. 1 |
| 2017 | WECC | PUD No. 2 of Grant County |
| 2017 | wecc | Bonneville Power Administration-Power Services |
| 2017 | wecc | Bonneville Power Administration-Hydro |
| 2017 | wecc | Bonneville Power Administration-Transmission |
| 2017 | WECC | City of Redding |
| 2017 | wecc | City of Roseville |
| 2017 | WECC | Modesto Irrigation District |
| 2017 | wecc | Sacramento Municipal Utility District |
| 2017 | WECC | Western Area Power Administration-Sierra Nevada Region |
| 2017 | wecc | California Independent System Operator |
| 2017 | WECC | El Paso Electric Company |
| 2017 | wecc | Idaho Power Company |
| 2017 | WECC | Imperial Irrigation District |
| 2017 | wecc | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power |
| 2017 | wecc | City of Henderson |
| 2017 | wecc | City of Las Vegas |
| 2017 | WECC | City of North Las Vegas |
| 2017 | wecc | Clark County Water Reclamation District |
| 2017 | WECC | Colorado River Commission of Nevada |
| 2017 | wecc | Las Vegas Valley Water District |
| 2017 | WECC | Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy |
| 2017 | wecc | MGM Resorts International |
| 2017 | WECC | Switch-North |
| 2017 | wecc | Switch-South |
| 2017 | WECC | Wynn Las Vegas |
| 2017 | wecc | Overton Power District No. 5 |
| 2017 | wecc | Southern Nevada Water Authority |
| 2017 | wecc | Basin Electric Power Cooperative |
| 2017 | WECC | Big Horn County Electric Cooperative |
| 2017 | wecc | NorthWestern Corp. dba NorthWestern Energy, LLC |
| 2017 | WECC | Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region |
| 2017 | wecc | Pacificorp West (PACW) |
| 2017 | WECC | Constellation New Energy |
| 2017 | WECC | 3 Phases Renewables |
| 2017 | wecc | Avangrid Renewables |
| 2017 | wecc | Calpine Energy Solutions, LLC./Noble Americas Energy Solutio |


| u.s. | 1,558 | 1,558 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| u.s. | 1,056 | 1,056 |
| u.s. | 101 | 101 |
| u.s. | 2,368 | 2,368 |
| u.s. | 17,001 | 17,001 |
| u.s. | 5,383 | 5,383 |
| u.s. | 2,430 | 2,430 |
| u.s. | 5,850 | 5,850 |
| u.s. | 1,924 | 1,924 |
| u.s. | 1,278 | 1,278 |
| u.s. | 2,368 | 2,368 |
| u.s. | 2,901 | 2,901 |
| u.s. | 1,249 | 1,249 |
| u.s. | 455,011 | 455,011 |
| u.s. | 14,576 | 14,576 |
| u.s. | 47,858 | 47,858 |
| u.s. | 4,338 | 4,338 |
| u.s. | 299,242 | 299,242 |
| u.s. | 9,533 | 9,533 |
| u.s. | 2,431,694 | 2,431,694 |
| u.s. | 37,568 | 37,568 |
| u.s. | 58,752 | 58,752 |
| u.s. | 123,382 | 123,382 |
| u.s. | 545,469 | 545,469 |
| u.s. | 93,485 | 93,485 |
| u.s. | 10,775,267 | 10,775,267 |
| u.s. | 396,308 | 396,308 |
| u.s. | 742,487 | 742,487 |
| u.s. | 176,052 | 176,052 |
| u.s. | 1,354,118 | 1,354,118 |
| u.s. | 1,935 | 1,935 |
| u.s. | 1,960 | 1,960 |
| u.s. | 1,104 | 1,104 |
| u.s. | 3,831 | 3,831 |
| u.s. | 22,223 | 22,223 |
| u.s. | 5,092 | 5,092 |
| u.s. | 1,472,296 | 1,472,296 |
| u.s. | 44,036 | 44,036 |
| u.s. | 272 | 272 |
| u.s. | 13,950 | 13,950 |
| u.s. | 8,634 | 8,634 |
| u.s. | 18,612 | 18,612 |
| u.s. | 5,686 | 5,686 |
| u.s. | 37,591 | 37,591 |
| u.s. | 1,808 | 1,808 |
| u.s. | 444,032 | 444,032 |
| u.s. | 376 | 376 |
| u.s. | 1,014,269 | 1,014,269 |
| u.s. | 16,435 | 16,435 |
| u.s. | 10 | 10 |
| u.s. | 4,856 | 4,856 |
| u.s. | 76,970 | 76,970 |



Appendix 2-B, Total Assessments


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total ERO Assessments (NERC, RE \& WIRAB Costs) |  |  |  | Total NERC Assessments |  |  |  | Total Regional Entity Assessments (Including WIRAB Assessments) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Colorado Springs Utilities | u.s. | 216,708 | 216,708 | - | - | 73,150 | 73,150 | - | - | 143,558 | 143,558 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Deseret Generation \& Transmission Cooperative | u.s. | 5,465 | 5,465 | - | - | 1,845 | 1,845 | - | - | 3,620 | 3,620 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Farmington | u.s. | 46,701 | 46,701 | - | - | 15,764 | 15,764 | - | - | 30,937 | 30,937 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska | u.s. | 29,644 | 29,644 | - | - | 10,007 | 10,007 | - | - | 19,638 | 19,638 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navajo Tribal Utility Authority-Colorado | u.s. | 10,174 | 10,174 | - | - | 3,434 | 3,434 | - | - | 6,740 | 6,740 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navajo Agricultural Products Industry (NAPI) | u.s. | 154 | 154 | - | - | 52 | 52 | - | - | 102 | 102 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Nebraska Public Power Marketing | u.s. | 311 | 311 | - | - | 105 | 105 | - | - | 206 | 206 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Francis E. Warren Air Force Base | u.s. | 569 | 569 | - | - | 192 | 192 | - | - | 377 | 377 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Town of Fredonia | u.s. | 491 | 491 | - | - | 166 | 166 | - | - | 326 | 326 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Tri-State Generation \& Transmission Assoc. Inc - Reliability | u.s. | 369,938 | 369,938 | - | - | 124,873 | 124,873 | - | - | 245,065 | 245,065 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration - CRSP | u.s. | 90,213 | 90,213 | - | - | 30,451 | 30,451 | - | - | 59,761 | 59,761 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power - Loveland, co | u.s. | 86,251 | 86,251 | - | - | 29,114 | 29,114 | - | - | 57,137 | 57,137 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Wyoming Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 10,309 | 10,309 | - | - | 3,480 | 3,480 | - | - | 6,829 | 6,829 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 6,920 | 6,920 | - | - | 2,336 | 2,336 | - | - | 4,584 | 4,584 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Montana-Dakota Utilities Co . | u.s. | 1,069 | 1,069 | - | - | 361 | 361 | - | - | 708 | 708 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | NorthWestern Corp. dba NorthWestern Energy, LLC | u.s. | 14,228 | 14,228 | - | - | 4,803 | 4,803 | - | - | 9,425 | 9,425 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region | u.s. | 16,732 | 16,732 | - | - | 5,648 | 5,648 | - | - | 11,084 | 11,084 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Aha Macav Power Service | u.s. | 689 | 689 | - | - | 233 | 233 | - | - | 457 | 457 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Desalter) - c/o dSw Emmo | u.s. | 5 | 5 | - | - | , | 2 | - |  | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Wellfield) | u.s. | 323 | 323 | - | - | 109 | 109 | - | - | 214 | 214 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Central Arizona Water Conservation District | u.s. | 107,200 | 107,200 | - | - | 36,185 | 36,185 | - | - | 71,014 | 71,014 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Mesa | u.s. | 12,571 | 12,571 | - | - | 4,243 | 4,243 | - | - | 8,327 | 8,327 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Needles Public Utilities Authority | u.s. | 1,491 | 1,491 | - | - | 503 | 503 | - | - | 988 | 988 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Colorado River Agency-Bureau of Indian Affairs | u.s. | 833 | 833 | - | - | 281 | 281 | - | - | 552 | 552 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District \#2- Coolidge Generating Station | u.s. | 433 | 433 | - | - | 146 | 146 | - | - | 287 | 287 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District \#2 | u.s. | 8,912 | 8,912 | - | - | 3,008 | 3,008 | - | - | 5,904 | 5,904 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Silver State Energy Association | u.s. | 30,870 | 30,870 | - | - | 10,420 | 10,420 | - | - | 20,450 | 20,450 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Arizona Electric Power Coooperative, Inc | u.s. | 163,865 | 163,865 | - | - | 55,313 | 55,313 | - | - | 108,552 | 108,552 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground | u.s. | 924 | 924 | - | - | 312 | 312 | - | - | 612 | 612 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation \& Drainage District | u.s. | 239 | 239 | - | - | 81 | 81 | - | - | 158 | 158 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration-Desert Southwest Region | u.s. | 76,559 | 76,559 | - | - | 25,843 | 25,843 | - | - | 50,716 | 50,716 | - | - |
|  |  |  | TOTAL WECC |  | 39,485,838 | 34,252,330 | 4,598,675 | 634,833 | 13,453,838 | 11,561,930 | 1,679,998 | 211,910 | 26,032,000 | 22,690,400 | 2,918,677 | 422,923 |
| total ero |  |  |  |  | 183,095,046 | 165,944,381 | 16,515,832 | 634,833 | 68,883,995 | 62,466,508 | 6,205,577 | 211,910 | 114,211,051 | $103,477,873$ | 10,310,255 | 422,923 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Summary by Regional Entity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | FRCC |  |  |  | 9,522,255 | 9,522,255 | - | - | 3,694,330 | 3,694,330 | - | - | 5,827,925 | 5,827,925 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO |  |  |  | 23,183,705 | 20,846,820 | 2,336,885 | - | 7,712,036 | 6,932,574 | 779,462 | - | 15,471,669 | 13,914,246 | 1,557,423 | - |
| 2017 | npCC |  |  |  | 23,156,162 | 13,575,889 | 9,580,272 | - | 8,152,751 | 4,406,633 | 3,746,117 | - | 15,003,411 | 9,169,256 | 5,834,155 | - |
| 2017 | RF |  |  |  | 35,095,152 | 35,095,152 | - | - | 13,839,321 | 13,839,321 | - | - | 21,255,831 | 21,255,831 | - | - |
| 2017 | SERC |  |  |  | 33,704,596 | 33,704,596 | - | - | 16,332,381 | 16,332,381 | - | - | 17,372,215 | 17,372,215 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2017 | TRE |  |  |  | 18,947,337 | 18,947,337 |  | - | 5,699,337 | 5,699,337 | - |  | 13,248,000 | 13,248,000 | - | - |
| 2017 WECC |  |  |  |  | 39,485,838 | 34,252,330 | 4,598,675 | 634,833 | 13,453,838 | 11,561,930 | 1,679,998 | 211,910 | 26,032,000 | 22,690,400 | 2,918,677 | 422,923 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 183,095,046 | 165,944,381 | 16,515,832 | 634,833 | 68,883,995 | 62,466,508 | 6,205,577 | 211,910 | 114,211,051 | $103,477,873$ | 10,310,255 | 422,923 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | 10 | Entity | Country | Total NeRC Assessments |  |  |  | NERC NEL Assessments |  |  |  | Penalty Sanctions |  | NERC Compliance Credits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1074 | Alachua, City of | u.s. | 2,151 | 2,151 | - | - | 2,114 | 2,114 | - | - | (19) | (19) | 56 | 56 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1075 | Bartow, City of | u.s. | 4,683 | 4,683 | - | - | 4,602 | 4,602 | - | - | (41) | (41) | 122 | 122 | - |  |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1076 | Chattahoochee, City of | u.s. | 586 | 586 | - | - | 576 | 576 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 15 | 15 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1077 | Florida Keys Electric Cooperative Assn | u.s. | 11,906 | 11,906 | - | - | 11,701 | 11,701 | - | - | (105) | (105) | 310 | 310 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1078 | Florida Power \& Light co. | u.s. | 1,815,373 | 1,815,373 | - | - | 1,784,109 | 1,784,109 | - | - | $(15,884)$ | $(15,884)$ | 47,247 | 47,247 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1079 | Florida Public Utilities Company | u.s. | 5,556 | 5,556 | - | - | 5,460 | 5,460 | - | - | (49) | (49) | 145 | 145 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1080 | Gainesville Regional Utilities | u.s. | 28,754 | 28,754 | - | - | 28,259 | 28,259 | - | - | (253) | (253) | 748 | 748 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1081 | Homestead, City of | u.s. | 9,461 | 9,461 | - | - | 9,298 | 9,298 | - | - | (83) | (83) | 246 | 246 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1082 | JEA | u.s. | 198,750 | 198,750 | - | - | 195,327 | 195,327 | - | - | $(1,750)$ | $(1,750)$ | 5,173 | 5,173 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1083 | Lakeland Electric | u.s. | 48,989 | 48,989 | - | - | 48,145 | 48,145 | - | - | (431) | (431) | 1,275 | 1,275 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1626 | Lee County Electric Cooperative, Inc | u.s. | 64,578 | 64,578 | - | - | 63,466 | 63,466 | - | - | (569) | (569) | 1,681 | 1,681 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1661 | City of Lake Worth | u.s. | 7,461 | 7,461 | - | - | 7,333 | 7,333 | - | - | (66) | (66) | 194 | 194 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1084 | Mount Dora, City of | u.s. | 1,459 | 1,459 | - | - | 1,434 | 1,434 | - | - | (13) | (13) | 38 | 38 | - | - |
| 2017 | fric | 1085 | New Smyrna Beach, Utilities Commission of | u.s. | 6,890 | 6,890 | - | - | 6,771 | 6,771 | - | - | (61) | (61) | 179 | 179 | - | - |
| 2017 | frcc | 1086 | Orlando Utilities Commission | u.s. | 96,856 | 96,856 | - | - | 95,188 | 95,188 | - | - | (853) | (853) | 2,521 | 2,521 | - | - |
| 2017 | fricc | 1087 | Duke Energy Florida | u.s. | 646,860 | 646,860 | - | - | 635,720 | 635,720 | - | - | $(5,695)$ | $(5,695)$ | 16,835 | 16,835 | - | - |
| 2017 | frcc | 1088 | Quincy, City of | u.s. | 2,075 | 2,075 | - | - | 2,039 | 2,039 | - | - | (18) | (18) | 54 | 54 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1089 | Reedy Creek I Improvement District | u.s. | 19,224 | 19,224 | - | - | 18,893 | 18,893 | - | - | (169) | (169) | 500 | 500 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1090 | St. Cloud, City of (OUC) | u.s. | 12,208 | 12,208 | - | - | 11,997 | 11,997 | - | - | (107) | (107) | 318 | 318 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1091 | Tallahassee, City of | u.s. | 43,782 | 43,782 | - | - | 43,028 | 43,028 | - | - | (385) | (385) | 1,139 | 1,139 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1092 | Tampa Electric Company | u.s. | 322,191 | 322,191 | - | - | 316,642 | 316,642 | - | - | $(2,837)$ | $(2,837)$ | 8,385 | 8,385 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1603 | City of Vero Beach | u.s. | 12,017 | 12,017 | - | - | 11,810 | 11,810 | - | - | (106) | (106) | 313 | 313 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1093 | Wauchula, City of | u.s. | 1,032 | 1,032 | - | - | 1,014 | 1,014 | - | - | (9) | (9) | 27 | 27 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1094 | Williston, City of | u.s. | 575 | 575 | - | - | 565 | 565 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 15 | 15 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1095 | Winter Park, City of | u.s. | 7,018 | 7,018 | - | - | 6,897 | 6,897 | - | - | (62) | (62) | 183 | 183 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1724 | Moore Haven, City of | u.s. | 238 | 238 | - | - | 234 | 234 |  |  | (2) | (2) | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1072 | Florida Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 95,000 | 95,000 | - | - | 93,364 | 93,364 | - | - | (836) | (836) | 2,472 | 2,472 | - | - |
| 2017 | FRCC | 1073 | Seminole Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 228,658 | 228,658 | - | - | 224,720 | 224,720 | - |  | $(2,013)$ | $(2,013)$ | 5,951 | 5,951 | . |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL FRCC |  | 3,694,330 | 3,694,330 | - | - | 3,630,708 | 3,630,708 | - |  | $(32,528)$ | (32,528) | 96,150 | 96,150 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1199 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 307,589 | 307,589 | - | - | 302,292 | 302,292 | - | - | $(2,708)$ | $(2,708)$ | 8,005 | 8,005 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1201 | Central Iowa Power Cooperative (CIPCO) | u.s. | 44,944 | 44,944 | - | - | 44,170 | 44,170 | - | - | (396) | (396) | 1,170 | 1,170 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1204 | Corn Belt Power Cooperative | u.s. | 31,270 | 31,270 | - | - | 30,731 | 30,731 | - | - | (275) | (275) | 814 | 814 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1207 | Dairland Power Cooperative | u.s. | 87,454 | 87,454 | - | - | 85,948 | 85,948 | - | - | (770) | (770) | 2,276 | 2,276 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1210 | Great River Energy | u.s. | 208,663 | 208,663 | - | - | 205,069 | 205,069 | - | - | $(1,837)$ | $(1,837)$ | 5,431 | 5,431 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1222 | Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 60,836 | 60,836 | - | - | 59,788 | 59,788 | - | - | (536) | (536) | 1,583 | 1,583 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1230 | Nebraska Public Power District | u.s. | 217,318 | 217,318 | - | - | 213,576 | 213,576 | - | - | $(1,913)$ | $(1,913)$ | 5,656 | 5,656 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1232 | Omaha Public Power District | u.s. | 177,359 | 177,359 | - | - | 174,305 | 174,305 | - | - | $(1,562)$ | $(1,562)$ | 4,616 | 4,616 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1240 | Western Area Power Administration (UM) | u.s. | 147,141 | 147,141 | - | - | 144,607 | 144,607 | - | - | $(1,296)$ | $(1,296)$ | 3,830 | 3,830 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1239 | Western Area Power Administration (LM) | u.s. | 728 | 728 | - | - | 716 | 716 | - | - | (6) | (6) | 19 | 19 | - |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1217 | Manitoba Hydro | can | 382,641 |  | 382,641 | - | 372,769 |  | 372,769 | - | - | - | 9,872 | - | 9,872 | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1235 | SaskPower | can | 396,820 |  | 396,820 | - | 386,583 |  | 386,583 | - | - |  | 10,238 | - | 10,238 | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1195 | Alliant Energy (Alliant East - WPL \& Alliant West PL) | u.s. | 461,886 | 461,886 | , | - | 453,932 | 453,932 | , | - | $(4,067)$ | $(4,067)$ | 12,021 | 12,021 | , | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1710 | Dahlberg Electric Company | u.s. | 1,778 | 1,778 | - | - | 1,747 | 1,747 | - | - | (16) | (16) | 46 | 46 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1216 | Madison, Gas and Electric | u.s. | 53,714 | 53,714 | - | - | 52,789 | 52,789 | - | - | (473) | (473) | 1,398 | $\begin{array}{r}1,398 \\ \hline 1063\end{array}$ | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1220 | MidAmerican Energy Company | u.s. | 407,414 | 407,414 | - | - | 400,398 | 400,398 | - | - | (3,587) | $(3,587)$ | 10,603 | 10,603 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1221 | Minnesta Power | u.s. | 205,033 | 205,033 | - | - | 201,502 | 201,502 | - | - | $(1,805)$ | $(1,805)$ | 5,336 | 5,336 | - | - |
| 2017 2017 | MRO | 1226 1711 | Montana-Dakota Utilites Co. North Central Power Company | u.s.s. u.s. | 51,617 | 51,617 590 | - | $:$ | 50,728 580 | 50,728 580 | - | $:$ | ${ }^{(454)}$ | $(454)$ $(5)$ | $\begin{array}{r}1,343 \\ \hline 15\end{array}$ | 1,343 15 | $:$ | $:$ |
| 2017 | MRO MRO | 1711 1231 | North Central Power Company NorthWestern Energy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { u.s. } \\ & \text { u.s. } \end{aligned}$ | - $\begin{array}{r}590 \\ 24,722\end{array}$ | 590 24,722 | : | $:$ | 580 24,296 | 580 24,296 | - | - | (5) (218) | (218) | 15 643 | 15 643 | : | $:$ |
| 2017 | mRo | 1712 | NorthWestern Wisconsin | u.s. | 2,949 | 2,949 | - | - | 2,899 | 2,899 | - | - | (26) | (26) | 77 | 77 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1233 | Otter Tail Power Company | u.s. | 78,981 | 78,981 | - | - | 77,621 | 77,621 | - | - | (695) | (695) | 2,056 | 2,056 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1664 | Wisconsin Public Service (WPS) | u.s. | 185,615 | 185,615 | - | - | 182,418 | 182,418 | - | - | $(1,634)$ | $(1,634)$ | 4,831 | 4,831 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1665 | Upper Peninsula Power Company (UPPCO) | u.s. | 10,853 | 10,853 | - | - | 10,666 | 10,666 | - | - | (96) | (96) | 282 | 282 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1244 | Xcel Energy Company (NSP) | u.s. | 689,848 | 689,848 | - | - | 677,968 | 677,968 | - | - | $(6,074)$ | $(6,074)$ | 17,954 | 17,954 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1196 | Ames Municipal Electric System | u.s. | 12,002 | 12,002 | - | - | 11,796 | 11,796 | - | - | (106) | (106) | 312 | 312 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1604 | Atlantic Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 1,289 | 1,289 | - | - | 1,267 | 1,267 | - | - | (11) | (11) | 34 | 34 | - | - |


| DataYear | Regional Entity | 10 | Entity | Country | Total Nerc Assessments |  |  |  | Nerc nel assessments |  |  |  | Penalty Sanctions |  | NERC Compliance Credits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us] | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | mRo | 1713 | Bloomer Electric \& Water co. | u.s. | 877 | 877 | - | - | 862 | 862 | - | - | (8) | (8) | 23 | 23 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1714 | Village of Caddott | u.s. | 218 | 218 | - | - | 214 | 214 | - | - | (2) | (2) | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1200 | Cedar Falls Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 8,219 | 8,219 | - | - | 8,077 | 8,077 | - | - | (72) | (72) | 214 | 214 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1477 | Central Minnesota Municipal Power Agency (CMMPA) | u.s. | 6,194 | 6,194 | - | - | 6,087 | 6,087 | - | - | (55) | (55) | 161 | 161 | - |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1776 | Eldridge Electric and Water Utilities | u.s. | 673 | 673 | - | - | ${ }^{661}$ | 661 | - | - | ${ }^{(6)}$ | (6) | 18 | 18 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1203 | City of Escanaba | u.s. | 2,188 | 2,188 | - | - | 2,150 | 2,150 | - | - | (19) | (19) | 57 | 57 | - |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1205 | Falls City Water \& Light Department | u.s. | 934 | 934 | - | - | 918 | 918 | - | - | (8) | (8) | 24 | 24 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1206 | Fremont Department of Utilities | u.s. | 6,868 | 6,868 | - | - | 6,750 | 6,750 | - | - | (60) | (60) | 179 | 179 | - | - |
| 2017 | mro | 1208 | Geneseo Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 1,026 | ${ }^{1,026}$ | - | - | 1,008 | 1,008 | - | - | (9) | (9) | 27 | 27 |  | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1209 | Grand Island Utilities Department | u.s. | 12,056 | 12,056 | - | - | 11,849 | 11,849 | - | - | (106) | (106) | 314 | 314 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1717 | Great Lakes Utilities | u.s. | 23,437 | 23,437 | - | - | 23,034 | 23,034 | - | - | (206) | (206) | 610 | 610 | - |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1718 | City of Guttenberg | u.s. | 299 | 299 | - | - | 294 | 294 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 8 | 8 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1606 | Harlan Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 267 | 267 | - | - | 262 | 262 | - | - | (2) | (2) | 7 | 7 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1211 | Hastings Utilities | u.s. | 6,811 | 6,811 | - | - | 6,694 | 6,694 | - | - | (60) | (60) | 177 | 177 | - |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1212 | Heartland Consumers Power District | u.s. | 6,899 | 6,899 | - | - | 6,781 | 6,781 | - | - | (61) | (61) | 180 | 180 | - |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1213 | Hutchinson Utilities Commission | u.s. | 4,613 | 4,613 | - | - | 4,534 | 4,534 | - | - | (41) | (41) | 120 | 120 |  | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1719 | City of Kasota | u.s. | 52 | 52 | - | - | 51 | 51 | - | - | (0) | (0) | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1215 | Lincoln Electric System | u.s. | 50,871 | 50,871 | - | - | 49,995 | 49,995 | - | - | (448) | (448) | 1,324 | 1,324 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1223 | Missour River Energy Services | u.s. | 42,789 | 42,789 | - | - | 42,052 | 42,052 | - | - | (377) | (377) | 1,114 | 1,114 | - |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1224 | MN Municipal Power Agency (MMPA) | u.s. | 24,674 | 24,674 | - | - | 24,249 | 24,249 | - | - | (217) | (217) | 642 | 642 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1607 | Montezuma Municipal Ligh \& Power | u.s. | 401 | 401 | - | - | 394 | 394 | - | - | (4) | (4) | 10 | 10 | - |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1227 | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska | u.s. | 14,970 | 14,970 | - | - | 14,712 | 14,712 | - | - | ${ }^{(132)}$ | ${ }^{(132)}$ | 390 | 390 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRo | 1228 | Muscatine Power and Water | u.s. | 13,941 | 13,941 | - | - | 13,701 | 13,701 | - | - | (123) | (123) | 363 | 363 | - |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1229 | Nebraska City Utilities | u.s. | 2,050 | 2,050 | - | - | 2,014 | 2,014 | - | - | (18) | (18) | 53 | 53 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1720 | Resale Power Group of lowa | u.s. | 8,945 | 8,945 | - | - | 8,791 | 8,791 | - | - | (79) | (79) | 233 | 233 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1721 | Rice Lake Utilities | u.s. | 2,626 | 2,626 | - | - | 2,581 | 2,581 | - | - | (23) | (23) | 68 | 68 | - | - |
| 2017 | mRO | 1234 | Rochester Public Utilities | u.s. | 37 | 37 | - | - | 36 | 36 | - | - | (0) | (0) | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| 2017 | mro | 1236 | Southern Mineesota Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 44,167 | 44,167 | - | - | 43,406 | 43,406 | - | - | (389) | (389) | 1,149 | 1,149 | - |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1722 | City of Spooner | u.s. | ${ }_{503}^{5061}$ | 503 | - | - | 494 3893 | 494 3893 | - | - | ${ }^{(4)}$ | (4) | ${ }^{13}$ | ${ }^{13}$ | - |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1241 | Willmar Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 3,961 | 3,961 | - | - | 3,893 | 3,893 | - | - | (35) | (35) | 103 | 103 | - | - |
| 2017 | MRO | 1242 | Wisconsin Public Power, Inc. (East and West regions) | u.s. | 84,019 569 | 84,019 569 | - | - | 82,572 | 82,572 | - | - | (740) | $(740)$ $(5)$ | 2,187 | 2,187 15 | - |  |
| 2017 | MRO |  | Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative | u.s. | 569 | 569 | - | - | 559 | 559 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 15 | 15 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-Mro-SERC |  | Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation | u.s. | 60,201 | 60,201 580729 | - | - | 59,165 | $\begin{array}{r}59,165 \\ \hline 57,565\end{array}$ | - | - | ${ }^{(530)}$ | ${ }^{(530)}$ | 1,567 15297 | 1,567 | - |  |
| 2017 2017 | STP-MRO | 1246 1707 | American Electric Power AEP-VEMCO | u.s. u.s. | 587,768 10,258 1 | 587,768 <br> 10,258 | $:$ | $:$ | 577,646 10,082 2, | 577,646 10,082 | $:$ | $:$ | $(5,175)$ $(90)$ | $(5,175)$ $(90)$ | $\begin{array}{r}15,297 \\ \hline 267\end{array}$ | 15,297 267 | $:$ | : |
| 2017 | SpP-MRO | 1247 | Board of Public Utilities (Kansas City KS) | U.s. | 38,440 | 38,440 | - | - | 37,778 | 37,778 |  | - | (338) | (338) | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | - |
| 2017 | Sp-MRO | 1620 | Board of Public Utilities, City of McPherson, Kansas | u.s. | 16,817 | 16,817 | - | - | 16,527 | 16,527 | - | - | (148) | (148) | 438 | 438 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1647 | Carthage City Water \& Light | u.s. | 4,780 | 4,780 | - | - | 4,698 | 4,698 | - | - | (42) | (42) | 124 | 124 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1469 | Central Valley Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 12,996 | 12,996 | - | - | 12,772 | 12,772 1037 | - | - | (114) | ${ }^{(114)}$ | 338 | 338 |  |  |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1556 | City of Bentonville | u.s. | 11,027 | 11,027 | - | - | 10,837 | 10,837 | - | - | (97) | (97) | 287 | 287 | - | $\cdot$ |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1709 | city of Nixa | u.s. | 2,560 | 2,560 | - |  | 2,516 | 2,516 | - | - | (23) | ${ }^{(23)}$ | ${ }^{67}$ | ${ }^{67}$ | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1703 | City of Chanute | u.s. | 7,995 | 7,995 | - | - | 7,857 | 7,857 | - | - | (70) | (70) | 208 | 208 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1248 | Independence Power \& Light (Independence, MO) | u.s. | 16,528 | 16,528 | - |  | 16,243 | 16,243 | - | - | (146) | (146) | 430 | 430 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1436 | City Utilities of Springfield, MO | u.s. | 49,347 | 49,347 | - | - | 48,497 | 48,497 | - | - | (434) | (434) | 1,284 | 1,284 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1437 | East Texas Electric Coop, Inc. | u.s. | 6,836 | 6,836 | - | - | 6,719 | 6,719 | - | - | (60) | (60) | 178 | 178 | - |  |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1250 | The Empire District Electric Company | u.s. | 81,859 | 81,859 | - | - | 80,449 | 80,449 | - | - | (721) | (721) | 2,130 | 2,130 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1470 | Farmers' Electric Coop | u.s. | 4,571 | 4,571 | - | - | 4,492 | 4,492 | - | - | (40) | (40) | 119 | 119 | - |  |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1438 | Golden Spread Electric Coop | u.s. | 78,900 | 78,900 | - | - | 77,541 | 77,541 | - | - | (695) | (695) | 2,053 | 2,053 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1251 | Grand River Dam Authority | u.s. | 82,758 | 82,758 | - | - | 81,333 | 81,333 | - | - | (729) | (729) | 2,154 | 2,154 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1252 | Kansas City Power \& Light (KCPL) | u.s. | 245,684 | 245,684 | - | - | 241,453 | 241,453 | - | - | $(2,163)$ | $(2,163)$ | 6,394 | 6,394 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1439 | Kansas Electric Power Coop., Inc | u.s. | 33,482 | 33,482 | - | - | 32,905 | 32,905 | - | - | (295) | (295) | 871 | 871 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1440 | Kansas Municipal Energy Agency (KCPL) | u.s. | 25,031 | 25,031 | - | - | 24,600 | 24,600 | - | - | (220) | (220) | 651 | 651 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1637 | Kansas Power Pool | u.s. | 13,875 | 13,875 | - | - | 13,636 | 13,636 | - | - | (122) | (122) | 361 | 361 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1598 | KCP\&L GMOC (Greater Missouri Operations Company) | u.s. | 135,023 | 135,023 | - | - | 132,698 | 132,698 | - | - | $(1,189)$ | $(1,189)$ | 3,514 | 3,514 | - |  |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1472 | Lea County Electric Coop | u.s. | 19,255 | 19,255 | - | - | 18,924 | 18,924 | - | - | (170) | (170) | 501 | 501 | - | - |
| 2017 | SpP-MRO | 1441 | Midwest Energy Inc. | u.s. | 28,399 | 28,399 | - | - | 27,910 | 27,910 | - | - | (250) | (250) | 739 | 739 | - |  |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO-SERC |  | Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission | u.s. | 7,074 | 7,074 | - | - | 6,953 | 6,953 | - | - | (62) | (62) | 184 | 184 | - | - |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | 10 | Entity | Country | Total Nerc Assessments |  |  |  | Nerc nel Assessments |  |  |  | Penalty Sanctions |  | NERC Compliance Credits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1442 | Northeast Texas Electric Cooperativ, Inc. | u.s. | 49,675 | 49,675 | - | - | 48,820 | 48,820 | - | - | (437) | (437) | 1,293 | 1,293 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1255 | Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. | u.s. | 451,723 | 451,723 | - | - | 443,944 | 443,944 | - | - | $(3,977)$ | $(3,977)$ | 11,757 | 11,757 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1444 | Oklahoma Municipal Power Auth | u.s. | 45,190 | 45,190 | - | - | 44,412 | 44,412 | - | - | (398) | (398) | 1,176 | 1,176 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1651 | Paragould Light, Water \& Cable | u.s. | 9,296 | 9,296 | - | - | 9,136 | 9,136 | - | - | (82) | (82) | 242 | 242 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1725 | People's Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 7,856 | 7,856 | - | - | 7,721 | 7,721 | - | - | (69) | (69) | 204 | 204 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1473 | Roosevelt County Electric Coop | u.s. | 2,400 | 2,400 | - | - | 2,359 | 2,359 | - | - | (21) | (21) | 62 | 62 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1257 | Xcel Energy Company (Southwerstern Public Service) | u.s. | 341,136 | 341,136 | - | - | 335,261 | 335,261 | $\cdot$ | - | $(3,004)$ | $(3,004)$ | 8,878 | 8,878 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1256 | Sunflower Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 71,513 | 71,513 | - | - | 70,281 | 70,281 | - | - | (630) | (630) | 1,861 | 1,861 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1445 | Tex - La Electric Cooperative of Texas | u.s. | 7,756 | 7,756 | - | - | 7,622 | 7,622 | - | - | (68) | (68) | 202 | 202 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1475 | Tri County Electric Coop | u.s. | 5,565 | 5,565 | - | - | 5,469 | 5,469 | - | - | (49) | (49) | 145 | 145 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1260 | Westar Energ, Inc. | u.s. | 333,669 | 333,699 | - | - | 327,923 | 327,923 |  | - | $(2,938)$ | $(2,938)$ | 8,684 | 8,684 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1259 | Western Farmers Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 133,405 | 133,405 | - | - | 131,108 | 131,108 | - | - | $(1,175)$ | (1,175) | 3,472 | 3,472 | - | - |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1501 | West Texas Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 44,177 | 44,177 |  |  | 43,417 | 43,417 |  |  | (389) | (389) | 1,150 | 1,150 |  |  |
|  |  |  | total mro |  | 7,712,036 | 6,932,574 | 779,462 | - | 7,572,537 | 6,813,185 | 759,352 | - | $(61,039)$ | $(61,039)$ | 200,538 | 180,429 | 20,109 | - |
| 2017 | npCC | 1336 | New England | u.s. | 1,924,320 | 1,924,320 | - | - | 1,891,181 | 1,891,181 | - | - | $(16,943)$ | $(16,943)$ | 50,083 | 50,083 | - | - |
| 2017 | nPCC | 1339 | New York | u.s. | 2,482,313 | 2,482,313 | - | - | 2,439,564 | 2,439,564 | - | - | $(21,856)$ | $(21,856)$ | 64,605 | 64,605 | - | - |
| 2017 | necc | 1337 | Ontario | Canada | 1,418,177 | 2,482,31 | 1,418,177 | - | 2,060,782 | 2,33,564 | 2,060,782 | - | , | (21,86) | $(642,605)$ | 6, 60 | $(642,605)$ | - |
| 2017 | npCC |  | Quebec | Canada | 2,004,960 | - | 2,004,960 | - | 2,663,176 | - | 2,663,176 | - | - | - | $(658,216)$ | - | $(658,216)$ | - |
| 2017 | nPCC | 1705 | New Brunswick | Canada | 148,152 | - | 148,152 | - | 215,235 | - | 215,235 | - | - | - | $(67,083)$ | - | $(67,083)$ | - |
| 2017 | nPCC | 1340 | Nova Scotia | Canada | 174,829 | - | 174,829 |  | 170,319 | - | 170,319 | - | - |  | 4,510 | - | 4,510 |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL NPCC |  | 8,152,751 | 4,406,633 | 3,746,117 | - | 9,440,255 | 4,330,745 | 5,109,511 | - | $(38,799)$ | $(38,799)$ | $(1,248,705)$ | 114,688 | (1,363,394) | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1102 | Cannelton Utilities | u.s. | 225 | 225 | - | - | 221 | 221 | - | - | (2) | (2) | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1106 | City of Croswell | u.s. | 623 | 623 | - | - | 613 | 613 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 16 | 16 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1490 | City of Lansing | u.s. | 34,583 | 34,583 | - | - | 33,987 | 33,987 | - | - | ${ }^{(304)}$ | ${ }^{(304)}$ | 900 | 900 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1120 | Cloverland Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 11,821 | ${ }^{11,821}$ | - | - | 11,618 | 11,618 | - | - | (104) | (104) | 308 | 308 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1122 | CMS ERM Michigan LLC | u.s. | 2,795 | 2,795 | - | - | 2,747 | 2,747 | - | - | (25) | (25) | 73 | 73 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1124 | Constelation New Energy (MECSC-CONS) | u.s. | 19,096 | 19,096 | - | - | 18,767 | 18,767 | - | - | (168) | ${ }^{(168)}$ | 497 | 497 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1123 | Constellation New Energy (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 21,426 | 21,426 | - | - | 21,057 | 21,057 | - | - | (189) | (189) | ${ }_{5}^{558}$ | ${ }_{5}^{558}$ | - | - |
| 2017 2017 | RF RF | 1126 1128 | Consumers Energy Company Detroit dison company | u.s. u.s. coser | 527,887 707805 | 527,807 707805 | - | $:$ | 518,777 695,616 | 518,717 695,616 | $:$ | - | $\underset{(4,647)}{(6,23)}$ | $(4,647)$ $(6,232)$ | 13,737 18,422 | 13,737 18.422 | - | $:$ |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {RF }}$ | 1166 | Duke Energy Indiana | U.s. | 467,545 | 467,545 | - | - | 459,493 | 4959,493 | - | - | $(4,117)$ | $(4,117)$ | 18,422 12,168 | 18,422 12,168 | - |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1135 | Ferdinand Municipal Light \& Water | u.s. | 787 | 787 | - | - | 774 | 774 | - | - | (7) | (7) | 20 | 20 |  | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1646 | Firstenergy Solutions (MECS-CoNS) | u.s. | 13,606 | 13,606 | - | - | 13,372 | 13,372 | - | - | (120) | (120) | 354 | 354 | - | . |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1549 | Firstenergy Solutions (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 16,407 | 16,407 | - | - | 16,124 | 16,124 | - | - | (144) | (144) | 427 | ${ }_{3}^{427}$ | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1145 | Hoosier Energy | u.s. | 118,994 | 118,694 | - |  | 116,649 | 116,649 | - | - | $(1,045)$ | $(1,045)$ | 3,089 | 3,089 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1148 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (DUKE CII) | u.s. | 48,327 | 48,327 | - | - | 47,494 | 47,494 | - | - | ${ }^{(426)}$ | ${ }^{(426)}$ | 1,258 | 1,258 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ | 1485 | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (NIPSCO) | u.s. us. | ${ }_{6,718}^{6,353}$ | ${ }_{6}^{6,718}$ | $:$ | $:$ | 6,602 | 6,602 | $:$ | $:$ | (59) (82) | (59) | 175 243 | 175 243 | $:$ | $:$ |
| 2017 2017 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{RF} \\ & \mathrm{RF} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1486 \\ & 1149 \end{aligned}$ | Indiana Municipal Power Agency (SIGE) Indianapolis Power \& Light Co. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { u.s. } \\ & \text { u.s. } \end{aligned}$ | 9,353 219,045 | 9,353 219,045 | - | $:$ | 9,192 215,273 | 9,192 215,273 | $:$ | $:$ | $(82)$ $(1,929)$ | $(82)$ $(1,929)$ | 243 5,701 | 243 5,701 | $:$ | - |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {RF }}$ | 1553 | Integry Energy Services (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 6,946 | - ${ }_{6}$ 9,946 | - | - | 6, ${ }_{6}^{2527}$ | 6,827 | - | - | (61) | ${ }_{(61)}$ | ${ }_{181}$ | 181 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1554 | Integry Energy Services (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 9,941 | 9,941 | - | - | 9,770 | 9,770 | - | - | (88) | (88) | 259 | 259 |  | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1666 | Integry Energy Services | u.s. | 4,693 | 4,693 |  | - | 4,612 | 4,612 | - | - | (41) | (41) | 122 | 122 | - |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1614 | Just Energy (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 135 | 135 | - | - | 133 | 133 | - | - | (1) | (1) | 4 | 4 | - | - |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1154 | Michigan Public Power Agency | u.s. | 60,025 | 60,025 | - |  | 58,992 | 58,992 | - | - | (529) | (529) | 1,562 | 1,562 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF RF | 1155 | Michigan South Central Power Agency | u.s. | 11,207 | 11,207 | - | $:$ | 11,014 | 11,014 | $:$ | $:$ | (99) | (99) | ${ }^{292}$ | 292 | $:$ | $:$ |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1158 | MidAmerican Energy Company Retail | u.s. | 269 | 269 | - | - | 265 | 265 | - | - | ${ }^{(2)}$ | (2) | 7 | 7 7 | - | $:$ |
| 2017 2017 | $\stackrel{\text { RF }}{\text { RF }}$ | 1163 1164 | Northern Indiana Public Service Co. Ontonagon County Rural lectrification Assoc. | u.s. u.s. | 278,040 441 | 278,040 441 | \% | - | 27,252 434 | 27,252 434 | - | $:$ | $(2,448)$ $(4)$ | $(2,448)$ $(4)$ | 7,236 11 | 7,236 11 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1265 | PJM Interconnnection, LLC | u.s. | 10,544,842 | 10,544,842 | - | - | 10,363,243 | 10,363,243 | - | - | (92,844) | $(92,844)$ | 274,443 | 274,443 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1172 | Calpine Energy Solutions (k.n.a.Noble Americas Energy Solutions (MECS-CONS)) | u.s. | 6,082 | 6,082 | - | - | 5,977 | 5,977 | - | - | (54) | (54) | 158 | 158 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1171 | Calpine Energy Solutions (k.n.a.Noble Americas Energy Solutions (MECS-DETT) | u.s. | 9,567 | 9,567 | - | - | 9,402 | 9,402 | - | - | (84) | (84) | 249 | 249 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1176 | Direct Energy (fk:Strategic Energy,LLC) (MECS-CONS) | u.s. | 3,040 | 3,040 | - | - | 2,988 | 2,988 | - | - | (27) | (27) | 79 | 79 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1174 | Direct Energy (fka:Strategic Energy,LLC) (MECS-DET) | u.s. | 14,420 | 14,420 | - | - | 14,171 | 14,171 | - | - | (127) | (127) | 375 | 375 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1581 | Spartan Renewable Energy | u.s. | 1,450 | 1,450 | - | - | 1,425 | 1,425 | - | - | (13) | (13) | 38 | 38 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF |  | Spartan Renewable Energy (MI UP) | u.s. | 877 | 877 | - | - | 862 | 862 | - | - | (8) | (8) | 23 | 23 | - | - |


|  |  |  |  |  | Total Nerc Assessments |  |  |  | Nerc nel Assessments |  |  |  | Penalty Sanctions |  | NERC Compliance Credits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ | 1180 | Thumb Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 2,859 | 2,859 | - | - | 2,810 | 2,810 | - | - | (25) | (25) | 74 | 74 | - | - |
| 2017 | RF | 1662 | Ohio Valley Electric Corporation | u.s. | 6,432 | 6,432 | - | - | 6,321 | 6,321 | - | - | (57) | (57) | 167 | 167 | - |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1181 | Vectren Energy Delivery of IN | u.s. | 80,656 | 80,656 | - | - | 79,267 | 79,267 | - | . | (710) | (710) | 2,099 | 2,099 | - |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1184 | Wabash Valley Power Association Inc. (DUKE CII) | u.s. | 44,695 | 44,695 | - | . | 43,925 | 43,925 | . |  | (394) | (394) | 1,163 | 1,163 |  |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1488 | Wabash Valley Power Association Inc.(NIPSCO) | u.s. | 26,925 | 26,925 | - | - | 26,461 | 26,461 | - | - | (237) | (237) | 701 | 701 |  |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1185 | Wisconsin Electric Power Co. | u.s. | 435,808 | 435,808 | - | - | 428,303 | 428,303 | - | - | $(3,837)$ | $(3,837)$ | 11,342 | 11,342 | - |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1189 | Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative | u.s. | 12,030 | 12,030 | - | - | 11,823 | 11,823 | - | - | (106) | (106) | 313 | 313 | - |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1191 | Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative | u.s. | 42,412 | 42,412 | - | - | 41,682 | 41,682 | - | - | (373) | (373) | 1,104 | 1,104 | - |  |
| 2017 | RF | 1190 | Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative(MECS-DET) | u.s. | 8,866 | 8,866 | . | . | 8,714 | 8,714 | . |  | (78) | (78) | 231 | 231 |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL RELABBLITYFRRST |  | 13,839,321 | 13,839,321 | - | - | 13,600,987 | 13,600,987 | - | - | (121,851) | (121,851) | 360,186 | 360,186 | - | - |
| 2017 | Strc | 1267 | Alabama Municipal Electric Authority | u.s. | 53,313 | 53,313 | - | - | 52,395 | 52,395 | - | - | (469) | (469) | 1,388 | 1,388 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1268 | Alabama Power Company | u.s. | 891,037 | 891,037 | - | - | 875,692 | 875,692 | - | - | $(7,845)$ | $(7,845)$ | 23,190 | 23,190 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1269 | Ameren - Illinois | u.s. | 652,478 | 652,478 | - | - | 641,242 | 641,242 | - | - | $(5,745)$ | (5,745) | 16,982 | 16,982 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1271 | Ameren - Missouri | u.s. | 574,343 | 574,343 | - | - | 564,452 | 564,452 | - | - | $(5,057)$ | $(5,057)$ | 14,948 | 14,948 | - |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1273 | Associated Electric Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 299,884 | 299,884 | - | - | 294,720 | 294,720 | - | - | $(2,640)$ | (2,640) | 7,805 | 7,805 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1582 | Beauregard Electric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 17,583 | 17,583 | - | - | 17,280 | 17,280 | - | - | (155) | (155) | 458 | 458 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1462 | Benton Utility District | u.s. | 3,970 5 | 1,970 58310 | - | - | 13,902 57 | 3,902 | - | - | (35) (513) | ${ }^{(35)}$ | 103 1.518 | 103 1.518 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1274 | Big Rivers Electric Corporation | u.s. | 58,310 | 58,310 | - | - | 57,306 | 57,306 | - | - | (513) | (513) | 1,518 | 1,518 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1275 | Black Warrior EMC | u.s. | 6,342 | 6,342 | - | - | 6,233 | 6,233 | - | - | (56) | (56) | 165 | 165 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1276 | Blue Ridge EmC | u.s. | 21,476 | 21,476 | - | - | 21,106 | 21,106 | - | - | ${ }^{(189)}$ | ${ }^{(189)}$ | 559 | 559 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1628 | Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 7,423 | 7,423 | - |  | 7,295 | 7,295 | - | - | ${ }^{(65)}$ | ${ }^{(65)}$ | 193 | 193 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1463 | Canton, Ms | u.s. | 2,036 | 2,036 | - | - | 2,001 | 2,001 | - | - | (18) | (18) | 53 | 53 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1277 | Central Electric Power Cooperative Inc. | u.s. | 265,510 | 265,510 | - | - | 260,937 | 260,937 | - | - | $(2,388)$ | $(2,338)$ | 6,910 | 6,910 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1667 | Century Aluminum - Hawesville | u.s. | 26,834 | 26,834 | - | - | 26,372 | 26,372 | - | - | ${ }^{(236)}$ | ${ }^{(236)}$ | 698 | 698 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1668 | Century Aluminum - Sebree | u.s. | 53,374 | 53,374 | - | - | 52,455 | 52,455 | - | - | ${ }^{(470)}$ | ${ }^{(470)}$ | 1,389 | 1,389 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1278 | City of Blountstown FL | u.s. | 575 | 575 | - | - | 565 | 565 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 15 | 15 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1279 | city of Camden Sc | u.s. | 2,974 | 2,974 | - | - | 2,923 | 2,923 | - | - | ${ }^{(26)}$ | ${ }^{(26)}$ | 77 | 77 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC SERC | 1280 1281 | City of Collins MS City of Columbia MO | u.s.s. u.s. | 713 18,581 | 713 18.581 | : | $:$ | 701 18,261 | 701 18,261 | $:$ | $:$ | (6) (164) | (6) (164) | 19 484 | 19 484 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1282 | City of Conway AR (Conway Corporation) | U.s. | ${ }_{1}^{18,738}$ | ${ }_{15,738}^{18,581}$ | - | - | 18,467 | 18,267 | - | - | ${ }_{\text {(139) }}$ | ${ }_{(139)}^{(164)}$ | ${ }_{410}$ | 481 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1284 | City of Evergreen AL | u.s. | 865 | 865 | - | - | 850 | 850 | - | - | (8) | (8) | 23 | 23 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1285 | City of Hampton GA | u.s. | 488 | 488 | - | - | 479 | 479 | - | - | (4) | (4) | 13 | 13 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1286 | City of Hartford AL | u.s. | 493 | 493 | - | - | 485 | 485 | - | - | ${ }^{(4)}$ | ${ }^{(4)}$ | 13 | 13 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1287 | City of Henderson (KY) Municipal Power \& Light | u.s. | 9,728 | 9,728 | - | - | 9,560 | 9,560 | - | - | (86) | (86) | 253 | 253 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1288 | City of North Little Rock AR (DENL) | u.s. | 14,642 | 14,642 | - | - | 14,390 | 14,390 | - | - | ${ }^{(129)}$ | ${ }^{(129)}$ | 381 | 381 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC SERC | 1289 | City of Orangeburg SC Department of Public Utilities | u.s. | 12,906 1286 | 12,906 1,286 | : | - | 12,684 1,264 | 12,684 1,264 | $:$ | $:$ | (114) | (114) | 336 33 | 336 33 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC SERC | 1290 1291 | City of Robertsdale AL City of Ruston LA (DERS) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { u.s. } \\ & \text { u.s. } \end{aligned}$ | 1,286 4,332 | 1,286 4,332 | : | $:$ | 1,264 4,258 | 1,264 4,258 | $:$ | $:$ | ${ }_{(11)}^{(13)}$ | ${ }_{(38)}^{(11)}$ | 33 113 | 33 113 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1292 | Seneca Light \& Power | u.s. | 2,603 | 2,603 | - | - | 2,558 | 2,558 | - | - | (23) | (23) | 68 | 68 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1115 | City of Springfield (CWLP) | u.s. | 27,116 | 27,116 | - | - | 26,649 | 26,649 | - | - | (239) | (239) | 706 | 706 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1465 | City of Thayer, MO | u.s. | 316 | 316 | - | - | 311 | 311 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC SERC | 1293 | City of Troy AL | u.s. | ${ }_{6}^{6,599}$ | 6,599 6,044 | - | - | 6,485 5 5 | 6,485 5940 | - | - | ${ }^{(58)}$ | ${ }^{(58)}$ | 172 | 172 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC SERC | 1294 | City of West Memphis AR (West Memphis Utilities) Claiborne Electric Cooperative, Inc. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { u.s. } \\ & \hline \text { us. } \end{aligned}$ | 6,044 10,169 | 6,044 10,169 | $:$ | $:$ | 5,940 9,993 | 5,940 9,993 | $:$ | $:$ | (53) (90) | (53) (90) | 157 265 | 157 265 |  |  |
| 2017 | sterc | 1584 | Concordia Electric Cooperative, Inc. | U.s. | +10,169 | 10,169 | $:$ | : | 3,927 | 3,993 3,25 | : | : | (29) (29) | (29) | 265 87 | 265 87 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1726 | Cube Hydro Carolinas | u.s. | 230 | 230 | - | - | 226 | 226 | - | - | (2) | (2) | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1283 | Dalton Utilities | u.s. | 28,676 | 28,676 | - | - | 28,182 | 28,182 | - | - | ${ }^{(252)}$ | ${ }^{(252)}$ | 746 | 746 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1585 | Dixie Electric Membership Corporation | u.s. | 34,121 | 34,121 | - | - | 33,533 | 33,533 | - | - | (300) | (300) | 888 | 888 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1295 | Dominion Virginia Power | u.s. | 1,349,522 | 1,349,522 | - | - | 1,326,282 | 1,326,282 | - | - | (11,882) | (11,882) | 35,123 | 35,123 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1296 | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | u.s. | 1,334,461 | 1,334,461 | - | - | 1,311,479 | 1,311,479 | - | - | (11,750) | (11,750) | 34,731 | 34,731 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC SERC | 1466 1478 | Durant, MS $L G 8 E$ and K Services Co as agent for LG8E Co and KU Co | $\begin{aligned} & \text { u.s. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 398 533,567 | 398 533,567 | : | $:$ | 391 524,378 | 391 524,378 | $:$ | $:$ | (4) $(4.698)$ | (4) (4,69) | 10 13887 | 10 13887 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1297 | East Kentucky Power Cooperative | u.s. | 208,552 | 200,852 | . | - | 205,255 | 205,255 | . | - | $(4,839)$ | $(1,899)$ | - | $\stackrel{\substack{13,886 \\ 5,436}}{ }$ |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1298 | East Mississippi Electric Power Association | u.s. | 6,516 | 6,516 | - | - | 6,404 | 6,404 | - | - | (57) | (57) | 170 | 170 |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1669 | Electricities of North Carolina Inc | u.s. | 184,032 | 184,032 | - | - | 180,863 | 180,863 | - | - | $(1,620)$ | $(1,620)$ | 4,790 | 4,790 |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1300 | EnergYUnited EMC | u.s. | 39,958 | 39,958 |  |  | 39,270 | 39,270 |  |  | (352) | (352) | 1,040 | 1,040 |  |  |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Data \\
Year
\end{tabular}} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Regional Entity} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{10} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Entity} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Country} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Total Nerc Assessments} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Nerc nel Assesments} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Penalty Sanctions} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{NERC Compliance Credits} \\
\hline \& \& \& \& \& Total \& us \& Canada \& Mexico \& Total \& us \& Canada \& Mexico \& Total \& us \& Total \& us \& Canada \& Mexico \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1301 \& Entergy \& u.s. \& 1,879,652 \& 1,879,652 \& - \& - \& 1,847,282 \& 1,847,282 \& - \& - \& \((16,550)\) \& (16,550) \& 48,920 \& 48,920 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1302 \& Fayetteville (NC) Public Works Commission \& u.s. \& 33,081 \& 33,081 \& - \& - \& 32,511 \& 32,511 \& - \& - \& (291) \& (291) \& 861 \& 861 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1303 \& Florida Public Cutilities (FL Panhandle Load) \& u.s. \& 4,859 \& 4,859 \& - \& - \& 4,775 \& 4,775 \& - \& - \& (43) \& (43) \& 126 \& 126 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1304 \& French Broad EMC \& u.s. \& 7,979 \& 7,979 \& - \& - \& 7,842 \& 7,842 \& - \& - \& (70) \& (70) \& 208 \& 208 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1305 \& Georgia Power Company \& u.s. \& 1,347,671 \& 1,347,671 \& - \& - \& 1,324,462 \& 1,324,462 \& - \& - \& \((11,866)\) \& \((11,866)\) \& 35,075 \& 35,075 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1306 \& Georgia System Optns Corporation \& u.s. \& 617,667 \& 617,667 \& - \& - \& 607,030 \& 607,030 \& - \& - \& (5,438) \& \((5,438)\) \& 16,076 \& 16,076 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1479 \& Greenwood (MS) Utilities Commission \& u.s. \& 4,435 \& 4,435 \& - \& - \& 4,359 \& 4,359 \& - \& - \& (39) \& (39) \& 115 \& 115 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1307 \& Greenwood (SC) Commissioners of Public Works \& u.s. \& 5,023 \& 5,023 \& - \& - \& 4,937 \& 4,937 \& - \& - \& (44) \& (44) \& 131 \& 131 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1308 \& Gulf Power Company \& u.s. \& 180,901 \& 180,901 \& - \& - \& 177,785 \& 177,785 \& - \& - \& \((1,593)\) \& \((1,593)\) \& 4,708 \& 4,708 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1586 \& Haywood EMC \& u.s. \& 4,868 \& 4,868 \& - \& - \& 4,784 \& 4,784 \& - \& - \& (43) \& (43) \& 127 \& 127 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& \& Hoosier Energy REC, Inc \& u.s. \& 6,368 \& 6,368 \& - \& - \& 6,259 \& 6,259 \& - \& - \& (56) \& (56) \& 166 \& 166 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1309 \& llinois Municipal Electric Agency \& u.s. \& 30,086 \& 30,086 \& - \& - \& 29,567 \& 29,567 \& - \& - \& (265) \& (265) \& 783 \& 783 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1480 \& Itta Bena, Ms \& u.s. \& \({ }^{219}\) \& 219 \& - \& - \& 215 \& 215 \& - \& - \& (2) \& (2) \& 6 \& \({ }^{6}\) \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1587 \& Jefferson Davis Electric Cooperative, Inc. \& u.s. \& 4,162 \& 4,162 \& - \& - \& 4,090 \& 4,090 \& - \& - \& (37) \& (37) \& 108 \& 108 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1617 \& Kentucky Municipal Power \& u.s. \& 10,369 \& 10,369 \& - \& - \& 10,191 \& 10,191 \& - \& - \& (91) \& (91) \& 270 \& 270 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1481 \& Kosciusko, Ms \& u.s. \& 1,161 \& 1,161 \& \& - \& 1,141 \& 1,441 \& - \& - \& (10) \& (10) \& 30 \& 30 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC
SERC \& 1482 \& Leland, Ms \& u.s. \& 474
259 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
474 \\
\hline 29
\end{tabular} \& - \& - \& 466
255 \& 466
255 \& \(\div\) \& - \& \({ }^{(4)}\) \& \({ }^{(4)}\) \& \[
\begin{gathered}
12 \\
7
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
12 \\
7
\end{gathered}
\] \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC
SERC \& 1313 \& McCormick Commission of Public Works \& u.s. \& 259
160811 \& 259
160811 \& - \& - \& 255
158.042 \& 255
158,042 \& - \& - \& \({ }_{(12)}^{(216)}\) \& \({ }^{(2)}\) \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
7 \\
4,185
\end{array}
\] \&  \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC
SERC \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 1314 \\
\& 1630
\end{aligned}
\] \& Mississippi Power Company \& u.s.s.
u.s. \& 160,811 \& 160,811 \& - \& - \& 158,042 \& 158,042 \& - \& - \& (1,416) \& \((1,416)\) \& 4,185 \& 4,185 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC
SERC \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 1630 \\
\& 1315
\end{aligned}
\] \& Mt. Carmel Public Utitity
Municipa Electric Authority of Georgia \& u.s.s.
u.s. \& 1,639
171,589 \& 1,639
171,589 \& : \& - \& 1,611
168,634 \& \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,611 \\
168632
\end{array}
\] \& - \& \(:\) \& \((14)\)
\((1,511)\)
\((1,75)\) \& \({ }^{(14)}\) \& \begin{tabular}{|c}
43 \\
4466
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{|c}
43 \\
4.466
\end{tabular} \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1315 \& Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia \& u.s. \& 171,589 \& 171,589 \& - \& - \& 168,634 \& 168,634 \& - \& - \& \((1,511)\) \& \((1,511)\) \& 4,466 \& 4,466 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1316 \& N.C. Electric Membership Corp. \& u.s. \& 201,642 \& 201,642 \& - \& - \& 198,170 \& 198,170 \& - \& - \& \((1,775)\) \& (1,775) \& 5,248 \& 5,248 \& \& \\
\hline 2017
2017 \& SERC
SERC \& 1588
1574 \& Northeast Louisiana Power Cooperative, Inc. Northern Virginia Electric Cooperative \& u.s.
u.s. \& 4,167
74,719 \& 4,167
74,719 \& . \& \(:\) \& 4,095
73,433 \& 4,095
73,433 \& - \& - \& \((37)\)
\((658)\) \& (657) \& 108
1,945 \& 108
1,945
1, \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1319 \& Old Dominion Electric Cooperative \& u.s. \& 78,979 \& 78,979 \& - \& - \& 77,619 \& 77,619 \& . \& - \& (695) \& (695) \& 2,056 \& 2,056 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1618 \& Osceola (Arkansas) Municipal Light and Power \& u.s. \& 2,473 \& 2,473 \& - \& \& 2,431 \& 2,431 \& - \& - \& (22) \& (22) \& 64 \& 64 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1320 \& Owensboro (KY) Municical Utilities \& u.s. \& 12,900 \& 12,900 \& - \& \& 12,678 \& 12,678 \& - \& - \& (114) \& (114) \& 336 \& 336 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1321 \& Piedmont EMC in Duke and Progress Areas \& u.s. \& 8,003 \& 8,003 \& - \& - \& 7,865 \& 7,865 \& - \& - \& (70) \& (70) \& 208 \& 208 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1323 \& Piedmont Municipal Power Agency (PMPA) \& u.s. \& 37,128 \& 37,128 \& - \& - \& 36,489 \& 36,489 \& - \& - \& (327) \& (327) \& 966 \& 966 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1589 \& Pointe Coupee Electric Memb. Corp. \& u.s. \& 4,125 \& 4,125 \& - \& - \& 4,054 \& 4,054 \& - \& - \& \({ }^{(36)}\) \& \({ }^{(136)}\) \& 107 \& 107 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1266 \& Powersouth Energy \& u.s. \& 137,103 \& 137,103 \& - \& \& 134,742 \& 134,742 \& - \& - \& \((1,207)\) \& \((1,207)\) \& 3,568 \& 3,568 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1330 \& Prairie Power, Inc. \& u.s. \& 24,368 \& 24,368 \& - \& - \& 23,948 \& 23,948 \& - \& - \& (215) \& (215) \& 634 \& 634 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1706 \& Duke Energy Progress \& u.s. \& 728,721 \& 728,721 \& - \& - \& 716,171 \& 716,171 \& - \& - \& \((6,416)\) \& \((6,416)\) \& 18,966 \& 18,966 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1325 \& Rutherford EMC \& u.s. \& 20,747 \& 20,747 \& - \& - \& 20,389 \& 20,389 \& - \& - \& (183) \& (183) \& 540 \& 540 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1631 \& Sam Rayburn G8T Electric Cooperative Inc. \& u.s. \& 28,313
36939 \& \(\begin{array}{r}28,313 \\ \hline 66939\end{array}\) \& - \& - \& \(\begin{array}{r}27,825 \\ \hline 65019\end{array}\) \& \(\begin{array}{r}27,825 \\ \hline 65019\end{array}\) \& - \& - \& \({ }^{(229)}\) \& \({ }^{(229)}\) \& 737
9 \& 737
0.550 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1326 \& South Carolina Electric \& Gas Company \& u.s. \& 366,939 \& 366,939 \& - \& - \& 360,619 \& 360,619 \& - \& - \& \((3,231)\) \& \((3,231)\) \& 9,550 \& 9,550 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1327 \& South Carolina Public Service Authority \& u.s. \& 136,340 \& 136,340 \& - \& - \& 133,992 \& 133,992 \& - \& - \& \((1,200)\) \& \((1,200)\) \& 3,548 \& \[
3,548
\] \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1590 \& South Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association \& u.s. \& 9,161 \& 9,161 \& - \& - \& 9,003 \& 9,003 \& - \& - \& (81) \& (81) \& 238 \& 238 \& \& \\
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1328 \& Cooperative Energy (formerly SMEPA) \& u.s. \& 152,651 \& 152,651 \& - \& - \& 150,022

24501 \& 150,022
24501 \& - \& - \& $\underset{(1,344)}{(220)}$ \& $(1,344)$
$(220)$ \& 3,973
649 \& 3,973 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1329 \& Southern Illinois Power Cooperative \& u.s. \& 24,930 \& 24,930 \& - \& - \& 24,501 \& 24,501 \& - \& - \& (220) \& (220) \& ${ }^{649}$ \& 649 \& \& <br>

\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1591 \& Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation \& u.s. \& 38,892 \& 38,892 \& - \& - \& 38,222 \& 38,222 \& - \& - \& ${ }^{(342)}$ \& ${ }^{(342)}$ \& 1,012 \& $$
1,012
$$ \& \& <br>

\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1619 \& Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc. \& u.s. \& 6,664 \& 6,664 \& - \& - \& 6,549 \& 6,549 \& - \& - \& (59) \& (59) \& 173 \& 173 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1331 \& Tennessee Valley Authority \& u.s. \& 2,463,921 \& 2,463,921 \& - \& - \& 2,421,488 \& 2,421,488 \& - \& - \& $(21,694)$ \& (21,694) \& 64,127 \& ${ }^{64,127}$ \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1632 \& Tex-La Electric Cooperative of Texas, Inc \& u.s. \& 3,309 \& 3,309 \& - \& - \& 3,252 \& 3,252 \& - \& - \& (29) \& (29) \& 86 \& 86 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1332 \& Tombigbee Electric Cooperative Inc. \& u.s. \& 1,923 \& 1,923 \& \& - \& 1,890 \& 1,890 \& \& - \& (17) \& (17) \& 50 \& 50 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1594 \& Town of Sharpsburg, N. .C. \& u.s. \& 309 \& 309 \& - \& - \& 304 \& 304 \& - \& - \& (3) \& (3) \& 8 \& 8 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1595 \& Town of Stantonsburg, N.C. JRo \& u.s. \& 882 \& 882 \& - \& - \& 867 \& 867 \& - \& - \& (8) \& (8) \& 23 \& 23 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1333 \& Town of Waynesille NC \& u.s. \& 1,466 \& 1,466 \& - \& - \& 1,441 \& 1,441 \& - \& - \& (13) \& (13) \& 38 \& 38 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1334 \& Town of Winssboro SC \& u.s. \& 984 \& 984 \& - \& - \& 967 \& 967 \& - \& - \& (9) \& (9) \& 26 \& 26 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1335 \& Town of Winterville NC \& u.s. \& 857 \& 857 \& - \& - \& 843 \& 843 \& - \& - \& (8) \& (8) \& 22 \& 22 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1597 \& Washington-St.Tammany Electric Cooperative, Inc. \& u.s. \& 16,339 \& 16,339 \& - \& - \& 16,058 \& 16,058 \& - \& - \& (144) \& (144) \& 425 \& 425 \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1435 \& Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation \& u.s. \& 162,728 \& 162,728 \& - \& - \& 159,926 \& 159,926 \& - \& - \& $(1,433)$ \& $(1,433)$ \& 4,235 \& 4,235 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1557 \& City of Clarksdale, Mississipi \& u.s. \& 2,483 \& 2,883 \& - \& - \& 2,440 \& 2,440 \& - \& - \& ${ }^{(22)}$ \& (22) \& 65 \& 65 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1708 \& City of Abbeville \& u.s. \& 2,183 \& 2,183 \& - \& - \& 2,146 \& 2,146 \& - \& - \& (19) \& (19) \& 57 \& 57 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1558 \& Hope Water \& Light (HWL) \& u.s. \& 4,674 \& 4,674 \& - \& - \& 4,593 \& 4,593 \& - \& - \& (41) \& (41) \& 122 \& 122 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1559 \& City of Minden \& u.s. \& 2,194 \& 2,194 \& - \& - \& 2,156 \& 2,156 \& - \& - \& (19) \& (19) \& 57 \& 57 \& - \& - <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1249 \& Cleco Power LLC \& u.s. \& 177,883 \& 177,883 \& - \& - \& 174,819 \& 174,819 \& - \& - \& $(1,566)$ \& $(1,566)$ \& 4,630 \& 4,630 \& - \& - <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | 10 | Entity | Country | Total Nerc Assessments |  |  |  | Nerc nel Assessments |  |  |  | Penalty Sanctions |  | NeRC Compliance Credits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | serc | 1648 | Jonesboro City Water \& Light | u.s. | 22,055 | 22,055 | - | - | 21,675 | 21,675 | - | - | (194) | (194) | 574 | 574 | - | - |
| 2017 | Serc | 1649 | Kennett Board of Public Works | u.s. | 2,169 | 2,169 | - | - | 2,131 | 2,131 | - | - | (19) | (19) | 56 | 56 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1471 | Lafayette Utilities System | u.s. | 32,621 | 32,621 | - | - | 32,059 | 32,059 | - | - | (287) | (287) | 849 | 849 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1253 | Louisiana Energy \& Power Authority (LEPA) | u.s. | 15,193 | 15,193 | - | - | 14,932 | 14,932 | - | - | (134) | (134) | 395 | 395 | - |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1650 | Malden Board of Public Works | u.s. | 790 | 790 | - | - | 776 | 776 | - | - | (7) | (7) | 21 | 21 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1443 | Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission | u.s. | 32,894 | 32,894 | - | - | 32,328 | 32,328 | - | - | (290) | (290) | 856 | 856 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1639 | OzMo Ozark Missouri, West Plains MO | u.s. | 2,995 | 2,995 | - | - | 2,944 | 2,944 | - | - | (26) | (26) | 78 | 78 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1652 | Piggott Municipal Light, Water \& Sewer | u.s. | 580 | 580 | - | - | 570 | 570 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 15 | 15 | - | - |
| 2017 | serc | 1653 | Poplar Bluff Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 5,893 | 5,893 | - | - | 5,792 | 5,992 | - | - | (52) | (52) | 153 | 153 | - |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1636 | City of Presott | u.s. | 1,301 | 1,301 | - | - | 1,279 | 1,279 | - | - | (11) | (11) | 34 | 34 | - |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1561 | Public Service Commission of Yazoo City of Mississippi | u.s. | 1,857 | 1,857 | - | - | 1,825 | 1,825 | - | - | (16) | (16) | 48 | 48 | - |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1654 | Sikeston Board of Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 5,910 | 5,910 | - | - | 5,808 | 5,808 | - |  | (52) | (52) | 154 | 154 |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL SERC |  | 16,332,381 | 16,332,381 | - | - | 16,051,113 | 16,051,113 | - | - | (143,802) | (143,802) | 425,071 | 425,071 | - |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL SPP |  | . | . | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | TRE | 1019 | ercot | u.s. | 5,699,337 | 5,699,337 | - | - | 5,601,186 | 5,601,186 | . | - | (50,181) | (50,181) | 148,332 | 148,332 | . |  |
|  |  |  | total ErCot |  | 5,999,337 | 5,999,337 | - | - | 5,601,186 | 5,601,186 | - | . | (50,181) | (50,181) | 148,332 | 148,332 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Alberta Electric System Operator | Canada | 656,732 | - | 656,732 | - | 971,083 | - | 971,083 | - | - | - | (314,351) | - | $(314,351)$ | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | British Columbia Hydro \& Power Authority | Canada | 1,023,265 | - | 1,023,265 | - | 996,866 | - | 996,866 | - | - | - | 26,399 |  | 26,399 |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Centro Nacional de Control de Energia | Mexico | 211,910 | 173 | , | 211,910 | 206,443 | - |  | 206,443 | - |  | 5,467 | - | - | 5,467 |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Ajo Improvement District | u.s. | 173 | 173 | - | - | 170 | 170 | - | - | (2) | (2) | 5 | 5 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Arizona Public Service Company | u.s. | 461,227 | 461,227 | - | - | 453,284 | 453,284 | - | - | $(4,061)$ | $(4,061)$ | 12,004 | 12,004 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Williams | u.s. | 711 | 711 | - | - | 698 | 698 | - | - | (6) | (6) | 18 | 18 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical Districts 3 | u.s. | 1,353 | 1,353 | - | - | 1,330 | 1,330 | - | - | (12) | (12) | 35 | 35 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Aguila lrigation District - APs | u.s. | 526 | 526 | - | - | 517 | 517 | - | $\cdot$ | (5) | (5) | 14 | 14 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Buckeye Water Conservation and Drainage District - APS | u.s. | 356 | 356 | - | - | 350 | 350 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 9 | 9 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District No. 6 of Pinal County - APS | u.s. | 34 | 34 | $\cdot$ | - | 34 | 34 | - | - | (0) | (0) | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District No. 7 of Maricopa County - APS | u.s. | 799 | 799 | - | - | 786 | 786 | - | - | (7) | (7) | 21 | 21 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District No. 8 of Maricopa County - APS | u.s. | 5,739 | 5,739 | - | - | 5,640 | 5,640 | - | - | (51) | (51) | 149 | 149 | - | . |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Harquahala Valley Power Districts - APS | u.s. | 1,817 | 1,817 | - | - | 1,786 | 1,786 | - | - | (16) | (16) | 47 | 47 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Maricopa County Municipal Water Conservation Dist No. 1 - APS | u.s. | 820 | 820 | - | - | ${ }^{806}$ | 806 | - | - | (7) | (7) | 21 | 21 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | MCMullen Valley Water Conservation \& Drainage District - APS | u.s. | 1,975 | 1,975 | - | - | 1,941 | 1,941 | - | $\cdot$ | (17) | (17) | 51 | 51 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Roosevelt lririgation District - - Ps | u.s. | 649 | 649 | - | - | 638 | 638 | - | - | (6) | (6) | 17 | 17 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Tonopah Irrigation District - APS | u.s. | 431 | 431 | - | - | 424 | 424 | - | - | (4) | (4) | 11 | 11 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navajo Tribal Utility Authority-Arizona | u.s. | 799 | 799 | - | - | ${ }^{786}$ | 786 | - | - | (7) | (7) | 21 | 21 |  | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Tohono O'Odham Utility Authority | u.s. | 979 | 979 | - | - | 963 | 963 | - | - | (9) | (9) | 25 | 25 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Town of Wickenburg | u.s. | 422 | 422 | - | - | 414 | 414 | - | - | (4) | (4) | 11 | 11 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Avista Corporation | u.s. | 153,590 | 153,590 4920 | $:$ | $\div$ | $\begin{array}{r}150,945 \\ \hline 886\end{array}$ | 150,945 4836 | $:$ | $:$ | $(1,352)$ $(43)$ | ${ }_{(1,352)}^{(43)}$ | 3,997 | 3,997 | $:$ |  |
| 2017 2017 | WECC Wecc |  | Kaiser Aluminum Fabricated Products LLC Pend Oreille County PUD No. 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { u.s. } \\ & \text { u.s. } \end{aligned}$ | 4,920 16,155 | 4,920 16,155 | $:$ | $\div$ | 4,836 15,876 | 4,836 15,876 | $:$ | $:$ | ${ }_{(142)}^{(143)}$ | ${ }_{(142)}^{(42)}$ | 128 420 | 128 420 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | PuD No. 2 of Grant County | U.s. | 1,464 | 1,464 | : | - | $1,1,869$ 1,439 | $1,1,839$ 1,389 | - | - | ${ }_{(13)}$ | ${ }_{(132)}^{(122)}$ | 420 38 | 420 38 | $\div$ |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bonneville Power Administration-Power Services | u.s. | 101,010 | 101,010 | - | - | 99,270 | 99,270 | - | - | (889) | (889) | 2,629 | 2,629 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bonneville Power Administration-Hydro | u.s. | 3,218 | 3,218 | - | - | 3,162 | 3,162 | - | - | (128) | (28) | 84 | 84 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bonneville Power Administration-Transmission | u.s. | 820,822 | 820,822 | - | - | 806,686 | 806,686 | - | - | $(7,227)$ | $(7,227)$ | 21,363 | 21,363 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Redding | u.s. | 12,681 | 12,681 | - | - | 12,463 | 12,463 | - | - | (112) | (112) | 330 | 330 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | City of Roseville ${ }_{\text {Modesto }}$ | u.s. | 19,832 41848 | 19,832 41,648 | $:$ | - | 19,490 | 19,490 | - | - | ${ }_{(1275)}^{(1367)}$ | ${ }_{(1275)}^{(1367)}$ | \% 516 | 516 | - | $:$ |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Modesto Irrigation District Sacramento Municipal Utility District | u.s. | 41,648 | 41,648 | - | - | 40,931 | 40,931 | - | - | ${ }^{(367)}$ | ${ }_{(1657)}^{(1621)}$ | 1,084 | 1,084 4,792 | - | $:$ |
| 2017 | WECC WECC |  | Sacramento Municipal Uilility District Western Area Power Administration-iierra Nevada Region | u.s. u.s. U | 184,124 31,566 | 184,124 31,556 | - | $:$ | 180,953 31,013 | 180,953 31,013 | $:$ | - | $(1,621)$ $(278)$ | $\underset{(1,621)}{(278)}$ | 4,792 821 | 4,792 821 | $:$ | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Cailifrria Independent System Operator | u.s. | 3,637,209 | 3,637,209 | - | - | 3,574,571 | 3,574,571 | - | - | (32,025) | $(32,025)$ | 94,663 | 94,663 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | El Paso Electric Company | u.s. | 133,774 | 133,774 | - | - | 131,471 | 131,471 | - | - | $(1,178)$ | $(1,178)$ | 3,482 | 3,482 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Idaho Power Company | u.s. | 250,628 | 250,628 | - | - | 246,311 | 246,311 | - | - | $(2,207)$ | $(2,207)$ | 6,523 | 6,523 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Imperial Irigation District | u.s. | 59,427 | 59,427 | - | - | 58,403 | 58,403 | - | - | (523) | (523) | 1,547 | 1,547 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | u.s. | 457,085 | 457,085 | - | - | 449,213 | 449,213 | - | - | $(4,025)$ | $(4,025)$ | 11,896 | 11,896 |  | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Henderson | u.s. | 653 | 653 | - | - | 642 | 642 | - | - | (6) | (6) | 17 | 17 | - |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Total NERC Assessments |  |  |  | NERC NEL Assessments |  |  |  | Penalty Sanctions |  | NERC Compliance Credits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total | us. | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Las Vegas | u.s. | 662 | 662 | - | - | 650 | 650 | - | - | (6) | ${ }^{(6)}$ | 17 | 17 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of North Las Vegas | u.s. | 373 | 373 | - | - | 366 | 366 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 10 | 10 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Clark County Water Reclamation District | u.s. | 1,293 | 1,293 | - | - | 1,271 | 1,271 | - | - | (11) | (11) | 34 | 34 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Colorado River Commission of Nevada | u.s. | 7,501 | 7,501 | - | - | 7,372 | 7,372 | - | - | (66) | (66) | 195 | 195 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Las Vegas Valley Water District | u.s. | 1,719 | 1,719 | - | - | 1,689 | 1,689 | - | - | (15) | (15) | 45 | 45 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Nevada Power Company dba NV Energy | u.s. | 496,976 | 496,976 | - | - | 488,417 | 488,417 | - | - | $(4,376)$ | $(4,376)$ | 12,934 | 12,934 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | MGM Resorts International | u.s. | 14,864 | 14,864 | - | - | 14,608 | 14,608 | - | - | (131) | (131) | 387 | 387 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Switch-North | u.s. | 92 | 92 | - | - | 90 | 90 | - | - | (1) | ${ }^{(1)}$ | 2 | 2 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Switch-South | u.s. | 4,709 | 4,709 | - | - | 4,628 | 4,628 | - | - | (41) | (41) | 123 | 123 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Wynn Las Vegas | u.s. | 2,915 | 2,915 | - | - | 2,864 | 2,864 | - | - | ${ }^{(26)}$ | ${ }^{(26)}$ | 76 164 | 76 164 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Overton Power District No. 5 | u.s. | 6,282 | 6,282 | - | - | 6,174 | 6,174 | - | - | (55) | (55) | 164 | 164 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Southern Nevada Water Authority | u.s. | 1,919 | 1,919 | - | - | ${ }^{1,8866}$ | ${ }^{1,8886}$ | - | - | ${ }_{(17)}^{(112)}$ | ${ }^{(117)}$ | 50 330 | 50 330 | $\square$ | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 12,689 | 12,689 | - | - | 12,471 | 12,471 | - | - | (112) | (112) | 330 | 330 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Big Horn County Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 610 | 610 | - | - | 600 | 600 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 16 | 16 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | NorthWestern Corp. dba NorrthWestern Energy, LLC | u.s. | 149,884 | 149,884 | - | - | 147,302 | 147,302 | - | - | $(1,320)$ | $(1,320)$ | 3,901 | 3,901 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region PacifiCorp West (PACW) | u.s. | 127 | ${ }^{127}$ | - | - | 125 | 125 | - | - | ${ }^{(1)}$ | ${ }^{(1)}$ | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Constellation New Energy | U.S. | 5,548 | 54,548 | . | - | 536,422 | 36,42 5,452 | . | - | (19, ${ }_{(49)}$ | (19) | ${ }_{1}^{8,914}$ | $\begin{array}{r}144 \\ \hline 19\end{array}$ | : | $\because$ |
| 2017 | wecc |  | 3 Phases Renewables | u.s. | 3 | 3 | - | - | 3 | 3 | - | - | (0) | (0) |  | 0 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Avangrid Renewables | u.s. | 1,639 | 1,639 | - | - | 1,611 | 1,611 | - | - | (14) | (14) | 43 | 43 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Calpine Energy Solutions, LLC./Noble Americas Energy Solutions, LLC | u.s. | 25,981 | 25,981 | - | - | 25,534 | 25,534 | - | - | (229) | (229) | 676 | 676 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Pacificorp (IPC) | u.s. | 33 | 33 | - | - | 33 | 33 | - | - | (0) | (0) | 1 | 1 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Pacificorp (EasternBalAuth) | u.s. | 791,096 | 791,096 | - | - | 777,472 | 777,472 | - | - | $(6,965)$ | $(6,965)$ | 20,589 | 20,589 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Pacificorp (Portland) | u.s. | 71 | 71 | - | - | 69 | 69 | - | - | (1) | (1) | 2 | 2 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Pacificorp (WAPA-CO-MO) | u.s. | 1,843 | 1,843 | - | - | 1,811 | 1,811 | - | - | (16) | (16) | 48 | 48 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Portland General Electric Company | u.s. | 279,341 | 279,341 | - | - | 274,530 | 274,530 | - | - | $(2,460)$ | $(2,460)$ | 7,270 | 7,270 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Shell Energy North America | u.s. | 1,188 | 1,188 | - | - | 1,167 | 1,167 | - | - | ${ }^{(10)}$ | (10) | 31 | 31 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Arkansas River Power Authority (ARPA) | u.s. | 4,248 | 4,248 | - | - | 4,175 | 4,175 | - | - | (37) | (37) | 111 | 111 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Black tills Colorado Electric | u.s. | 32,628 | 32,628 | - | - | 32,066 | 32,066 | - | - | (287) | ${ }^{(287)}$ | 849 | 849 | - |  |
| 2017 2017 | wecc wecc |  | Burlington | u.s.s. us. | 495 960 | 495 960 | : | : | 487 943 | 487 943 | : | $:$ | ${ }_{(8)}^{(4)}$ | (4) | 13 25 | 13 25 | : |  |
| 2017 | WEcc |  | Grand Valley Power | u.s. | 3,948 | 3,948 | . | - | 3,880 | 3,880 | . | - | (35) | (35) | 103 | 103 | . |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Holy Cross Energy | u.s. | 16,456 | 16,456 | - | - | 16,173 | 16,173 | - | - | (145) | (145) | 428 | 428 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Intermountain Rural Electric Assciation | u.s. | 35,441 | 35,441 | - | - | 34,831 | 34,831 | - | - | (312) | (312) | 922 | 922 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska | u.s. | 2,705 | 2,705 | - | - | 2,658 | 2,658 | - | - | (24) | (24) | 70 | 70 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | ${ }^{\text {Platte River Power Authority }}$ Public Service Compny | u.s. | 51,253 482564 | 51,253 482564 | - | - | 50,371 474,253 | 50,371 474.253 | - | - | $(451)$ $(4299)$ | ${ }^{(451)}$ | 1,334 12,559 | 1,334 12,559 | $\square$ | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Public Service Company of Colorado (Xell) ${ }^{\text {Putic Service Comany of }}$ | u.s. | 482,564 | 482,564 1,830 | - | - | 474,253 1,799 | 474,253 | - | - | $(4,249)$ $(16)$ | (4,249) | 12,559 48 | 12,559 48 | . | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Public Service Company of Colorado (Xcel)-(WAPA-CO-MO) | u.s. | 1,830 | 1,830 | - | - | 1,799 | 1,799 | - | - | ${ }_{(16)}$ | ${ }_{(16)}$ | 48 | 48 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Raton Public Service | u.s. | 692 | 692 | - | - | 680 | 680 | - | - | ${ }^{(6)}$ | ${ }^{(6)}$ | 18 | 18 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Town of Center | u.s. | ${ }_{4}^{236}$ | 236 41.932 | - | $:$ | +232 | \% 232 |  | $:$ | (2) (369) | $(2)$ $(369)$ | ${ }^{6}$ | $6$ |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Wecc Wecc |  | Tri-State Generation \& Transmission Assoc. Inc- Reliability Western Area Power - Loveland, co | u.s. u.s. | 41,932 2,683 | 41,932 2,683 | : | $:$ | 41,210 2,637 | 41,210 2,637 | : | $:$ | $(369)$ $(24)$ | $(369)$ $(24)$ | 1,091 70 | 1,091 70 | : | $:$ |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Yampa Valley Electric Association | u.s. | 8,906 | 8,906 | . | - | 8,752 | 8,752 | . | . | (78) | (78) | 232 | 232 | - | . |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Aztec Electric Dept | u.s. | 580 | 580 | - | - | 570 | 570 | - | - | (5) | (5) | 15 | 15 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Gallup | u.s. | 3,516 | 3,516 | - | - | 3,455 | 3,455 | - | - | (31) | (31) | 92 | 92 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Jicarilla Apache Nation Power Authority | u.s. | 366 | 366 | - | - | 360 | 360 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 10 | 10 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Kit Carson Electric Inc | u.s. | 4,678 | 4,678 | - | - | 4,597 | 4,597 | - | - | (41) | (41) | 122 | 122 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navaj Tribal Utility Authority-New Mexico | u.s. | 3,149 | 3,149 | - | - | ${ }^{3,095}$ | 3,095 | - | - | (128) | (18) | 82 | 82 | - |  |
| 2017 2017 | wecc |  | Public Service Company of New Mexico The incorvorated County of Los Alamos | u.s. | 145,117 | 145,117 | - | - | 142,618 | 142,618 | - | - | $(1,278)$ | $(1,278)$ $(86)$ | $\begin{array}{r}3,777 \\ \hline 23\end{array}$ | 3,777 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | The Incorporated Country of Los Alamos | u.s. | 9,718 | 9,718 | - | - | 9,551 | 9,551 | - | - | (86) | (86) | 253 | 253 | - | - |
| 2017 2017 | WECC |  | Tri-State Generation \& Transmission Association, Inc. US Dept of Enery- Kirtand AfB | u.s. | 43,967 | 43,967 | - | - | 43,210 | 43,210 | - | $:$ | $\stackrel{(387)}{(59)}$ | $(387)$ <br> $(59)$ | $\begin{array}{r}1,144 \\ \hline 176\end{array}$ | 1,144 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County | U.s. | 29,523 | 29,523 | : | : | -6,015 | 29,015 | - | - | ${ }_{(260)}$ | ${ }_{(260)}$ | 768 | 768 | . | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Okanogan PUD | u.s. | 10,540 | 10,540 | - | - | 10,359 | 10,359 | - | - | (93) | (93) | 274 | 274 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Pud No. 1 of Douglas County | u.s. | 14,564 | 14,564 | - | - | 14,313 | 14,313 | - | - | (128) | (128) | 379 | 379 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Douglas Palisades / PUD No. 1 of DC | u.s. | 325 | 325 | - | - | 319 | 319 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 8 |  | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | PUD No. 2 of Grant County | u.s. | 75,738 | 75,738 | - | - | 74,434 | 74,434 | - | - | (667) | (667) | 1,971 | 1,971 | - |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | ID | Entity | Country | Total Nerc Assessments |  |  |  | Nerc nel Assesments |  |  |  | Penalty Sanctions |  | NERC Compliance Credits |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Puget Sound Energy, Inc. | u.s. | 388,766 | 388,766 | - | - | 382,071 | 382,071 | - | - | $(3,423)$ | (3,423) | 10,118 | 10,118 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Salt River Project | u.s. | 474,683 | 474,683 | - | - | 466,509 | 466,509 | - | - | $(4,179)$ | $(4,179)$ | 12,354 | 12,354 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Seattle City Light | u.s. | 158,171 | 158,171 | - | - | 155,447 | 155,447 | - | - | $(1,393)$ | (1,393) | 4,117 | 4,117 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. | u.s. | 22,030 | 22,030 | - | - | 21,650 | 21,650 | - | - | (194) | (194) | 573 | 573 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Fallon | u.s. | 1,464 | 1,464 | - | - | 1,439 | 1,439 | - | - | (13) | (13) | 38 | 38 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Mt. Wheeler Power | u.s. | 8,779 | 8,779 | - | - | 8,627 | 8,627 | - | - | (77) | (77) | 228 | 228 | 4 | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Truckee Donner Public Utility District | u.s. | 2,564 | 2,564 | - | - | 2,520 | 2,520 | - | - | (23) | (23) | 67 | 67 |  | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Beartooth Electric Cooperative | u.s. | 1,222 | 1,222 | - | - | 1,201 | 1,201 | - | - | (11) | (11) | $\begin{array}{r}32 \\ \hline 2085\end{array}$ | ${ }^{32}$ |  | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Tacoma DBA Tacoma Power | u.s. | 79,477 | 79,477 | - | - | 78,109 | 78,109 | - | - | (700) | (700) | 2,068 | 2,068 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Tucson Electric Power Company | u.s. | 235,713 8,244 | 235,713 8,244 | - | - | 231,654 | 231,654 | - | - | $(2,075)$ | $(2,075)$ | 6,135 | 6,135 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Merced Irrigation District | u.s. | 8,244 | 8,244 | - | - | 8,102 | 8,102 | - | - | (73) | (73) | 215 | ${ }^{215}$ | - | - |
| 2017 2017 | WECC Wecc |  | Turlock Irrigation District | u.s. u.s. | 34,591 36820 | 34,591 36,820 | $:$ | : | 33,995 36,186 | 33,995 36,186 | - | $:$ | (305) (324) | (305) (324) | 900 958 | 900 958 | $:$ | $:$ |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 36,820 | 36,820 | - | - | 36,186 | 36,186 | - | - | (324) | (324) | 958 | 958 |  | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | Black Hills Colorado Electri/Chevenne Light Fuel \& Power | u.s. | 69,628 | 69,628 | - | - | 68,429 | 68,429 | - | - | ${ }^{(613)}$ | (613) | ${ }_{1,812}$ | 1,812 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Black Hills state University South Dakota | u.s. | 333 | 333 | - | - | 327 | 327 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 9 | 9 | - | - |
| 2017 | WECC |  | ${ }^{\text {city of Page }}$ Corad | u.s. | 1,148 <br> 7 <br> 1,150 | 1,148 | - | - | 1,128 | 1,128 | - | - | ${ }^{(10)}$ | ${ }_{(10)}^{(104)}$ | -30 | 30 1904 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Colorado Springs Utilities | u.s. | 73,150 | 73,150 | - | - | 71,890 | 71,890 | - | - | (644) | (644) | 1,904 | 1,904 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Desseret Generation \& Transmission Cooperative | u.s. | 1,845 15754 | 1,845 15754 | - | - | 1,813 | 1,813 | - | - | ${ }^{(16)}$ | (16) | 48 | 48 | - |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Farmington | u.s. | 15,764 | 15,764 | - | - | 15,493 | 15,493 | - | - | (139) | (139) | 410 | 410 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Municipal Energy Agency of Nebraska | u.s. | 10,007 | 10,007 | - | - | 9,834 | 9,834 | - | - | (88) | ${ }^{(88)}$ | 260 | 260 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navajo Tribal Utility Authority-Colorado | u.s. | 3,434 | 3,434 | - | - | 3,375 | 3,375 | - | - | (30) | (30) | 89 | 89 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Navajo Agricultural Products Industry (NAPI) | u.s. | 52 | 52 | - | - | 51 | 51 | - | - | ${ }^{(0)}$ | ${ }^{(0)}$ | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Nebraska Public Power Marketing | u.s. | 105 | 105 | - | - | 103 | 103 | - | - | (1) | (1) | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Francis E. Warren Air Force Base | u.s. | 192 | 192 | - | - | 189 | 189 | - | - | ${ }^{(2)}$ | ${ }^{(2)}$ | 5 | 5 |  | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Town of Fredonia | u.s. | 166 | 166 | - | - | 163 | 163 | - | - | (1) | (1) | 4 | 4 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Tri-State Generation \& Transmission Assoc. Inc - Reliability | u.s. | 124,873 | 124,873 | - | - | 122,723 | 122,723 | - | - | $(1,099)$ | $(1,099)$ | 3,250 | 3,250 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration - CRSP | u.s. | 30,451 | 30,451 | - | - | 29,927 | 29,927 | - | - | (268) | (268) | 793 | 793 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power - Loveland, co | u.s. | 29,114 | 29,114 | - | - | 28,613 | 28,613 | - | - | (256) | ${ }^{(256)}$ | 758 | 758 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Wyoming Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 3,480 | 3,480 | - | - | 3,420 | 3,420 | - | - | (31) | (31) | 91 | 91 | - | - |
| 2017 2017 | wecc wecc |  | Basin Electric Power Cooperative Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. | u.s.s. u.s. | $\begin{array}{r} 2,336 \\ 361 \end{array}$ | 2,336 361 | - | : | $\begin{array}{r} 2,296 \\ 355 \end{array}$ | 2,296 355 | $:$ | $:$ | (21) (3) | (21) (3) | 61 9 | 61 9 | - | $:$ |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Norrthwestern Corp. dba NorthWestern Energy, LLC | U.s. | 4,803 | 4,803 | - | - | 4,720 | 4,720 | - | - | (42) | (42) | 125 | 125 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region | u.s. | 5,648 | 5,648 | - | - | 5,551 | 5,551 | - | - | (50) | (50) | 147 | 147 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Aha Macav Power Service | u.s. | 233 | 233 | - | - | 229 | 229 | - | - | (2) | (2) | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Desalter) - c/o DSw EmMO | u.s. | 2 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | (0) | (0) | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Wellifield) | u.s. | 109 | 109 | . | - | 107 | 107 | - |  | (1) | (1) | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Central Arizona Water Conservation District | u.s. | 36,185 | 36,185 | - | - | 35,562 | 35,562 | - | - | (319) | (319) | 942 | 942 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of Mesa | u.s. | 4,243 | 4,243 | - | - | 4,170 | 4,170 | - | - | (37) | (37) | 110 | 110 | - | $\cdot$ |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Needles Public Utilities Authority | u.s. | 503 | 503 | - | - | 495 | 495 | - | - | (4) | (4) | 13 | 13 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Colorado River Agency-Bureau of Indian Affairs | u.s. | 281 | 281 | - | - | 276 | 276 | - | - | (2) | (2) | 7 | 7 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District \#2-Coolidge Generating Station | u.s. | 146 | 146 | - | - | 144 | 144 | - | - | (1) | (1) | 4 | 4 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District \#2 | u.s. | 3,008 | 3,008 | - | - | 2,957 | 2,957 | - | - | (26) | (26) | 78 | 78 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Silver State Energy Association | u.s. | 10,420 | 10,420 | - | - | 10,241 | 10,241 | - | - | (92) | (92) | 271 | 271 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc | u.s. | 55,313 | 55,313 | - | - | 54,360 | 54,360 | - | - | (487) | (487) | 1,440 | 1,440 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground | u.s. | 312 | 312 | - | - | 306 | 306 | - | - | (3) | (3) | 8 | 8 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Wellton-Mohawk lrigation \& Drainage District | u.s. | 81 | 81 | - | - | 79 | 79 | - | - | (1) | (1) | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration-Desert Southwest Region | u.s. | 25,843 | 25,843 | - | - | 25,398 | 25,398 | - | - | (228) | (228) | 673 | 673 | - |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL WECC |  | 13,453,838 | 11,561,930 | 1,679,998 | 211,910 | 13,537,209 | 11,362,816 | 1,967,949 | 206,443 | $(101,800)$ | (101,800) | 18,429 | 300,914 | (287,952) | 5,467 |
|  | total ero |  |  |  | 68,883,995 | 62,466,508 | 6,205,577 | 211,910 | 69,433,995 | 61,390,740 | 7,886,813 | 206,443 | $(555,000)$ | (550,000) | (0) | 1,625,769 | $(1,631,236)$ | 5,467 |



2017 NEL Calculations and Allocations to Load Serving Entities (or Designee) for the 2019 NERC and RE Assessments

|  |  |  |  |  | Total Regional Entity Assessments (Including WIRABAssessments) |  |  |  | Regional Enity NEL Assessments |  |  |  | Penatry Sanction | us only | NPCC Cosc Program |  |  | NECC Compliance Assessments <br> (ex.AESO) |  |  |  | wirab Assesments |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Regional Enity | 10 | Entity | Country | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us/ | Canada | mexico | Total | us | Total | us, | Canada | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexic |
| 2017 | frec | 1074 | Alachua, City of | u.s. | 3,393 | 3,393 | . | - | 3,393 | 3,393 |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frac | 1075 | Bartow, City of | u.s. | 7,388 | 7,388 | - | - | 7,388 | 7,388 | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frac | 1076 | Chattahooche, , ity of | u.s. | 924 | 924 | - | . | 924 | 924 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | $\underset{\substack{\text { FRCC } \\ \text { frec }}}{\text { cect }}$ | 1077 1078 | Florida Keys Electric cooperative Asn Florid Power L Light co. | u.s. | 18,782 | 18,782 |  |  | 18,782 | 18,782 |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frec | 1079 | Florida Public utilites company | u.s. | 8,765 | ${ }_{8,765}$ | - | . | $\underset{8,685}{2,8689}$ | 2,869,090 | - | . | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frac | 1080 | Gainesvill Regional Uuilities | u.s. | 45,360 | 45,360 | - | . | 45,360 | 45,360 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | $\substack{\text { FRCC } \\ \text { FRCC }}$ | 1081 1082 1 | Homestead, city of | u.s. | $\underset{\substack{14,925 \\ 313535}}{ }$ | ${ }_{\substack{14,925 \\ 313535}}$ | : | : | $\underset{\substack{14,925 \\ 313,535}}{ }$ |  | : | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { frect } \\ \text { FRCC }}}{ }$ | 1082 | ${ }^{\text {Lea }}$ Lealand Electric | U.S. | 318,335 77,282 | 313,35 77,282 | : | - | 318,335 77,282 | 313,35 77,282 | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frac | 1626 | Lee County Electric Cooperativ, Inc | u.s. | 101, 178 | 101,874 |  |  | 101,874 | 101, 178 | . |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { FRCC } \\ \text { frec }}}{\text { cer }}$ | 1661 1084 | city of lake Worth Mount ora, City or | u.s. | 11,770 2,301 | 11,770 2,301 | : | : |  | $c117702301$ | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frec | 1085 | New Smyma Beach, Utilities Commisision of | u.s. | 10,869 | 10,869 | - |  | 10,869 | 10,869 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frac | 1086 | Orlando utilities commision | u.s. | 152,793 | 152,793 |  |  | 152,93 | 152,793 | - | - | - | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ |  | 1087 <br> 1088 | Duke Energy florida Quinc, City of | u.s. u.s. | $1,020,443$ <br> 3,273 <br> , 23 | (1,020,433 | : | : | $\underset{\substack{1,020,443 \\ 3,273}}{\text { a }}$ | $1,202,443$ 3,273 3,28 | : | : | : | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frec | 1089 | Reedy Creek Improvement District | u.s. | 30,327 | 30,327 |  | - | 30,37 | 30,37 | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | $\underset{\substack{\text { FRCC } \\ \text { FRCC }}}{\text { cec }}$ | 1090 | St. Cloud. Citiv of (OUC) | u.s. | 19,2588 | 19,258 |  |  |  | 19,258 | : | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | FRCC <br> FReC | 1091 1092 | Telalahase, city of | U.S. | -69,068 | $\underset{508,67}{69,08}$ | $:$ | \% | ¢90,068 508,267 | 69,068 508,67 | $:$ | : | $\because$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {FRCC }}$ | 1603 | City of vero Beach | u.s. | ${ }^{18,957}$ | 18,957 |  |  | 18,957 | ${ }^{18,957}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ |  | 1093 1094 1 |  | u.s. u.s. |  | 1,628 <br> 907 | : | : | +1,688 ${ }_{\text {907 }}$ | 1, 1.688 | : | . | : | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | fric | 1095 | Winter Park, ctit of | u.s. | 11,071 | 11,071 |  | . | 11,071 | 11,071 | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ |  | 1724 1072 | Moore Alven, City of $\begin{aligned} & \text { Florida Municipal Power agency }\end{aligned}$ | u.s. | 376 149,866 | 376 199,86 |  |  | 376 149866 | 376 149,866 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | frcc | 1073 | Seminole Electric cooperative | u.s. | 360,715 | 360,715 | . | - | 360,715 | 360,715 | . | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total fric |  | 5,827,925 | 5,827,925 | - | - | 5,827,925 | 5,27,925 | . | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1199 | Basin lectric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 617,357 | 617,357 |  |  | 61,998 | 61,998 |  |  | (2,641) | (2,641) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Mro MRO | 1201 1204 120 | Central Iow Power Cooperative (IIPCO) Corn elt Power Coooerative | u.s. | 90,206 62762 | ${ }^{90,2061}$ | - | - | ${ }^{90,591}$ | ${ }^{90,591}$ | - | : | (136) | ${ }^{(386)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1207 | Dairland Power Cooperative | u.s. | 175,528 | 177,528 |  |  | 176,279 | 176,279 | - | - | (751) | ${ }^{(751)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1210 | Great River Energy | u.s. | 418,804 | 418,804 | - | - | 420,995 | 420,995 | - | - | (1,792) | (1,792) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Mro | 1222 1230 1 | Minknota Power Cooperative, Inc. | U.S. | ${ }_{4361275}^{122,103}$ | 122,103 436175 | : | : | 122,25 <br> 438.041 | 122,25 <br> 438.041 | : | - | (1522) | (522) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1232 | Omaha pulic Power District | u.s. | 355,974 | 355,974 |  |  | 357,497 | 357,497 | - | . | ${ }_{\text {(1,523) }}(1,18)$ | ${ }_{(1,523)}^{(1,52)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Mro | ${ }_{1230}^{1220}$ | Western Area Power Administration (UM) | u.s. | 299,325 | ${ }^{295,325}$ | - |  | 296,588 | 296,588 |  |  | ${ }^{(1,263)}$ | ${ }^{(1,263)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Mro <br> MRO | 1239 1217 | Western Area Power Administration (IM) Manitoa tydre | U.S. can | - $\begin{array}{r}1,462 \\ 76,546\end{array}$ | 1,462 | ${ }_{764,546}$ | : | - $\begin{array}{r}1,468 \\ 76,546\end{array}$ | 1,468 | 764,546 | : | (6) | (6) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1235 | SaskPower | can | 792,877 |  | 799,877 | . | 792,877 |  | 799,877 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1195 | Alliant Energy Alliant East- WPL L Alliant West PL) | u.s. | 927,043 | 927,043 |  | - | 931.009 | 931,099 |  | - | (3,966) | (3,966) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Mro MRO | 1710 1216 | Dahberg Eleetric Company Madison, Gas and liectric | u.s. | 3,568 107,899 | 3,568 107,809 | : | : | 3,583 <br> 108,270 | 3,883 108,270 | : | : | ${ }^{(1561)}$ | ${ }_{(461)}^{(15)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | мRo | 1220 | MidAmeician Enersy Company | u.s. | 817,13 | 817,713 | - |  | ${ }_{821,211}$ | 821,211 |  |  | (3,998) | (3,998) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Mro | ${ }_{1221}^{1226}$ | Minnestata Power | u.s. | ${ }_{\text {412,517 }}^{41099}$ | ${ }_{\text {411,517 }}^{40,599}$ | : | : | 413,278 10048 | 413,278 100404 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(1,760) }}^{(43)}$ | ${ }_{(143)}^{(1,760)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1711 | North Central Powerc Company | u.s. | ${ }_{1}^{1,184}$ | 10,1,184 |  | - | 1,189 | 1,189 | - | - | ${ }_{(5)}$ | ${ }_{(5)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mpo | 1231 | NorthWestern Energy | u.s. | 49,619 | 49,619 | - | - | 49,831 | 49,831 | - | - | (212) | ${ }^{(212)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | MRO | 1712 123 | Northwestern Wisconsin Otter Tai Power Company | U.S. | 5,920 155,522 | 5,920 158,522 | $:$ | : | 5,945 159,200 | 5,945 159,200 | : | $\because$ | ${ }_{\text {(168) }}^{(25)}$ | ${ }_{(1678)}^{125)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1664 | Wisconsin Public Senice (WPs) | u.s. | 372,549 | 372,544 | - |  | 374,138 | 374,138 |  |  | (1,594) | (1,594) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Mro | 1665 1224 1 |  | u.s. | 21,783 |  | : | : | ( 21.876 | 21,876 | : | : | (193) (593) | (193) (5923) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 1196 | Ames Municipal lectric System | u.s. | +24,990 | 1,24,090 | - | - | ${ }_{24,193}$ | ${ }^{1,24,193}$ | . | - | ${ }_{\text {(103) }}$ | ${ }_{(103)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Mro | 1604 | Atantic Municipal utilites | u.s. | 2,588 | 2,588 1,761 | - | - | $\begin{array}{r}2,599 \\ 1 \\ \hline 1588\end{array}$ | 2,599 | - | - | ${ }^{(11)}$ | ${ }^{(11)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | MRO | 1713 1714 | Blomer lectric \& Water Co. Village of cadoott | U.S. | ${ }_{\text {4,737 }}$ | 1,761 437 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {1,768 }}^{139}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,768 \\ 439}}$ | - | : | ${ }^{(8)}$ | ${ }_{(2)}^{(8)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mpo | 1200 | Cedar falls Municipal utilites | u.s. | ${ }^{16,496}$ | 16,496 | - | - | 16,567 | 16,567 | - | - | (71) | (71) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | MRO MRO | 1477 1716 | Central Minesota Municipal Power Asency (CMMPA) Eldride Iectric and Water Uutities | U.S.S. | 12,432 <br> 1,350 | 12,432 <br> 1,350 <br> 1 | $:$ | : | 12,485 1,356 | 12,485 1,356 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(53) }}^{(6)}$ | ${ }_{(6)}^{(53)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | мRo | 1203 | City of fesanaba | u.s. | 4,391 | 4,391 | - | - | 4,410 | 4,410 | - | - | (19) | (19) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Mro | 1205 1206 | Falls city Water \& Ligh Department Fremont Departmentof fuitites | u.s. | (1,875 | (1,875 | : | : | (1,883 | (1,883 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(8) }}(5)$ | ${ }_{\text {(89) }}^{(8)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | MRO | 1208 1208 | Feemeseo Municicipal Utilities | u.s. | - |  | : |  | (13,068 | (13,068 |  |  | ${ }^{(9)}$ | (9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Mro | 1209 | Grand lsland Utilities Department Great lakes Ulities | u.s. | 24,198 | 24,198 | - | : | 24,301 | 24,301 47222 | - | : | (104) | (104) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | MRO MRO | 1717 1718 | Cret tees Uilites | U.S. | 47,041 600 | 47,041 600 |  | : | $\stackrel{47,242}{603}$ | $\stackrel{47,242}{603}$ | : | : | ${ }_{(3)}^{(201)}$ | ${ }_{(201)}^{(3)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1606 | Harran Municipal Utilities | u.s. | 536 | 536 | - |  | 538 | 538 |  |  | (2) | (2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2017 NEL Calculations and Allocations to Load Serving Entities (or Designee) for the 2019 NERC and RE Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  | Total Re | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Entity Assessme } \\ & \text { Assessmen } \end{aligned}$ | nts (Including <br> ts) |  |  | nal Entity NEL A | ssessments |  | Penalty Sanctio | sony | NPC | Corc Prog |  | WECCCo | Asse) |  |  |  | ab Ass | sments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Entity | 10 | Entity | country | Total | us | Canad | Mexico | Total | us | Canad | mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Total | us | Canada | Mexicol | Total | us) | Canad | Mexico |
| 2017 | MRO | 1211 | Hastings utilities | u.s. | 13,670 | 13,670 |  |  | ${ }^{13,729}$ | 13,729 |  |  | (58) | (58) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | MRo | 1212 | Heartland Consumers Power District | u.s. | 13,488 | 13,848 | - |  | 13,907 | 13,907 |  |  | (59) | (59) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | MRO | 1213 | Hutchinso U Uilities Commision | U.S. | 9,259 | 9,259 | - |  | 9,298 | ${ }^{9,298}$ | : | - | $(40)$ $(0)$ | $\stackrel{(40)}{(0)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | MRO | 11215 | Lincoln Electric System | u.s. | ${ }_{102,103}^{104}$ | ${ }_{102,104}^{103}$ | : | : | 104 10,540 | ${ }^{102,540}$ | : | - | ${ }^{(437)}$ | (437) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1223 | Missouri River Energ Senices | u.s. | ${ }^{85,881}$ | 85,881 | - |  | 86,248 | ${ }^{86,248}$ |  |  | ${ }^{(367)}$ | ${ }^{(367)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Mro MRO | 1224 1207 | MN Municipl Power Agency (MMPA) Monteruma Muncicial Light P Power | u.s. | 49,523 | 49,523 | : | . | 49,735 | 49,735 | - | - | ${ }^{(212)}$ | (212) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | мво | 1227 | Municipal Energy Agencry of Nebraska | u.s. | 30,046 | 30,046 | - | . | 30,175 | ${ }_{30,175}^{85}$ | - |  | ${ }^{(129)}$ | (129) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1228 | Muscatine Power and Water | u.s. | 27,980 | 27,980 | - | - | 28,100 | 28,100 | - | - | (120) | (120) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | MRO MRO | 1229 1720 | Netraska City Uutilies Resile Power crup of owa | U.S. | 4,114 17,954 | 4,114 17,954 5,2 | : | : | 4,131 <br> 18,031 | 4,131 18.031 | : | : | $\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { (18) } \\ (77) \\ \hline\end{array}\right.$ | ${ }_{(18)}^{(18)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1721 | Rice lake utilities | u.s. | 5,271 | 5,271 | - | . | 5,933 | 5,293 | - |  | (23) | (23) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | MRO MRO | 1234 1236 | Rochestere Public Uutilies Southern Minesosta Municipal Power Agency | u.s. | 74 88.646 | 74 88546 | : |  | 75 | \% 7 | - | : | ${ }_{\text {(139) }}^{(0)}$ | ${ }^{(37)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | MRO | 1236 1722 | Southers Minesesta Municipal Power Agency City f Spooner | U.S. | 88,46 1,009 | 88,646 1,009 | $:$ | : | 89,25 1,014 |  | $:$ |  | ${ }_{(4)}^{(379)}$ | ${ }_{(4)}^{(379)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | mRo | 1241 | Willmar Municipal Uutilies | u.s. | 7,951 | 7,951 | - | - | 7,985 | 7,985 | - | - | (34) | (34) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | ${ }_{\text {Mro }}^{\text {MRO }}$ | 1242 |  | u.s. | 168,633 | 168,633 | - | - | 169,355 | 169,355 | - | - | (721) | (721) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | ${ }_{\text {SpP-MRO-SERC }}^{\text {Mr }}$ |  | Woverine Power Marketing cooperative Arkansas lectric Coperative Corporation | U.S. | 120,142 | 1,142 120,829 | $:$ | $:$ | - 12,1474 | 1,1,47 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(517) }}^{(5)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(517) }}^{(5)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1246 | American Electric Power | u.s. | 1,179,698 | 1,177,698 | - | - | 1,184,745 | 1,184,745 | - | - | (5,047) | (5,047) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SpP-MRO | ${ }_{1247}^{1707}$ | Aep-VEMCO Baard of Public utilities (Kansas city ks) | U.S. | 20.589 771152 | 20,589 <br> 77158 | : | : | 20,657 <br> 777482 <br> 1082 | 20,657 <br> 777482 <br> 18 | : |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { (88) } \\ 1830}}^{(18)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(188) }}^{(130)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1620 | Board f fublic Utilities, , aty of Mchererson, Kansas | u.s. | 3,753 | 33,753 | - | ; | 3, 3,897 | 33,897 | ; | ; | ${ }^{(1434)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sp-Mro | 1647 | Carthage City Water \& Light | u.s. | 9,594 | 9,594 | - |  | 9,635 | 9,635 |  |  | (41) | (41) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SpP-Mro | 1469 1556 | Central Valley lectric Cooperative Cityof enenovile | u.s. | $\underset{\substack{26,083 \\ 22,131}}{2,1}$ | 26,083 22,131 | : | : | 26,195 22,265 | 26,195 22,226 | : | : | $\underset{\substack{(112) \\(95)}}{\text { (2) }}$ | $\underset{(112)}{(195)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SP-MRO | 1709 | City of Nixa | u.s. | ${ }_{5,139}$ | ${ }_{5,139}$ | - |  | ${ }_{5,161}$ | ${ }_{5,161}$ | - | - | (22) | (22) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP.MRO | 1703 | city of Chanute | u.s. | 16,046 | 16,046 | - | - | 16,115 | 16,115 | - |  | (69) | (69) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SpP-MRO Sp-MRO | 1248 1436 | Independence Power \& Light (1ndependence, MO) City Utitites of Springfeld, | u.s. u.s. | ${ }_{\substack{33,173 \\ 99,043}}$ | 33,173 <br> 99,04 <br> 6, | : | : | 33,315 99,468 | 33,315 99,468 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {1424) }}^{(122)}$ | ${ }_{\text {chen }}^{(1242)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP-MRO | 1437 | East eexas lectric coop, Inc. | u.s. | 13,721 | 13,21 | - | - | 13,780 | 13,780 | - | - | (59) | (59) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Spe.Mro | 1250 1270 |  | u.s. | 164,297 | 164,297 | : | : | ${ }^{165,000}$ | 165,000 | : |  | ${ }^{(703)}$ | ${ }^{(1733)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SPP-MRO SP-MRO | 1470 <br> 1438 | Farmers 'tectric Coop Golden Spread Electric coop | U.S. | 9, 9,73 | 9,173 <br> 15,359 | $:$ | : | 9,923 159,036 | 9,213 159,036 | $:$ | : | ${ }_{(1677)}^{(139)}$ | ${ }_{(677)}^{(139)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Spp..Mo | ${ }_{1251}^{1251}$ | Grand River Dam Authority | u.s. | ${ }^{166,103}$ | ${ }^{166,103}$ | - | - | ${ }_{1}^{166,813}$ | ${ }^{166,813}$ | - |  | (711) | ${ }^{(711)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP-MRO | 1252 1439 | Kansas ity Power Light (1KP) | u.s. | $\begin{array}{r}493,108 \\ 67,200 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 493,108 67,200 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {4 }}^{49,7,488}$ |  | : | $\because$ | ${ }_{\substack{(2,109) \\(287)}}^{(2)}$ | $\underset{(287)}{(2,109)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SPP.MRO | 1440 | Kansas Municipal Energy Agency (KCPL) | u.s. | 50,39 | 50,239 | - | - | 50,453 | 50,453 | - |  | (215) | (215) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Spe.Mro | 1637 1598 | Kansas Power Pool KCPIL CMOC ( Greate Missour Operations Company) | u.s. u.s. | 27,849 271,03 | 27,499 27.003 | : | : | 27,968 272,162 | ${ }_{\text {272, }}^{27,968}$ | : | : | ${ }_{(1,159)}^{(119)}$ | ${ }_{(12159)}^{(119)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP-MRO | 1472 | Lea county leetric coop | u.s. | 38,647 | ${ }_{38,647}$ |  |  | 38,812 | 38,812 |  |  | ${ }_{(165)}$ | ${ }_{(165)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP.MRO | 1441 | Midwest Energy Inc. | u.s. | 56,988 | 56,998 | - | - | 57,242 | 57,242 | - |  | (244) | (244) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  | 1442 |  | U.S. | ${ }_{9}^{14,9792}$ | ${ }_{99,702}^{14,99}$ | : | : | 14,260 100,128 | - | : | : | ${ }_{(427)}$ | ${ }_{(427)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sp-MRO | 1255 | Okihoma Gas and leetric Co. | u.s. | 906,646 | 900646 | - | - | 910,524 | 910,524 | - |  | (3,878) | ${ }^{(3,878)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SpP-MRO | ${ }_{1651}^{1444}$ | Okahoma Municipal Power Auth Paraguld ligh, Water Cable | U.S. | 90,700 18,658 | ${ }^{\text {co,700 }} 18$ | : | : | 91, 18,788 188 | ${ }^{911,088} 18$ | : | : | ${ }_{(188)}^{(88)}$ | ${ }_{\substack{(388) \\(80)}}^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP-MRO | 1725 | People's lectric cooperative | u.s. | 15,767 | 15,767 |  | - | 15,835 | 15,835 | - |  | (67) | (67) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Spe.Mro | ${ }_{1257}^{1273}$ | Roosevelt County leetric Coop Xel Enery Company ( Southerstem Public Serice) | U.S. |  | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{488,687}$ | : | : | 4,838 | ( $\begin{array}{r}\text { 4,388 } \\ 687,616\end{array}$ | : | : | ${ }_{(2,290)}^{(21)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(2, } 2129}^{(21)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP.MRO | 1256 | Sunflower Electric Power Cooperative | u.s. | 143,532 | 144,532 | . | - | ${ }_{144,146}$ | 144,146 |  | . | ${ }_{(614)}$ | (614) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SpP.Mro | 1445 | Tex- La lecteric Cooperative of Texas | u.s. | 115,57 | ${ }^{15,567}$ | - | - | 15,634 <br> 112646 | ${ }^{15,563}$ | . |  | ${ }^{(67)}$ | ${ }^{(67)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SPP-MRO | 1475 1260 | Tric Count leetric Coop | u.s. | 11,169 669,701 | 11,169 669701 | - | . | 11,216 672,566 | 11,216 672,566 | : | - | (2,865) | (2,865) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SpP-Mro | 1259 1501 | Western farmers lelectric Coperative West Texs Municical Power Agency | u.s. | 267,755 88,688 | 267,755 88.668 | . | - | 268,901 89,047 | 268,01 8904 | - |  | ${ }_{(1,1,45)}^{(139)}$ | (1,145) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | West Texas Municipal Power Agency |  | ${ }_{\text {15,471,699 }}$ | 13,94, 246 | 1,55, 223 | . | 15,531,492 | ${ }_{\text {13, }}$ 873,7,799 | 1,557,423 | - | (59,523) | (59,523) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | necc | 1336 | New Engand | u.s. | 3,999,989 | 3,999,989 | $\checkmark$ |  | 1,366,180 | 1,366,180 | - |  |  |  | 2,63,809 | 2,63,809 | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | NPCC NecC | ${ }_{1339}^{1339}$ | New York | ${ }_{\substack{\text { U.S. } \\ \text { Canada }}}^{\text {che }}$ | $5,169,267$ 2,16430 | 5,169,267 |  |  | $1,762,329$ $1,488,699$ | 1,762,329 |  |  |  |  |  | 3,406,938 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Npec | 1337 | Ontario | ${ }^{\text {Canada }}$ | 2,66,350 |  | 2,164,350 |  | 1,488,699 |  | ${ }^{1,488,999}$ |  |  |  | 675,651 |  | 675,651 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | NecC |  | Quebec | Canada | 3,058,277 <br> 34232 | $\bigcirc$ | $3,058,277$ 354392 | - | $1,923,866$ <br> 155484 | $\div$ | $1,923,866$ 1,5484 | - |  |  | $1,1344,411$ 19808 | - | 1,134,411 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | NpCC NPCC | 1705 1340 | New Brunswick Nova Scotia | $\underset{\substack{\text { Canada } \\ \text { canda }}}{\text { cen }}$ |  | - | 354,392 25,136 | : | 155,484 123,037 |  | 155,484 123,037 |  |  |  | 198,908 134,098 |  | 198,908 134,098 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2017 NEL Calculations and Allocations to Load Serving Entities (or Designee) for the 2019 NERC and RE Assessments

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& \& \& \& \& \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Total Regional Entity Assessments (Including WIRAB
Assessments)} \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Regional Enity NEL Assessments} \& \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Penatry Sanctions - Us only} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Npec corc Program} \& \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{WECC Compliance Assessments
(ex.AESO)} \& \& \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Wriab Assessments} <br>
\hline $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Dota } \\
\text { Year }
\end{gathered}
$$ \& Refional Entity \& ID \& Enity \& Country \& Total \& us] \& Canada \& Mexico \& Total \& us] \& Canada \& Mexico \& Total \& us \& Total \& us \& Canada \& Total \& us, \& Canada \& Mexico \& Total \& us] \& Canada \& Mexico <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1102 \& Cannelto Utitities \& us. \& 346 \& 346 \& - \& - \& 351 \& 351 \& - \& . \& (5) \& (5) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1106 \& City of croswell \& u.s. \& 957 \& 957 \& - \& \& 972 \& 972 \& \& \& (15) \& (15) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1490 \& city flansing \& u.s. \& ${ }_{5}^{53,116}$ \& ${ }^{53,116}$ \& - \& \& ${ }^{53,933}$ \& ${ }^{53,933}$ \& \& \& ${ }^{(818)}$ \& ${ }^{(818)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1120
1122 \& Coveranad diecric cooperative
CMS ERM Michigan LIC \& u.s. \& 18,156
4,293 \& 18,156
4,293 \& : \& \& 18,436
4.359 \& 18,436
4.359 \& \& \& ${ }_{(169)}^{(279)}$ \& $\underset{\substack{(279) \\ \text { (66) }}}{ }$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\mathrm{RF}}$ \& ${ }_{1124}^{1122}$ \& Constellation New Energy (Mecs.cons) \& us. \& ${ }_{29,329}$ \& $\stackrel{42,329}{429}$ \& - \& \& ${ }^{29,781}$ \& ${ }_{29,781}^{4,399}$ \& : \& \& ${ }_{(452)}$ \& ${ }_{(452)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& ${ }^{1123}$ \& Constelation New Energy (MECS.DET) \& u.s. \& 32,908 \& ${ }^{32,908}$ \& - \& \& ${ }^{33,415}$ \& 33,415 \& \& . \& (507) \& (507) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1126
1128 \& Consumers Serery Company
Detroit Edison Company \& u.s.
u.s. \& $81,0,69$
$1,087,19$ \& 810,659
$1,087,119$ \& : \& \& - $\begin{array}{r}823,139 \\ 1,103,854\end{array}$ \& - $\begin{array}{r}833,139 \\ 1,103,854\end{array}$ \& . \& . \&  \& ${ }_{(16,75)}^{(12,799)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}$ \& 1166 \& Duke Energy \ndiana \& us. \& ${ }_{718,103}$ \& ${ }^{1} 718,103$ \& \& \& ${ }^{1} 1729,157$ \& ${ }_{72,157}$ \& \& \& (11,055) \& (11,055) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1135 \& Ferdinand Municipal Light W Water \& u.s. \& 1,209 \& 1,209 \& - \& \& 1,228 \& 1,228 \& - \& - \& (19) \& (19) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1646 \& Firstenergy Solution (MECS.Cons) \& us. \& 20,898 \& 20,898 \& - \& \& 21,220 \& 21,220 \& - \& - \& (322) \& ${ }^{(322)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& ${ }_{\substack{\text { RF } \\ \text { RF }}}$ \& 1549
1145 \& Firsterergy Soutions (MECS.DET)
Hosier nerery \& u.s. \& 25,199
182302 \& 25,199
182302 \& : \& : \& 25,587
185108 \& 25,587
185108 \& : \& : \& ${ }_{\text {(28806) }}^{(138)}$ \&  \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1148 \& Indiana Municipal Power Agency (OUKE CII) \& u.s. \& 74,225 \& 74,225 \& - \& \& 75,368 \& 75,368 \& - \& - \& (1,143) \& ${ }_{(1,143)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1885 \& Indiana Municipal Powe A Agency (NTPSCO) \& u.s. \& 10,318 \& 10,318 \& - \& \& 10,477 \& 10,477 \& - \& - \& (159) \& (159) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1486
1149 \& Indian M Municipal Power Agency (SIGE)
Indianapois Power $\alpha$ Light
co. \& u.s.
u.s. \& 14,655
336,432 \& 14,365
336,432 \& : \& \& 14,586
341,611 \& 14,586
341,611 \& : \& : \& (15,179) \& (121) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1553 \& Integys \& us. \& 30,69 \& 10,699 \& - \& \& 10,833 \& 10,833 \& \& \& ${ }_{(164)}$ \& ${ }_{(1,164)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1554 \& Integrs Energy Servics (MECS-DET) \& u.s. \& 15,269 \& 15,269 \& - \& - \& 15,504 \& 15.504 \& - \& - \& (235) \& ${ }^{(235)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1666
1614 \&  \& u.s.
u.s. \& 7,208 \& 7,208 \& : \& \& 7,319
211 \& 7,319
211 \& : \& : \& ${ }_{(111)}^{(1)}$ \& ${ }_{(111)}^{(11)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1154 \& Michigan Public Power Agency \& u.s. \& 92,193 \& ${ }^{92,193}$ \& - \& \& 93,612 \& 93,612 \& \& - \& (1,419) \& (1,419) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1155 \& Michigan South Central Power Agency \& u.s. \& 17,213 \& 17,213 \& - \& \& 17,478 \& 17,478 \& . \& - \& (265) \& (265) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1158
1163 \& MidAmerican Energy Company Retail
Northern Indian Public Sevice Co. \& U.S. \& 414
427,042 \& 427,042 \& : \& $:$ \& 433,616 \& [430 4 4,616 \& : \& - \& ${ }_{\text {(6,574) }}{ }^{(6)}$ \& ${ }_{(6,574)}^{(6)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1164 \& Ontonagon County Rural liectrification Asso. \& u.s. \& 678 \& 678 \& - \& \& 688 \& 688 \& - \& \& (10) \& (10) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1265
1172 \&  \& u.s.
u.s. \& ${ }_{\text {c, }}^{16,199,836} 9$ \&  \& : \& : \& 16,445,566 \&  \& : \& : \&  \& ${ }^{(249,321)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}$ \& 1171 \& Caline Energy Soutions (k.n.a..Noble Americas Energy Soutions (MECS-DETT) \& u.s. \& 14,693 \& 14,693 \& - \& \& ${ }_{\text {14,920 }}$ \& cis, \& : \& - \& ${ }_{(226)}^{(124)}$ \& ${ }_{(1226)}^{(124)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1176 \& Direct Energy (kas.strategic Energy, LLC) (MESS.CONS) \& u.s. \& 4,669 \& 4,669 \& \& \& 4,741 \& 4,741 \& \& - \& (72) \& (12) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& ${ }_{\substack{\text { RF } \\ \text { RF }}}$ \& 1174
1581 \& Direct Energy (farastrategic Energ, LLC) (MECS-DET) \& u.s. \& 22,147 \& 22,147 \& : \& \& $\underset{\substack{\text { 22,488 } \\ \text { 2, } 261}}{1}$ \& 22,4888 \& - \& - \& ${ }^{(341)}$ \& ${ }^{(341)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1581 \& Sparta Reewewale Enersy
Spartan Renewable Energ (MM UP) \& u.s. \& 2,227
1,377 \& $2,2,37$
1,37 \& $:$ \& \& ${ }_{\substack{2,367}}^{2,261}$ \& ${ }_{\text {2, }}^{\text {2,67 }}$ \& : \& $:$ \& (12) \& ${ }_{\text {(12) }}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1180 \& Thumb lectric Cooperative \& u.s. \& 4,391 \& 4,391 \& - \& - \& 4,459 \& 4,459 \& - \& - \& ${ }^{(68)}$ \& ${ }^{(68)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1662
1181 \& Ohio Valey Electric Corporation
vectren Enersy delivery of \& U.S. \& 9,878
123,89 \& 9,878
123,879 \& $:$ \& \& 10,330
125,86 \& 10,330
125,76 \& : \& : \& ${ }_{\text {(1, }}^{(1,97)}$ (12) \& (1,907) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1184 \& Wabash valley Powe Association Inc. (OUKE CII) \& u.s. \& ${ }_{68,647}$ \& ${ }_{68,647}$ \& - \& - \& ${ }^{69,704}$ \& ${ }^{69,704}$ \& - \& - \& (1,057) \& (1,057) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 11888
1185 \& Wabash Valey Power Association Inc.(NPSCO)
Wisconsin lectric Power Co. \& u.s. \& ¢1,354
669,359 \& 41,354
669,39 \& $:$ \& : \& 41,991
679,683 \& ${ }_{679,663}^{41,91}$ \& : \& : \& (10,304) \& $(1637)$
$(10304)$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& ${ }^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1189 \& Wolverine Power Marketing cooperative \& u.s. \& 18,477 \& 18,477 \& - \& \& 18,761 \& 18,761 \& \& \& (284) \& (284) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\text {RF }}$ \& 1191
1190 \& Wolverine Power Suply cooperative
Woverine Power Marketin cooperative(MES-DET) \& u.s. \&  \&  \& : \& \& ${ }_{\substack{66,13 \\ 13,27}}$ \& 66,143
13,27 \& : \& - \& $\underset{\substack{\text { (1,003) } \\(210)}}{(12020}$ \& ${ }_{\substack{\text { c } \\ \text { (1,003) } \\ \text { (210) }}}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& TOTAL RELARBLLTTFFRSTS \& \& ${ }_{21,25,831}^{15,618}$ \& 21,25, 4,831 \& - \& . \& 21,58,046 \& ${ }_{21,583,046}^{15,07}$ \& - \& . \& (327,215) \& (327,215) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1267 \& Alabma Municipal leectric Authority \& us. \& 56,708 \& 56,78 \& - \& \& 56,79 \& 56,979 \& - \& - \& (271) \& (271) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& SERC
SERC
S \& 1268
1269 \& Alabam Power Company
Ameren -llinois \& u.s. \& ${ }_{\text {9 }} 947,767$ \& ${ }_{\text {949,767 }}^{994}$ \& $:$ \& : \& $\underset{\substack{952,295 \\ 69735}}{\text { 9, }}$ \& 952,295
697,335 \& $:$ \& $:$ \& ${ }_{\text {c }}^{(1,53,36)}$ \& ${ }_{(3,316)}^{(4,528)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& Sterc \& 1271 \& Ameren-Missouri \& u.s. \& 610,910 \& 610,910 \& - \& \& 613,829 \& 613,29 \& \& \& (2,919) \& (2,919) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& Serc \& 1273
158
158 \& Associated liectric Cooperative Inc. \& U.S. \& 318,977
18872
1 \& 318,977
18772 \& - \& : \& 320.501
18792 \& 320.501

187929 \& - \& : \& ${ }_{\text {coin }}^{(1,524)}$ \& (1,5,24) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& SERCR \& | 1582 |
| :--- |
| 1462 |
|  |
| 1 | \& Bearegadd liectic ooperativ, inc. \& u.s. \& 18,722 \& 4, $\begin{aligned} & 18,702 \\ & 4,223\end{aligned}$ \& ; \& : \& 18,792

4,24 \& - 18.7892 \& : \& \& (189) \& | (89) |
| :--- |
| $(20)$ |
| 180 | \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline ${ }_{2017} 2017$ \& ${ }_{\text {Sterc }}$ \& 1274 \& Big Rivers lectrric Corororation \& u.s. \& ${ }^{62,023}$ \& ${ }^{62,023}$ \& - \& - \& ${ }^{62,319}$ \& ${ }^{62,319}$ \& - \& - \& ${ }^{(296)}$ \& ${ }^{(296)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& SERC \& 1275
1276 \& Black Warioremc
Bue Ridge EMC \& u.s. \& ${ }_{\text {cher }}^{62,846}$ \& ${ }_{\text {cher }}^{62,846}$ \& $:$ \& . \&  \&  \& - \& - \& (109) \& ${ }_{(109)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& serc \& 1628 \& Brazs flectric Power Cooperative, inc. \& u.s. \& 7,896 \& 7,896 \& - \& - \& 7,934 \& 7,934 \& - \& - \& (38) \& (38) \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& SERC
SERC
Ster \& 1463
1277 \& Canton, MS
Centraf lectric Power Cooperative Inc. \& u.s. \& (2,166 \& 2,166
282,414 \& $:$ \& : \& 2,176
283,63 \& 2,176
288,63 \& : \& : \& ${ }_{\text {(11,39) }}^{(10)}$ \& ${ }_{(1,399)}^{(10)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& sterc \& 1667 \& Century Aluminum- Hawessille \& u.s. \& ${ }^{28,543}$ \& ${ }^{28,543}$ \& - \& \& 28,679 \& 28,679 \& \& \& (136) \& ${ }_{(136)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017 \& SERC \& 1668 \& Centur Aluminum- Sebree \& u.s. \& ${ }_{56,773}$ \& ${ }_{56,773}$ \& - \& - \& 57,044 \& 57,044 \& - \& - \& ${ }^{(271)}$ \& ${ }^{(271)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& SERC
SERC
Sel \& 1278
1279 \& Citrof y flountsown FL
city of camden
c \& u.s. \& 3,163 \& - $\begin{array}{r}611 \\ 3,163\end{array}$ \& : \& - \& 3,178 \& 3,178 \& - \& : \& ${ }_{\text {(15) }}(1)$ \& ${ }_{\text {(15) }}{ }^{(13)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& SERC \& 1280
1282 \& city of Collins Ms \& u.s. \& \% 79 \& \%999 \& - \& - \& 763
19858 \& $\begin{array}{r}763 \\ \hline 1958\end{array}$ \& - \& - \& ${ }^{(4)}$ \& ${ }^{(4)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& Strc
SERC
Ster \& 1281
1282

128 \& city of coumbia MO
City f Conway AR ( Conway Corporation) \& U.S. \& ${ }_{\text {cke }}^{19,764}$ \&  \& : \& \& [19,858 \& ${ }^{19,8888} 16$ \& : \& : \& ${ }_{(80)}^{(94)}$ \& ${ }_{\text {(80) }}(94)$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 2017
2017 \& SERC
SERC
Secter \& 1284
1285 \& city f fvergreen $A$ L
city f Hampen $6 A$ \& us. \& 920 \& 920
519 \& : \& : \& ${ }_{521}^{925}$ \& ${ }_{521}^{925}$ \& : \& - \& ${ }^{(4)}$ \& ${ }^{(4)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 7 \& SERC \& 1285
1285 \& City f flampton 6 A \& u.s. \& 519 \& ${ }_{519}^{519}$ \& - \& \& ${ }_{527}^{521}$ \& 521 \& - \& \& (2) \& ${ }^{(2)}$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ \& SERC
SERC
Ster \& 1286
1287 \& City of Harford AL
City f fenderson (kY) Municipal Power \& Light \& u.s. \& 525
0,347 \& 525
3,37 \& \& \& re, $\begin{array}{r}\text { 527 } \\ \text { 239 }\end{array}$ \& 527
10,397 \& \& \& ${ }_{\text {(4) }}^{(4)}$ \& ${ }_{\text {(3) }}(1)$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

2017 NEL Calculations and Allocations to Load Serving Entities (or Designee) for the 2019 NERC and RE Assessments

|  |  |  |  |  | Total Re | Entity Assessm Assessme | (Includin |  |  | al Enity NEL A | ssments |  | Penatry Sanction | us only | NPCC | Progra |  | cco | de asse |  |  |  | AB As | sments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Data } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Regional Enity | 10 | Entity | country | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us, | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us, | Canada | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexic |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1288 | City of North Litte Rock AR (IDENL) | u.s. | 15,574 | 15,574 |  | - | 15,649 | 15,649 | - | - | (74) | (74) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {Sterc }}$ | 1289 | City of Orageburg 5 C Department of Public Utilities | u.s. | ${ }^{13,728}$ | ${ }^{13,728}$ | - |  | ${ }^{13,793}$ | ${ }^{13,793}$ | - |  | ${ }^{(66)}$ | ${ }^{(66)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { SERC } \\ \text { SERC }}}^{\text {cer }}$ | 1290 1291 |  | u.s. u.s. | 1,368 <br> 4,608 | 1,368 <br> 4.608 <br> 2,98 | - |  | 1,374 | 1,374 | - |  | ${ }^{(7)}$ | ${ }^{(72)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | sterc | 1292 |  | u.s. | ${ }_{\text {2,769 }}$ | ${ }_{\text {2,769 }}$ | - |  | ${ }_{\text {2,782 }}$ | ${ }_{2}^{1,782}$ | . |  | ${ }_{(13)}$ | ${ }_{(13)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1115 | City of Sringfield (CWLP) | u.s. | 28,843 | 28,843 | - | - | 28,980 | 28,980 | - |  | (138) | (138) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Serc | 1465 | city of Thayer, mo | u.s. | 336 | 336 | - |  | 338 | 338 |  |  | (2) | (2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | ${ }_{1293}^{1293}$ | city of Trov Al | u.s. | 7.019 | 7.019 |  |  | 7,053 | 7,053 |  |  | (34) | (34) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ |  | ${ }_{1583}^{1294}$ | City of West Memphis AR ( West Memphis Utilities) Cliborne lectric Cooerative, Inc. | U.S. | 6,429 10,816 | 6,429 10816 | : | : | 6,460 10,888 a | c,460 10,888 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(52) }}^{(31)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(52) }}^{(31)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1584 | Concordia leetric Cooperative, inc. | u.s. | 3,544 | 3,544 |  |  | 3,561 | 3,561 | - |  | (17) | (17) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1726 | Cube Hydro Carolinas | u.s. | 244 | 244 | - |  | 245 | 245 |  |  | (1) | (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Secter | 1283 1585 | Dalto Uutilies ${ }_{\text {Dixie Iectric Memerssip Corporation }}$ | u.s. u.s. | 30,501 36,293 | 30,501 36,293 | : |  | ${ }_{\substack{30,647 \\ 36,466}}$ | 30,647 36,466 | . | : | ${ }_{\text {(176) }}^{(173)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(173) }}^{(126)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1295 | Dominion Virginia Power | u.s. | 1,435,442 | 1,435,442 |  | . | 1,442,301 | 1,442,301 | - | - | (6,588) | (6,858) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1296 | Duke Energ Carolinas, LlC | u.s. | 1,419,422 | 1,419,422 |  |  | 1,426,204 | 1,426,204 | - |  | (6,782) | (6,782) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Serc SERC Secter | 11466 148 1 | Durant MS LGEE and KU Serices Coas agent for LGEE Co and KU Co | u.s. | 424 567,588 | $\begin{array}{r}424 \\ 567,538 \\ \hline 129\end{array}$ | : | : | ( $\begin{array}{r}426 \\ 50.299\end{array}$ | ( $\begin{array}{r}426 \\ 50.249\end{array}$ | : | : | ${ }^{(2,72)}$ | ${ }^{(2,72)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1297 | East kentucky Power Cooperative | u.s. | 222,19 | 222,199 |  |  | 223,210 | 223,210 |  |  | (1,061) | (1,061) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ |  | 1298 <br> 169 <br> 1 | East Misisisipipi lectric Power Association Electictiesot North Carolina no | U.S. | 6,9311 | -6,931 | : | : |  | 枹,964 | : | : | ${ }^{(133)}$ | -133) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Ser | 1669 1300 |  | u.s. | 195,79 42,502 | 195,799 42,502 | : | - | 196,84 42,706 | 196,84 42,706 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(203) }}^{(935)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(203) }}^{(935)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1301 |  | u.s. | 1,999,324 | 1,999,324 | - | - | 2,008,876 | 2,008,876 | - | - | ${ }^{\text {(9,552] }}$ | ${ }_{\text {cem }}(9,552)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Secter | 1302 1303 |  | u.s. | 35,187 5,169 | 35,187 5,169 | : | : | 35,355 5,193 | 35,355 5,193 | : | : | $\underset{\substack{(1188) \\(25)}}{(2)}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1168) \\(25)}}^{(2)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1304 | French Broad EMC | u.s. | 8,487 | 8,487 | - | - | 8,528 | 8,528 | - | - | (41) | (41) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Ser | 1305 1306 | Georgia Power Company Georgis System Optus corporation | u.s. | $1,433,473$ 656,992 | 1,433,473 656,992 |  | : | $1,400,322$ 660,131 | $1,440,322$ <br> 660,131 | : | : | ${ }_{\substack{(6,849) \\(3,139)}}^{(129)}$ | ${ }_{\substack{(6,849) \\(3,139)}}^{(2,0)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Serc | 1479 | Greenwood (MS) Uutilites Commision | u.s. | 4,718 | 4,718 | - |  | 4,740 | 4,740 | - | - | (23) | (12) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC SREC Ser | 1307 | Greenvod (SC) Commissioners of Public Works | U.S. | - 5 , 343 | - 5 , 343 | - | - | 5,569 | 5,369 19337 | - | - | (12) | ${ }^{(26)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Serch | 1308 1586 | Guff Powe Company | U.S. | $\underset{\substack{192,18 \\ 5,178}}{\text { 2, }}$ | $\underset{\substack{192,18 \\ 5,178}}{\text { 2, }}$ | : | \% | $\underset{\substack{193,37 \\ 5,23}}{\text { cos }}$ | $\underset{\substack{193,37 \\ 5,23}}{\text { cos }}$ | : | : | ${ }_{(219)}^{(29)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(29) }}^{\text {(29) }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {serc }}$ |  | Hoosier Energy RE, Inc | u.s. | 6,774 | ${ }^{6,774}$ | - | - | ${ }_{6}^{6,806}$ | ${ }^{6,806}$ | - | - | (132) | (132) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Ser | 1309 1480 | Itinois Muncicipal Electric Agency | u.s. | 32,001 233 | 32,001 233 |  | : | $\begin{array}{r}32,154 \\ 234 \\ \hline 23\end{array}$ | 32,154 234 | : | $\because$ | ${ }_{(1)}^{(153)}$ | ${ }_{(123)}^{(153)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1587 | Jefferson Davis leatric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | 4,427 | 4,427 | - | - | 4,448 | 4,448 | - | - | (21) | (21) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Ser | 1017 1481 | Kentucky Municipal Power Kosciusk, Ms | u.s. | 11,029 1,235 | 11,029 1,235 | : | : | ${ }_{\substack{11,082 \\ 1,241}}$ | 11,082 1,241 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(53) }}^{(6)}$ | ${ }_{(6)}^{\text {(53) }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1482 | Leland, Ms | u.s. | 505 | 505 | - |  | ${ }_{507}$ | -507 |  |  | (2) | (2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Serc | ${ }_{1314}^{1313}$ | Mccormick Commission of Public Works | u.s. | ${ }_{17276} 27$ | ${ }_{\text {272 }}^{276}$ | - | : | ${ }_{17277}^{2787}$ | ${ }_{172787}^{2787}$ | : | - | ${ }^{(1)}$ | (11) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Ster | 1314 | Mist Carmel public Cutility | u.s. | ${ }_{\text {17, }}^{17,74}$ | ${ }_{\text {17, }}^{17,74}$ |  | : | ${ }_{\substack{17,1,57 \\ 1,52}}^{\text {2, }}$ | ${ }_{1}^{17,752}$ | - | - | ${ }_{(8)}^{1817}$ | ${ }_{(8)}^{1817}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1315 | Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia | u.s. | 182,513 | 182,513 | - | - | ${ }^{183,385}$ | ${ }^{183,385}$ | - | - | ${ }^{\text {(872) }}$ | ${ }^{\text {(872) }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Ser | 1316 1588 | N.C.E.Eectric Membership Corp. Northeast Luusisan Power cooperative, Inc. | U.S. | 214,880 | 21,4,480 | $:$ | . | $\underset{\substack{215,505 \\ 4,45}}{\text { 2, }}$ | $\underset{\substack{215,555 \\ 4,453}}{\text { 2, }}$ | : | : | ${ }_{\substack{\text { (1,025) } \\(21)}}^{(1)}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { (1,025) } \\(21)}}^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1574 | Northern Virginia lectric Cooperative | u.s. | 79,477 | 79,477 | - |  | 79,856 | 79,856 | - | - | (380) | (380) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Ser | 1319 1618 | Old Dominion leecric Cooperative Oscelal Afrkansas Municipal Light and Power | U.S. | 84,008 2,631 | 84,008 2,631 | $:$ | : |  | 84,409 2,643 | : | : | ${ }_{(1301)}^{(401)}$ | ${ }_{(1301)}^{(401)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1320 | Owensboro (KY) Municipal Uvilities | u.s. | 13,722 | 13,722 |  |  | 13,787 | ${ }_{13,787}^{26}$ |  |  | (66) | (66) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | ${ }_{1321}^{1321}$ | Piedmont EMC C D Duke and Prorress Areas | u.s. | 8,512 | ${ }_{\text {8,512 }}$ | - | - | 8,553 | 8,553 | - | - | ${ }^{(41)}$ | ${ }^{(41)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Ser | 1323 1589 | Piedmont Municipal Power Agency (PMPA) Pointe Coupe flectric Memb. Corp. | u.s. | 39,992 4,387 | 39,492 4 | : | - | ${ }_{\substack{3,8,681 \\ 4,408}}$ | 39,681 <br> 4,408 | : | : | ${ }_{(189)}^{(189)}$ | ${ }_{(129)}^{(189)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1266 | Powersouth Energy | u.s. | 145, 832 | 145,832 | - | - | 146,528 | 146,528 | - | - | (697) | (697) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC SERC Secter | 1330 1706 | Prairie Power, inc. Duke Energy Progesess | u.s. u.s. | 25,919 775.116 | 25,919 775,116 | $:$ | : | 26,043 778,819 | 26,043 778,819 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(3,703) }}^{(124)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(3,703) }}^{(124)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1325 | Rutherford EMC | u.s. | 22,067 | 22,067 | - | . | 22,173 | 22,173 | - | - | (105) | (105) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ |  | 1631 1326 | Sam Rayburn 68 ETE Electic Cooperative lnc. South Caroina lectic cas company | U.S. | 30,15 390,301 3 | 30,15 390,301 3 | : | : | (e, $\begin{gathered}30,299 \\ \text { 392, } 265\end{gathered}$ | 30,259 | - | - | (144) | ${ }^{(124)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Serc | 1327 | Sout caroinin tectric e cas eompny | u.s. | 145,021 | 145,021 | - | : | ${ }_{145,713}$ | 145,713 | : | ; | ${ }_{\text {(693) }}^{(1,857)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(693) }}^{(1.85)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}$ | ${ }_{\text {SERC }}$ | 1590 | South Louisiana Electric Cooperative Association | u.s. | 9,744 | 9,744 | - | - | 9,791 | 9,791 | - | - | ${ }^{(47)}$ | ${ }^{(47)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Sel | 1328 1329 | Cooperative Enery ( yormerly SMEPA) Southern llinios Power cooperative | u.s. | 162,370 26,517 | 162,370 26,517 | : | . | 163,146 26,649 | 163,146 26,649 | - | - | ${ }_{\substack{\text { (176) }}}^{(127)}$ | ${ }_{(127)}^{(776)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1591 | Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation | u.s. | ${ }^{41,368}$ | ${ }^{41,368}$ | - | - | ${ }^{41,566}$ | ${ }^{41,566}$ | - | - | (198) | (198) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | SERC SERC Secter | ${ }_{1331}^{1619}$ | Southwestern llectric Cooperative, Inc. | u.s. | (\%,0888 | (\%,0888 | : | : |  | (i.63,3132 | - | : | ${ }^{(12.521)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(12,52]) }}^{(124)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1632 | Tex-la Electric Cooperative of Texs, 1 nc | u.s. | 3,520 | 3,520 |  |  | 3,537 | 3,337 |  |  | (17) | (17) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ |  | ${ }_{1}^{1332}$ | Tombibbee Electric Cooperative Inc. Town of Sharssurs N.C. | u.s. | $\underset{\substack{2,045 \\ 329}}{ }$ | $\underset{\substack{2,045 \\ 329}}{ }$ | : | - | 2,055 | 2,055 | - | - | ${ }^{(10)}$ | ${ }^{(10)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Serer | 1594 | Town of Sharssurs, N.C.C. | U.S. | 329 938 | 329 938 |  |  | 330 943 | 330 943 |  |  | ${ }_{\text {(4) }}(2)$ | ${ }_{(4)}^{(2)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1333 | Town of Waynessille nc | u.s. | 1,560 | 1,560 |  |  | 1,567 | 1,567 |  |  | (7) | (7) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  | Totat Re, | tity Assessm | s Includin |  |  | Entity NEL As | sessments |  | Penalty Sanction | us only |  | Progra |  | wecci | easse |  |  |  | AB Ass | ssments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dota } \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | Regional Enity | 10 | Entity | Country | Total | us] | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico |
| 2017 | Serc | 1334 | Town of Winssoro Sc | u.s. | 1.047 | 1.047 | - | - | 1,052 | 1,052 | - | - | (5) | (5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC | 1335 159 159 | Town of initeville NC | us.s. | 1,912 17379 | 1,912 17379 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {1, } 916}^{17462}$ | 1096 17462 17 | : | : | (14) (83) | (84) (83) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1435 | Askansas lectricic cooperative Corporation | u.s. | ${ }_{1}^{17,3,38}$ | 173,888 | : | : | 17,43, 17 | 17,43,915 | - | , | ${ }_{(827)}^{(88)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(827) }}^{(83)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1557 | City of Clarssale, M Misisisipi | us. | 2,641 | 2,641 | - | - | 2,654 | 2,554 | - | - | (13) | (13) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Sterc SERC Ser | 1708 1588 |  | u.s. | ${ }^{2}, 322$ | 2,322 | - | - | 2,333 | 2,333 | - | - | (11) | (11) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1559 | city of Minden | u.s. | ${ }_{\text {2,334 }}$ | ${ }_{2,334}$ | - | - | 2,345 | 2,345 | - | . | ${ }_{(11)}$ | (11) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1249 | Cleco Power LLC | u.s. | 189,208 | 189,208 | - | - | 190,112 | 190,112 | - | - | (904) | (904) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC SERC Secter | 1648 1649 | Jonesboro City Water L Light Keneet Baard of Pubic Works | u.s.s. u.s. | 23,459 <br> 2,307 | 23,459 2,307 | : | : | $2,3,51$ 2,318 | $2,3,51$ 2,318 | : | : | ${ }_{\substack{\text { (112) } \\(11)}}$ | ${ }_{(111)}^{(112)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1471 | Lafivette Utilities System | u.s. | 34,698 | 34,698 | - | - | ${ }_{34,863}$ | 34,863 | - | - | ${ }^{(166)}$ | (166) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1253 | Louisiana Energ \& Powe Authority (LFPA) | u.s. | 16,161 | 16,161 | - | - | 16,238 | 16,238 | - | - | (77) | (77) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | SERC SERC Ser | 1650 143 | Malden Board of pubic Works Missuri dioint Municipal lectric utility Commission | u.S. | 840 34,988 | (840 | : | : | \% $\begin{array}{r}844 \\ \text { 35,155 }\end{array}$ | [844 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {(16) }}^{(16)}$ | ${ }_{(167)}^{(16)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Sterc | 1639 | OzMo ozark Missour, West Plains MO | u.s. | ${ }_{3,186}$ | ${ }_{3,186}$ | - | . | 3,201 | ${ }_{\text {3,201 }}$ | . | - | (15) | (15) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Ster | 1652 | Piggot Municipal Light, Water \& Sewer | u.s. | 617 | 617 | - | . | 620 | 620 | . |  | (3) | (3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | serc | 1653 | Poplar Suff Municipal Uutilies | u.s. | 6,268 | ${ }^{6,268}$ | - | - | 6,298 | 6,298 |  | - | (30) | (30) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | ${ }_{\text {Sterc }}^{\text {Sesc }}$ | 1636 1561 | city f frescott | u.s. | ${ }^{1,384}$ | ${ }^{1,384}$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 1,391 | 1,391 | - | - | (7) | (7) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1551 | Public Service Commission of Y zazo C City of Missisisippi | u.s. | 1,975 | 1,975 | - | $\cdot$ | 1,984 | 1,984 | $\cdots$ | - | ${ }^{(9)}$ | ${ }^{(9)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | SERC | 1155 | Ston Baard of Municical Uutilites | u.s. | 286 | 6,286 | - | - | 6,317 | 317 | . |  | (30) | (30) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



[^32]2017 NEL Calculations and Allocations to Load Serving Entities (or Designee) for the 2019 NERC and RE Assessment


2017 NEL Calculations and Allocations to Load Serving Entities (or Designee) for the 2019 NERC and RE Assessments

|  |  |  |  |  | Total Re | $\begin{array}{r} \text { I Entity Assessm } \\ \text { Assessmen } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1ents (Includin } \\ & \text { nts) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | nal Enity NEL As | ssessments |  | Penaty Sanctions | -us only | NPCC | corc Progra |  | wecc com | liance Assee | ments |  |  | Wirab ass | ssments |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Data year | Regiona Entity | 10 | Entity | Country | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Canada | Mexico | Total | us | Total | us | Canada | Total | us | Canada | mex | Total | us | Can | Mexico |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Deseret Generation \& Transmision Cooperative | u.s. | 3,620 | 3,620 | - |  | 3,464 | 3,464 |  |  | (94) | (94) |  |  |  | 149 | 149 |  |  | 100 | 100 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | City of farmington | u.s. | 30,937 | 30,937 | - | - | 29,06 | 29,606 | - |  | ${ }^{(801)}$ | ${ }^{(801)}$ |  |  |  | 1,274 | 1,274 |  |  | ${ }^{858}$ | ${ }_{858}$ |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Municipal Enery $\begin{aligned} & \text { gencry of Nebraska } \\ & \text { a }\end{aligned}$ | u.s. | 19,638 | 19,688 | - |  | ${ }^{18,793}$ | 18,73 | - |  | (509) | (509) |  |  |  | 808 | 808 |  |  | 545 | 545 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Wecc |  |  | u.s. | ${ }_{\text {6,740 }}$ | 6,740 | : | : | 6,450 <br> 88 | 6,450 <br> 98 | : | : | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{(175)}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1175) \\(3)}}^{(1)}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{277}$ | ${ }_{4}^{277}$ |  |  | 187 3 | 187 3 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Nebraska Public Power Marketing | u.s. | 206 | 206 | - | . | 197 | 197 |  |  | (5) | (5) |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Francis. . Warren Aif Force Base | u.s. | 377 | ${ }^{377}$ | - | - | 361 | 361 | - | - | (10) | (10) |  |  |  | 16 | 16 |  |  | ${ }^{10}$ | 10 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Town of Fredonia | u.s. | 326 | ${ }^{326}$ | - |  | 312 | 312 |  |  | (8) | ${ }^{(8)}$ |  |  |  | 13 | 13 |  |  | 9 | 9 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Tristate Generation \& Trasmision Assoc. Inc-Reliability | u.s. | 245,06 | 245,065 | - |  | 234,524 | 234,524 | - | - | $(6,347)$ | (6,34) |  |  |  | 10,089 | 10,89 |  |  | 6,799 | 6,799 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | WECC |  | Western Area Power Administration - CRSP Western Rea Power - Loveland , | u.s. | 59,761 57137 | 59,761 57137 | : | : | 57,191 54,67 | 57,191 54679 | : | - | (1,548) | (1,548) |  |  |  | 2,460 | 2,460 |  |  | ${ }_{1}^{1,558}$ | 1,658 |  |  |
| 2017 | Wecc |  | Wyoming Municipal Power Asency | y.s. | ${ }_{6,829}^{51,139}$ | ${ }_{6}^{5,829}$ | - | - | ${ }_{6,536}$ | ${ }_{6,536}$ | - | - | (177) | (177) |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {281 }}^{2,382}$ | 2,352 <br> 281 <br> 1 |  |  | 1,585 189 1 | 1,585 189 1 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Basin Eletric Power Cooperative | us. | 4,584 | 4,584 | - | - | 4,387 | 4,387 | - | - | (119) | (119) |  |  |  | 189 | 189 |  |  | 127 | 127 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Montan-Dakota Utilities C O. | u.s. | 708 | 708 | - | - | ${ }^{678}$ | ${ }^{678}$ | - | - | (18) | (18) |  |  |  | 29 | 29 |  |  | 20 | 20 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Wecc wecc cec |  | Nortwwestern Corp. bba Northwestern Energy, uc | u.s. | 9,425 11084 | 9,425 <br> 11084 <br> 1085 | : | : | 9,020 10.607 | 9,020 <br> 10.607 | - | : | ${ }_{\text {col }}^{\text {(244) }}$ | ${ }_{\text {(284) }}^{\text {(28) }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{456}^{388}$ | - 388 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}262 \\ 308 \\ \hline 1\end{array}$ | 262 308 |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Wecc |  | Western Area Power Administration-Upper Grieat Plains Region Aha Macav Powerservice | u.s. | 11,084 457 | $\underset{457}{11,084}$ | $\because$ | : | 10,607 437 | ${ }^{10,607} 4$ | $:$ | : | ${ }_{\substack{\text { (28) } \\(12)}}^{(12)}$ | $\underset{\substack{1287) \\(12)}}{(2)}$ |  |  |  | - ${ }_{4}^{456} 1$ | 456 19 |  |  | 308 13 | 308 13 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Desalter) - c/o DSw EMMO | u.s. | 3 | 3 | - |  | 3 | 3 |  | - | (0) | (0) |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Bureau of Reclamation (Wellield) | u.s. | 214 | 214 | - | - | 205 | 205 | - | - | (6) | (6) |  |  |  | , | 9 |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Central Arizon Water Consereation District | u.s. | 71,014 | ${ }^{71,014}$ | - |  | 67,960 | 67,960 |  | - | $(1,839)$ | (1,839) |  |  |  | 2,924 | 2,924 |  |  | 1,970 | 1,970 |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Wecc |  | city of Mesa Needes Public Uuilities Authority | us.s. | ${ }^{8,387}$ | ${ }^{8,327}$ | : | : | 7,969 | 7,969 | - |  | ${ }_{(216)}$ | ${ }^{(216)}$ |  |  |  | 343 | 343 |  |  | ${ }_{21}^{231}$ | ${ }^{231}$ |  |  |
| 2017 2017 | Wecc Wecc encc |  |  | u.S. | ¢ ${ }_{5}^{988}$ | ${ }_{\substack{988 \\ 552}}$ | : | : | 945 528 | 945 528 | : | : | ${ }_{\substack{(26) \\(14)}}^{(1)}$ | ${ }_{\substack{(26) \\(12)}}^{(5)}$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{23}^{41}$ | 23 |  |  | 15 | 27 15 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District 2- Coolidge Generating station | u.s. | 287 | 287 | - |  | ${ }_{275}^{528}$ | ${ }_{275}^{528}$ | ; | ; | (7) | (7) |  |  |  | 12 | 12 |  |  | 15 | 15 |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | Electrical District \#2 | u.s. | 5,904 | 5,904 |  |  | 5,650 | 5,550 |  |  | (153) | (153) |  |  |  | 243 | 243 |  |  | 164 | 164 |  |  |
| ${ }_{2017}^{2017}$ | Wecc wecc ence |  | Stive State Enery A Asociation | u.s. | 20,450 100,552 | 20,450 108,552 | : | : | 19,570 103,83 | 19,570 10388 | : | : | ${ }_{(2,812)}^{(530)}$ | ${ }_{(2,812)}^{(530)}$ |  |  |  | - $\begin{array}{r}\text { 4,469 } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 84,499 |  |  | 567 3,012 | 5671 ${ }_{\text {3,012 }}$ |  |  |
| 2017 | wecc |  | U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground | u.s. | 612 | 612 | - | - | 586 | 586 |  | - | (16) | (16) |  |  |  | 25 | 25 |  |  | 17 | 17 |  |  |
| 2017 | Wecc |  | Wellton-Mohawk lrigation \& Orainage istrict | u.s. | 158 | 158 | - | . | 152 | 152 | - | - | (4) | (4) |  |  |  | 7 | 7 |  |  | , | , |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | Wester Are Power Administration-Desert Southwest Region Total wecc | u.s. | 50,716 | 50,716 $22.60,400$ |  |  | 48,355 $25.86,686$ | 21,741,409 | 3,760,763 | 394,514 | ${ }_{(587,788)}^{(1,34)}$ | ${ }_{(188,786)}^{(1,34)}$ |  |  |  | 2,088 | 2,088 |  |  | 1,407 | 1,407 |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL WECC |  | 26,032,000 | 22,60,400 | 2,918,677 | 422,923 | 25,89, 886 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 934,144 | [951,116) | 16,972 | 750,000 | 629,532 | 109,030 |  |
| total ero |  |  |  |  | 114,21,051 | 103,47,873 | 10,310,255 | 422,923 | 106,499,109 | 97,045,322 | 9,009,273 | 394,514 | $(1,171,873)$ | $(1,771,873)$ | 8,18,815 | 6,00,747 | 2,143,068 | 0 | 934,144 | (955,116) | 16,972 | 750,000 | 62,532 | 109,030 | 11,438 |
| Summary by Regional Entity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{2}^{2017}$ | (rRCC |  |  |  | 5,527,925 | 5,827,925 |  |  | 5,827,925 157292 | 5, 277,925 1373, |  | - | 15923) | (59523) | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |
| 201720172017 |  |  |  |  | 15,471,699 $15,03,411$ | $\underset{\substack{13,914,246 \\ 9,16,256}}{12,52,}$ | ${ }^{1,557,423} 5$ | . | (15,531,192 ¢,89,596 | $\underset{\substack{13,937,769 \\ 3,128,59}}{ }$ | ${ }^{1,557,41,083}$ | - |  | (59,523) | 8,18,8815 | 6,040,74 | 2,143,068 |  |  |  |  | - | ; | - |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {RF }}^{\substack{\text { NpCC }}}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{21,255,831}$ | ${ }_{2}^{21,255,831}$ |  |  | ${ }^{21,583,046}$ | 21,583,046 |  |  | $(327,215)$ | (327,215) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 201 | ${ }_{\text {der }}^{\substack{\text { RF } \\ \text { Ser }}}$ |  |  |  | 17,32,215 | 17,372,215 |  |  | 17,45,215 | 17,455,215 |  | - | $(83,000)$ | (83,000) |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |  | : | - |  |
| 20172017Tota |  |  |  |  | 13,248,000 | 13,248,000 |  |  | 13,362,499 | 13,362,499 |  |  | (114,499) | (114,449) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TREWECC |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {26,032,000 }}^{114,211051}$ | 22,90,400 | $\frac{2,98,677}{10,30,25}$ | ${ }_{4}^{422,923}$ | + 5 +,869,686 | $\frac{21,74,409}{97,045322}$ | ${ }_{\text {3,760,76 }}^{9.009273}$ | ${ }^{394,514} 304514$ | ( 587,686$)$ | ${ }^{(587,686)}$ | ${ }^{8.183815}$ | 6.000747 | 2.14 .068 | 0 | 934,144 03414 | ${ }_{\text {[9551,16] }}^{[951116]}$ | $\frac{16,972}{16992}$ | $\frac{750,000}{75000}$ | $\frac{62,532}{629532}$ | ${ }^{\text {109,030 }} 10$ | ${ }^{11,438} 114388$ |
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Introduction

*An FTE is defined as a full-time equivalent employee.
**Refer to the Statutory Reserve Analysis on page 43 in Section B.
***Refer to the Non-Statutory Reserve Analysis on page 63 in Section C.
****NEL is defined as Net Energy for Load.

## Organizational Overview

The Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) is a 501(c)(4) social welfare organization funded through Load-Serving Entity (LSE) assessments authorized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) under Section 215 of the Federal Power Act. WECC's mission is to effectively and efficiently reduce risks to the reliability and security of the Western Interconnection's Bulk Power System (BPS). WECC operates under a delegation agreement with the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) and in accordance with its Bylaws. WECC executes its mission while working with a broad community consisting of industry stakeholders and two advisory bodies-the Member Advisory Committee (MAC) and the Western Interconnection Regional Advisory Body (WIRAB).

The Western Interconnection is a geographic area in which the use and generation of electricity is synchronized. This area includes all or part of 14 Western states in the United States, the Canadian provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, and a portion of Baja California Norte, Mexico.

WECC's value proposition is to enhance reliability and security through two measures:

1. Providing efficient and effective risk-based Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement of Reliability Standards through standards development, entity registration, compliance risk assessment, and audits and investigations; and
2. Informing the actions, practices, and decisions of industry participants, regulators, and policymakers through reliability assessments, performance analysis, situation awareness, event analysis, training, and outreach.

WECC's business philosophy is guided by three fundamental principles:
Independence - As a 501(c)(4) social welfare organization, WECC's goal is to serve the public interest. WECC represents what is best for reliability within the Western Interconnection with an impartial and unbiased voice.
Perspective - WECC is uniquely situated in a way that allows its subject matter experts to develop comprehensive and influential work products for the Western Interconnection. Partnership - WECC is focused on assuring a reliable Bulk Electric System (BES) in the West by collaborating with others who have the same reliability-driven mission.

## Membership and Governance

WECC has 373 members ${ }^{1}$ divided into the following five Membership Classes:

1. Large Transmission Owners,
2. Small Transmission Owners,
3. Electric Line of Business Entities doing business in the Western Interconnection that do not own, control, or operate transmission or distribution lines in the Western Interconnection,
4. End Users and entities that represent the interests of end users, and
5. Representatives of State and Provincial Governments.

WECC membership is open to any person or entity that has an interest in the reliable operation of the Western Interconnection BPS. WECC membership is not a requirement for participation in the WECC Standards Development Process. ${ }^{2}$

[^33]WECC is governed by a nine-member Independent Board of Directors (Board) elected by the WECC membership, and WECC's President and Chief Executive Officer. The nine Independent Directors are compensated by WECC for their time.

WECC has five governance committees that provide functional oversight of WECC operations:

1. Compliance Hearing Body (CHB),
2. Finance and Audit Committee (FAC),
3. Governance Committee (GC),
4. Human Resources and Compensation Committee (HRCC), and
5. Nominating Committee (NC).

Under the direction of the WECC Board, additional committees provide the Board with technical advice and policy recommendations:

- Joint Guidance Committee (JGC),
- Market Interface Committee (MIC),
- Member Advisory Committee (MAC),
- Operating Committee (OC),
- Reliability Assessment Committee (RAC), and
- WECC Standards Committee (WSC).

Pursuant to Section 215(j) of the Federal Power Act, FERC created WIRAB. WIRAB's purpose is to advise WECC, NERC, and FERC on the governance of WECC, and whether proposed Reliability Standards and the budget are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

WECC and FERC may ask that WIRAB give advice on other topics. Members are appointed by the Governors/Premiers from Alberta, Arizona, British Columbia, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Texas, Washington, Wyoming, and Mexico. WECC's budget does not include any costs related to WIRAB operations.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

The Board recognizes that the electric industry is undergoing profound changes nationally and in the West, and that other institutions are involved in furthering the understanding of these changes. While WECC will not duplicate the efforts of other qualified entities, the Board believes WECC should proactively address issues where the impact to the Western Interconnection's reliability are less understood or where WECC and its committees are positioned to make a significant contribution to Western BPS reliability and security.

Therefore, in addition to supporting the Electric Reliability Organization (ERO) Enterprise-driven programs and long-term strategy, the Board has established the following strategic priorities for WECC:

- Monitor progress as proposals are developed for structural changes in the West and be prepared to evaluate potential impacts on reliability.
- Assess the reliability implications of the ongoing evolution of load composition and resource mix in the Western Interconnection as well as fuel security, resource and transmission adequacy, and BPS stability.
- Identify key vulnerability issues and work with stakeholders to address them.
- Maximize sharing of operating and system data (within agreed parameters), and insights from Event Analysis including, to the extent possible, near-misses.
- Focus reliability assessment efforts on identifying the impacts and possible mitigation efforts surrounding a handful of future industry evolution scenarios or high-impact/low-probability events.


## 2019 Key Strategic Goals

NERC and the Regional Entities' business plans and budgets reflect the collaborative development of the ERO Enterprise Long-term Strategy and the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan. These documents are available on NERC's website: http://www.nerc.com/AboutNERC/Pages/Strategic-Documents.aspx. WECC supports both the long-term strategy and operating plan as well as deliverables specific to WECC that are discussed in WECC's 2018-2020 Operating Plan and described in each statutory program area in Section A.

Working collaboratively, the ERO Enterprise has established six perennial goals, each of which is supported by key contributing activities of the combined ERO Enterprise, NERC, and WECC:

1. Risk-responsive Reliability Standards;
2. Objective, risk-informed compliance monitoring, mitigation, enforcement, and entity registration;
3. Reduction of known reliability risks;
4. Identification and assessment of emerging reliability risks;
5. Identification and reduction of cyber and physical security risks; and
6. Effective and efficient ERO Enterprise operations.

## 2019 Overview of Cost Impacts

WECC's proposed 2019 statutory budget is $\$ 26.95$ million, a $\$ 147,000$ (.54-percent) decrease from the 2018 statutory budget. The net decrease is mainly attributable to the completion of the Gas/Electric Interdependence Study, which is offset by a 3-percent merit pool and labor float assumption changes based on actual turnover and vacancy rates.

Full-time equivalents (FTE) represent the fractional allocation of a full-time position's cost to one or more functional areas. Headcount $(\mathrm{HC})$ represents either vacant or filled positions. Major drivers of the change between the 2019 and 2018 statutory budgets are as follows:

- Personnel Expenses increase by $\$ 645,000$ primarily due to a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, changes in position levels, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.
- Meetings decrease by $\$ 115,000$ primarily due to fine-tuned attendance estimates for outreach events.
- Consultants and Contracts decrease by a net of $\$ 730,000$ primarily due to the completion of the Gas/Electric Interdependence Study, decreased reliance on Compliance contract labor, and increased organizational and leadership development consulting.

The following table and graphs present a summary of funding requirements for WECC's primary statutory program areas:

| Program | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projection } \\ 2018 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2018 Budget v 2019 | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reliability Standards | \$ 858,296 | \$ 767,540 | \$ 807,516 | \$ (50,780) | (5.9\%) |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification | 14,643,677 | 15,508,951 | 14,966,474 | 322,797 | 2.2\% |
| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis | 10,476,295 | 10,242,366 | 10,022,744 | $(453,551)$ | (4.3\%) |
| Training and Outreach | 895,191 | 819,891 | 938,456 | 43,265 | 4.8\% |
| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security | 223,887 | 218,881 | 215,376 | $(8,511)$ | (3.8\%) |
| Total By Program | \$27,097,346 | \$27,557,629 | \$26,950,566 | \$ (146,780) | (0.5\%) |

Comparison of 2019 to 2018 Budgeted Funding Requirements


## Personnel Analysis

In the 2019 budget, WECC is not adding any additional FTEs. WECC realigned some positions between Program Areas in its 2019 budget due to an internal reorganization in 2018. Through attrition, and due to efficiencies gained in Corporate Services, positions were redeployed to Program Areas where resources were needed most. Those shifts account for the balance of the changes in FTEs between 2019 and 2018. Details are discussed in the respective Program Area sections of the Business Plan and Budget.

|  |  |  | Direct FTEs | Shared | Total FTEs Change |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total FTEs by Program Area | Budget | Projection | 2019 | FTEs 2019 | 2019 | from 2018 |


| Operational Programs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reliability Standards | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | - |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification | 59.0 | 59.5 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 1.0 |
| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis | 38.0 | 34.4 | 39.0 | 0.0 | 39.0 | 1.0 |
| Training and Outreach | 1.3 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.7 |
| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | - |
| Total FTEs Operational Programs | 102.3 | 100.0 | 105.0 | 0.0 | 105.0 | 2.7 |
| Corporate Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical Committees and Member Forums | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - |
| General \& Administrative | 16.75 | 16.7 | 17.05 | 0.0 | 17.05 | 0.30 |
| Legal and Regulatory | 7.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | (1.0) |
| Information Technology | 8.7 | 9.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 8.7 | - |
| Human Resources | 4.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | (1.0) |
| Finance and Accounting | 4.25 | 2.8 | 3.25 | 0.0 | 3.25 | (1.0) |
| Total FTEs Corporate Services | 40.7 | 37.4 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 38.0 | (2.7) |
| Total FTEs | 143.0 | 137.4 | 143.0 | 0.0 | 143.0 | - |

## 2018 Statutory Budget and Projection and 2019 Budget Comparisons



## Section A

## Statutory Programs

## 2019 Business Plan and Budget

## Section A - Statutory Programs

## Reliability Standards Program

|  | Reliability Standards Program (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Budget |  | Budget |  | ase) |
| Total FTEs |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  |  |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 589,296 | \$ | 544,095 | \$ | $(45,201)$ |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 272,650 | \$ | 266,454 | \$ | $(6,196)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets | \$ | $(3,650)$ | \$ | $(3,033)$ | \$ | 617 |
| Total Funding Requirement | \$ | 858,296 | \$ | 807,516 | \$ | $(50,780)$ |

## Program Scope and Functional Description

The WECC Reliability Standards Program supports the NERC Reliability Standards Program as well as facilitates the development of WECC Regional Reliability Standards (RRS), WECC Regional Variances to NERC Reliability Standards, and WECC Regional Criteria.

The WECC Reliability Standards Program also conducts a five-year review of each current WECC RRS, WECC Regional Variance to NERC Reliability Standards, and WECC Regional Criteria. These reviews can result in revisions to the reviewed document, a finding that no changes are necessary, or the retirement of the document if it is determined that the document is no longer needed for reliability.

WECC supports the development of Regional Variances to NERC Reliability Standards when it is necessary to address Western Interconnection reliability issues. The variances are necessitated by a physical difference in the BPS or in instances in which Western stakeholders desire more stringent performance. WECC will only develop an RRS (rather than a variance) when a NERC Reliability Standard addressing a reliability issue does not exist.

Regional Criteria may be necessary to implement, augment or comply with NERC Reliability Standards, but they are not Reliability Standards themselves and are not enforceable. Regional Criteria may include acceptable operating or planning parameters, guides or other documents used to enhance BPS reliability.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

- WECC expects the number of RRS projects to remain low, with the majority focusing on potential retirement of existing RRSs, due to the subject matter now being included in NERC Continent-wide Standards. It is possible, but not likely, that regulatory directives could result in RRS projects. For 2019, it may be necessary to develop either new WECC RRSs or WECC Regional Variances to NERC Reliability Standards to address potential reliability concerns
resulting from the addition of multiple new Reliability Coordinators ( RC ) in the Western Interconnection.
- WECC will conduct periodic reviews of existing RRSs and Regional Criteria to improve their content and quality.
- WECC will evaluate information obtained from audit and enforcement experiences as well as information learned through events analysis to determine whether any new RRSs or revisions to existing RRSs are necessary.
- WECC expects that much of the work required to develop Regional Reliability Standards, Regional Variances to NERC Reliability Standards, and Regional Criteria will continue to be performed by voluntary stakeholder participation.
- WECC will continue to rely on stakeholder volunteers to staff most NERC Standards drafting teams. WECC staff may, at times, participate as drafting team members or observers.
- WECC Standards staff will take an active role in the communication of NERC Standards drafting teams' activities to the Western stakeholders.
- WECC will continue to review existing WECC RRSs to determine whether any are candidates for incorporation as a Regional Variance to a NERC Continent-wide Reliability Standard and, if so, coordinate with NERC to address the incorporation during NERC's next enhanced periodic review of the NERC Reliability Standard(s).
- Integration of renewable resources and related energy storage devices may require new or modified NERC Reliability Standards or WECC RRSs. WECC supports the concept and will participate, when appropriate, in the enhanced periodic reviews of NERC Reliability Standards.
- Inverter-based resource growth may result in the need for a new WECC RRS or a WECC Regional Variance to NERC Reliability Standards.
- WECC expects that the effort necessary to complete these assumptions can be achieved by existing resources.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Ensure the Western Interconnection perspective is represented in NERC Continent-wide Reliability Standards or, if necessary, through the development of Regional Variances or RRSs if a NERC Continent-wide Standard addressing a Western Interconnection reliability issue does not exist.
- Ensure that the RRSs and Regional Criteria developed using the WECC Reliability Standards Development Procedures meet the needs of the Western stakeholders.
- Ensure that development of RRSs and Regional Criteria is in accordance with the most recent WECC Reliability Standards Development Procedures.
- Ensure that WECC members and stakeholders are informed and engaged in NERC Standards development efforts.
- Coordinate with NERC's enhanced periodic review process to identify any WECC RRSs that are candidates for inclusion as an improvement to a NERC Reliability Standard or as a Regional Variance.
- Use feedback from WECC's audit and enforcement experience as well as information learned through events analysis for enhancements to WECC RRSs or WECC Regional Criteria.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses decrease by $\$ 42,000$ primarily due to the conversion of a senior engineering position to a staff level.


## Meeting Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Operating Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.

See Section B - Supplemental Financial Information for explanations of other variances between the 2018 and 2019 budgets.

Reliability Standards Program Funding Sources and Expenditures

## Statement of Activities, Fixed Assets Expenditures, and Change in Working Capital <br> 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget <br> RELIABILITY STANDARDS


Revenue
Statutory Funding
WECC Assessments
Penalty Sanctions
Total Statutory Funding
Membership Fees
Services \& Softwa
Workshops
Interest
Miscellaneous

Personnel Expenses
Salaries
Payroll Taxe
Benefits
Retirement Costs
Total Personnel Expenses
Meeting Expenses
Meetings
Travel
Conference Calls
Total Meeting Expenses
Operating Expenses
Consultants \& Contracts
Office Rent
Office Costs


Projection
Over(Under)
Budget
Inc(Dec)

## 

Professional Services Miscellaneous
Depreciation
Total Operating Expenses
Total Direct Expenses

Indirect Expenses

Other Non-Operating Expenses
Total Expenses (B)


| Change in Assets | \$ | 24,848 | \$ | 121,036 | \$ | 96,188 | \$ | $(19,105)$ | \$ | $(43,953)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Fixed Assets

| Depreciation | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | $(3,650)$ |  | $(4,036)$ |  | (386) |  | $(3,033)$ |  | 617 |
| Incr(Dec) in Fixed Assets (C) | \$ | $(3,650)$ | \$ | $(4,036)$ | \$ | (386) | \$ | $(3,033)$ | \$ | 617 |
| TOTAL BUDGET (B+C) | \$ | 858,296 | \$ | 767,540 | \$ | $(90,756)$ | \$ | 807,516 | \$ | $(50,780)$ |
| TOTAL CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL (A-B-C) | \$ | 28,498 | \$ | 125,072 | \$ | 96,574 | \$ | $(16,072)$ | \$ | $(44,570)$ |
| FTEs |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  | - |  | 3.0 |  | - |
| HC |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |  | - |  | 3.0 |  | - |

2019 WECC Business Plan and Budget

## Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification Program

| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification Program <br> (in whole dollars) <br> 2018 Budget <br> 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  | Increase <br> (Decrease) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total FTEs |  | 59.0 |  | 60.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 9,353,357 | \$ | 9,698,042 | \$ | 344,685 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 5,362,114 | \$ | 5,329,085 | \$ | $(33,029)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets | \$ | $(71,794)$ | \$ | $(60,653)$ | \$ | 11,141 |
| Total Funding Requirement | \$ | 14,643,677 | \$ | 14,966,474 | \$ | 322,797 |

## Program Scope and Functional Description

WECC's Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification Program Area (CMEP) is implemented by WECC Registered Entity Oversight and Enforcement staff members who are independent of all users, owners, and operators of the BPS. All approved and effective mandatory Reliability Standards are monitored and enforced under the CMEP, including:

- Operations and Planning (O\&P) Standards made mandatory pursuant to FERC Order 693,
- the Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Standards under FERC Order 706, and
- various other FERC Orders approving standards since Orders 693 and 706.

To accomplish its objectives, staff is divided into six main areas: 1) Organization Registration, 2) O\&P Audits and Investigations, 3) CIP Audits and Investigations, 4) Enforcement, 5) Risk Analysis, and 6) Program Administration.

WECC will continue to conduct its monitoring and enforcement activities in accordance with the Boardendorsed Regulatory Philosophy, the key tenets of which are: be an informed regulator, identify top risks to reliability, exercise discretion responsibly and enforce fairly. WECC Registered Entity Oversight staff monitors and enforces the FERC-approved NERC Reliability Standards across $373^{3}$ registered owners, operators, and users of the BPS through a variety of risk-based activities.

WECC compliance monitoring and enforcement staff will continue to dedicate, assess, and deploy required resources in support of the ERO Enterprise-level initiatives, which include the following activities:

- Regional Reliability Risk Assessments;
- Inherent Risk Assessments;
- Internal Controls Evaluations;

[^34]- Organization Registration;
- Mitigation plan reviews, acceptance, approvals, and verification;
- Reviews of self-logged minimal risk issues;
- Processing and assessing self-certification requests and guided self-certification responses;
- Review and validation of periodic data submittals;
- Internal compliance program assessments;
- Activities specific to compliance audits, spot-checks, investigations and assessments of complaints;
- Creation of compliance oversight plans along with schedules to align monitoring activities based on potential risk;
- BES Exception request activities; and
- Enforcement activities in accordance with established risk-based approaches.

These are joint ERO Enterprise initiatives that benefit NERC, the Regional Entities, and the registered entities.

## Compliance in Alberta, British Columbia, and Mexico

Alberta and British Columbia, Canada; and a portion of Baja California Norte, Mexico; are all part of the Western Interconnection and have adopted or are adopting mandatory Reliability Standards based on FERC-approved Standards. WECC has entered into agreements with the Alberta Market Surveillance Administrator (MSA), the British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC), and Mexico's Comisión Reguladora de Energía (CRE) under which WECC performs compliance monitoring activities to help assure reliability across international borders within the Western Interconnection.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

The Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification Program Area incorporates the Regional Entity-specific contributing activities as described in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, and includes the following additional WECC-specific assumptions:

- WECC promotes a culture of compliance that addresses reliability risks by monitoring the FERCapproved NERC Reliability Standards for applicable entities through audits and/or spot-checks. WECC applies a risk-based approach that covers and ensures all audit, on-site/off-site and postaudit activities are completed in accordance with the NERC Rules of Procedure and the CMEP within the United States. With respect to non-U.S. jurisdictions, WECC monitors compliance in accordance with the approved agreements and applicable compliance monitoring programs with Canadian and Mexican authorities.
- WECC will develop and implement compliance oversight plans for registered entities focusing on relevant risks, including consideration of inherent risk assessments, entity performance history, and the effectiveness of internal controls.
- WECC will continue work in consultation with the international compliance enforcement authorities to determine which elements of the risk-based CMEP should be incorporated in the respective programs for international entities. Currently, WECC does not conduct Inherent Risk Assessments (IRA) or Internal Controls Evaluations (ICE) for international entities.
- WECC will allocate resources and provide continued support for the implementation of cybersecurity Reliability Standards for CIP v5 training, coordination, and facilitation of ERO Enterprise efforts and initiatives.
- Resource allocation will continue for activities associated with registration. WECC plans to participate in four NERC-led centralized review panel sessions as part of the application process for materiality tests of the risk-based registration process outlined in Appendix 5A of the NERC Rules of Procedure. WECC will continue to review, assess, validate, and submit registration recommendations to NERC for new registrations, partial deactivations, transfer of access and full deregistration changes impacting the NERC Compliance Registry (NCR).
- WECC will fully support ERO Enterprise efforts and activities to evaluate ERO business practices, consistency, implementation, and guidance within the risk-based CMEP. WECC will provide feedback to the ERO Enterprise regarding existing risks, with an emphasis on standard development, standard modification, audit and monitoring approaches, and potential gaps. WECC will work within the ERO Enterprise to develop application business requirements and allocate resources to test business functionality for application projects.
- WECC will use the results of the Regional Reliability Risk Assessment (RRA) to build areas of focus in the WECC CMEP Implementation Plan.
- WECC does not anticipate any hearings in 2019. To date, WECC has never had a hearing and; therefore, does not budget for them. Any costs related to a hearing that may occur will be funded through working capital reserves.
- One position is transferred from Finance and Accounting to realign resources based on business need and efficiencies gained in Finance and Accounting.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Process and complete organization registration request reviews, validations, and recommendations to NERC in accordance with risk-based registration activities and initiatives.
- Process all BES Exception submittals.
- Participate in ERO Enterprise working groups to ensure consistency in processing registration requests in accordance with the NERC Rules of Procedure outlined in Appendix 5b (Statement of Compliance Registry Criteria).
- Monitor and enforce compliance with mandatory standards in accordance with the WECC/NERC Delegation Agreement, including the Rules of Procedure and the CMEP within the U.S. With respect to non-U.S. jurisdictions, monitor compliance in accordance with the approved agreements and applicable compliance monitoring programs with Canadian and Mexican authorities.
- Complete 25 on-site audits and eight off-site audits of registered entities for 2019. Additional compliance audits and/or spot checks will be determined from risk-based analysis.
- Complete initial Inherent Risk Assessments by the end of 2019 for all entities registered after June 2016.
- Gather and review risk reports and operations information to update WECC's Regional RRA of the Western Interconnection.
- Work with registered entities within the WECC Region to promote a strong culture of compliance and reliability improvement.
- Represent the Western Interconnection on issues that will impact WECC regarding NERC and regional initiatives, for example: refining risk-based concepts in compliance monitoring and enforcement for the risk-based CMEP, streamlining enforcement processing, increasing consistency across the Regions and reviewing information-technology needs.
- Conduct outreach to the industry in various forums-webinars, conferences, and entity-specific engagements-in support of ERO Enterprise activities and priorities.
- Monitor and manage enforcement measures and metrics in support of the ERO Enterprise Strategic Plan, including caseload index, violation aging and mitigation plan aging; and collaborate with the ERO Enterprise to develop better measures of program effectiveness.
- Continue working with NERC and the other Regional Entities to shape and refine the ERO Enterprise enforcement philosophy that supports uniform, repeatable, transparent, and reliability-focused approaches.
- Conduct initial violation fact and circumstance reviews, and resolve enforcement actions in a timely manner using a reliability risk-based focus. Ensure enforcement discretion is consistent with NERC directives and FERC Orders, rules, and regulations.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses increase by a net of $\$ 538,000$ primarily due to one FTE transferred from Finance and Accounting, a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, changes in position levels, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.


## Meeting Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Operating Expenses

- Consultants and Contracts decrease by $\$ 135,000$ due to reduced reliance on Compliance contract labor and increased staff skill sets.
- Office Costs decrease by $\$ 49,000$ primarily due to renegotiated webCDMS fees.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.

See Section B - Supplemental Financial Information for explanations of other variances between the 2018 and 2019 budgets.

## Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification Program Funding Sources and Expenditures



## Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis Program

| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total FTEs |  | 38.0 |  | 39.0 |  | 1.0 |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 7,093,002 | \$ | 6,602,599 | \$ | $(490,403)$ |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 3,453,565 | \$ | 3,463,906 | \$ | 10,341 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets | \$ | $(70,272)$ | \$ | $(43,761)$ | \$ | 26,511 |
| Total Funding Requirement | \$ | 10,476,295 | \$ | 10,022,744 | \$ | $(453,551)$ |

## Program Scope and Functional Description

WECC conducts a variety of assessments, analyses, and studies essential to the reliable planning and operation of the BPS in the Western Interconnection. In addition, WECC compiles and distributes data and information used by WECC stakeholders to aid in regional and local planning studies. These integrated assessment and planning efforts enhance WECC's overall ability to assess potential reliability risks in the Western Interconnection.

The RAPA program area is organized into three departments:

1. The Performance Analysis Department conducts robust analyses on the historical operation and performance of the Western Interconnection to use as building blocks to assess Interconnection-wide risks and vulnerabilities. The information produced helps to identify best practices and mitigate potential risk.
2. The Events Analysis Department analyzes system conditions and events that impact or have the potential to impact the reliable operation of the BPS. The activities of the department ensure that WECC stakeholders, NERC, and FERC are well-informed of system events, emerging trends, lessons learned, and expected actions impacting BPS reliability.
3. The Reliability Planning Department develops and maintains WECC's integrated capability to study Western Interconnection reliability issues for the near- and long-term planning horizon. The group is the NERC-designated, Interconnection-wide model builder under MOD-32 and is focused on developing the planning tools and data sets to support transmission planning, and performing special studies on priority reliability issues as they are identified. The studies, made in close collaboration with the WECC technical committees, consider both system adequacy and system stability.

In addition to the Western Interconnection-specific work described above, WECC's RAPA program supports the development of NERC's RAPA activities through targeted data gathering and, as needed, participation in special reliability assessments.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

The Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis Program Area incorporates the Regional Entityspecific contributing activities as described in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, and includes the following additional WECC-specific assumptions:

- The RAPA staff and WECC technical committees will continue to focus on assessment activities that address the Strategic Priority areas identified by the WECC Board in December 2016 as well as any near-term priorities approved by the Board in June 2018.
- Building on the NERC Reliability Issues Steering Committee (RISC) Report, WECC staff and stakeholders will continue to play a leadership role in the identification of Western Interconnection-specific reliability challenges.
- One position is transferred from Human Resources to realign resources based on business needs and due to efficiencies gained in Human Resources.
- In 2017 and 2018, WECC performed an extensive assessment that identified key vulnerabilities related to the interface between the gas and electric systems, and explored potential mitigating measures. In 2019, WECC will continue to work with stakeholders and policymakers to highlight the key vulnerabilities identified and support efforts to mitigate them.
- The 2019 RAPA budget for meetings and travel to support the committees is forecasted to be slightly higher than 2018 due to the continuation of the 2018 schedule for subcommittee and work group in-person meetings, while allowing each committee, subcommittee, and work group to have one hosted meeting in 2019.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Implement the three-year planning cycle, in conjunction with the JGC, to align staff and technical committee work plans in support of the Board-approved strategic priorities.
- Coordinate internally with Western Interconnection stakeholders and with NERC to ensure that emerging reliability challenges are identified and addressed in work plans that may include reliability impacts as a result of the changing RC registry.
- Prepare Interconnection-wide power flow and stability base cases, and conduct studies to address key reliability challenges facing the Interconnection. Use base cases and power flow capabilities to study emerging issues (e.g., frequency response) and system vulnerabilities.
- Provide technical oversight, insight, and guidance to analyze frequency response trends and recommend any actions to minimize reliability risks and/or improve modeling capabilities.
- Complete Interconnection-wide reliability assessments that address resource adequacy, transmission infrastructure utilization, and other key factors in the 10-and 20-year planning horizon using the most applicable tools and models to identify potential future reliability risks.
- Implement lessons learned from the 2028 Anchor Data Set (ADS) and begin development of the 2030 ADS by preparing the 2030 Heavy Summer Base Case.
- Facilitate dynamic model development.
- Continue to develop and maintain a database(s) for production cost, capital expansion and other models, and conduct reliability assessments to meet the needs of NERC, WECC and stakeholders.
- Enhance tools and capabilities used for probabilistic-based planning and analysis.
- Conduct reliability assessments evaluating the adequacy and security of the system in the planning horizon, including supporting the NERC Long-Term Reliability Assessment and incorporated probabilistic assessment, Summer Reliability Assessment, and Winter Reliability Assessment.
- Conduct special reliability assessments as needed or requested by NERC for low-probability/high-impact events such as geomagnetic disturbances or prolonged droughts.
- Use data from actual system disturbances to validate power flow and stability base-case models and to identify near-misses.
- Publish WECC Transmission Maps of the existing and planned system.
- Facilitate the Project Coordination and Project Rating Review Process.
- Process BES Exception requests.
- Verify and submit NERC Transmission Availability Data System (TADS), Generator Availability Data System (GADS), Demand-Response Availability Data System (DADS) and Misoperation Information Data Analysis System (MIDAS) filings.
- Analyze trends and patterns in historical system performance, resource and load composition, and publish in reports such as the annual State of the Interconnection report.
- Assess Interconnection performance through site visits or short surveys regarding key operational practices to identify and share best practices and potential risks to Interconnectionwide reliability.
- Evaluate historical system performance trends to identify reliability risk metrics, key indicators, and potential improvement strategies. Work with WECC technical committees to engage in proactive reliability improvement activities.
- Enhance risk analysis capabilities through increased analysis of risk data sources such as Event Analysis Reports, TADS, GADS, and protection system misoperations.
- Identify key vulnerability issues and work with stakeholders to address them (e.g., physical and cyber security, situation awareness and coordination across neighboring systems, human performance, and equipment misoperations or failures).
- Complete Event Analysis Reports and develop Lessons Learned to support a high level of reliability within the BPS while minimizing the possibility of major significant events and preventing reoccurrence of similar events.
- Update and enhance the Reliability Risk Assessment to prospectively identify key risks to the Western Interconnection.
- Develop Reliability Guidelines, technical white papers and reports, and reference documents to address emerging issues, operational risks, and industry concerns related to system operations.
- Ensure the Western Interconnection is represented in reliability matters by participating in various NERC committees, WECC committees, and industry forums.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses increase by a net of $\$ 133,000$ primarily due to one FTE transferred from Human Resources, a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, changes in position levels, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.


## Meeting Expenses

- No significant changes.

Operating Expenses

- Consultants and Contracts decrease by a net of $\$ 595,000$ primarily due to the completion of the Gas/Electric Interdependence Study.
- Office Costs decrease by $\$ 15,000$ primarily due to changes in software products maintained and license fee structures.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.

See Section B - Supplemental Financial Information for explanations of other variances between the 2018 and 2019 budgets.

Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis Program Funding Sources and Expenditures

| Statement of Activities, Fixed Assets Expenditures, and Change in Working Capital 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $2018$ <br> Budget |  | $2018$ <br> Projection |  | ariance <br> 8 Budget <br> Projection <br> (Under) |  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance <br> 19 Budget <br> 18 Budget <br> nc(Dec) |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statutory Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WECC Assessments |  | 10,016,218 | \$ | 10,016,218 | \$ | - | \$ | 9,560,414 | \$ | $(455,804)$ |
| Penalty Sanctions |  | 780,059 |  | 780,059 |  | - |  | 218,283 |  | $(561,776)$ |
| Total Statutory Funding |  | 10,796,277 | \$ | 10,796,277 | \$ | - | \$ | 9,778,697 | \$ | $(1,017,580)$ |
| Membership Fees | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Interest |  | 27,859 |  | 91,919 |  | 64,060 |  | 44,571 |  | 16,712 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Revenue (A) |  | 10,824,136 | \$ | 10,888,196 | \$ | 64,060 | \$ | 9,823,268 | \$ | $(1,000,868)$ |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 4,127,042 | \$ | 4,045,231 | \$ | $(81,811)$ | \$ | 4,278,285 | \$ | 151,243 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 309,708 |  | 257,870 |  | $(51,838)$ |  | 294,608 |  | $(15,100)$ |
| Benefits |  | 501,612 |  | 543,550 |  | 41,938 |  | 494,397 |  | $(7,215)$ |
| Retirement Costs |  | 349,627 |  | 364,298 |  | 14,671 |  | 353,659 |  | 4,032 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 5,287,989 | \$ | 5,210,949 | \$ | $(77,040)$ | \$ | 5,420,949 | \$ | 132,960 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 126,812 | \$ | 87,506 | \$ | $(39,306)$ | \$ | 128,110 | \$ | 1,298 |
| Travel |  | 239,345 |  | 296,578 |  | 57,233 |  | 244,640 |  | 5,295 |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 366,157 | \$ | 384,084 | \$ | 17,927 | \$ | 372,750 | \$ | 6,593 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 1,185,000 | \$ | 1,228,828 | \$ | 43,828 | \$ | 590,000 | \$ | $(595,000)$ |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 229,824 |  | 252,762 |  | 22,938 |  | 214,564 |  | $(15,260)$ |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | 24,032 |  | 27,742 |  | 3,710 |  | 4,336 |  | $(19,696)$ |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 1,438,856 | \$ | 1,509,332 | \$ | 70,476 | \$ | 808,900 | \$ | $(629,956)$ |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 7,093,002 | \$ | 7,104,365 | \$ | 11,363 | \$ | 6,602,599 | \$ | $(490,403)$ |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 3,453,565 | \$ | 3,212,017 | \$ | $(241,548)$ | \$ | 3,463,906 | \$ | 10,341 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (B) |  | 10,546,567 | \$ | 10,316,382 | \$ | $(230,185)$ | \$ | 10,066,505 | \$ | $(480,062)$ |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 277,569 | \$ | 571,814 | \$ | 294,245 | \$ | $(243,237)$ | \$ | $(520,806)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(24,032)$ | \$ | $(27,742)$ | \$ | $(3,710)$ | \$ | $(4,336)$ | \$ | 19,696 |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | $(46,240)$ |  | $(46,274)$ |  | (34) |  | $(39,425)$ |  | 6,815 |
| Incr(Dec) in Fixed Assets (C) | \$ | $(70,272)$ | \$ | $(74,016)$ | \$ | $(3,744)$ | \$ | $(43,761)$ | \$ | 26,511 |
| TOTAL BUDGET (B+C) |  | 10,476,295 | \$ | 10,242,366 | \$ | $(233,929)$ | \$ | 10,022,744 | \$ | $(453,551)$ |
| TOTAL CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL (A-B-C) | \$ | 347,841 | \$ | 645,830 | \$ | 297,989 | \$ | $(199,476)$ | \$ | $(547,317)$ |
| FTEs |  | 38.0 |  | 34.4 |  | (3.6) |  | 39.0 |  | 1.0 |
| HC |  | 38.0 |  | 38.0 |  | - |  | 40.0 |  | 2.0 |

Training and Outreach Program


## Program Scope and Functional Description

The Training and Outreach Program Area provides outreach, education, and training on the application of Reliability Standards, compliance issues, improvement of compliance programs, reliability planning and performance analysis, grid operations, human performance, and Train-the-Trainer.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

The Training and Outreach Program Area incorporates the Regional Entity-specific contributing activities as described in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, and includes the following additional WECC-specific assumptions:

- Deliver two Compliance Workshops to provide in-depth education and training related to:
o lessons learned and process improvement for implementation of risk-based concepts in the Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program (CMEP);
o enforcement trends and statistics; and
o information on audit approach for upcoming O\&P standards and CIP standards changes and transitions.
- Conduct one Western Reliability Summit in 2019 to enhance outreach to all stakeholders as part of the three-year planning process.
- Conduct education webinars and workshops to expand awareness of reliability planning tools, modeling capabilities, and results.
- Transfer one position from Legal and Regulatory to realign resources based on business need and efficiencies gained in Legal and Regulatory.
- Transfer 0.3 FTE to General and Administrative based on changes in roles and responsibilities.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Provide eight Compliance Open Webinars.
- Deliver four Grid Fundamentals workshops.
- Deliver one Train-the-Trainer workshop.
- Create and deliver one Human Performance Work Group conference.
- Deliver two Compliance Workshops.
- Host a third Western Reliability Summit to gather input to identify and analyze risks and challenges to the reliability of the BPS.
- Create and deliver educational outreach in the form of webinars and workshops on:
o reliability planning tools and modeling capabilities, including base-case and commoncase studies;
o contingency studies and analysis;
o RAC studies;
o scenario planning and regulatory issues and trends; and
o events analysis.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses increase by $\$ 101,000$ due to an increase of 0.7 FTE, a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, changes in position levels, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.


## Meeting Expenses

- Meetings decrease by $\$ 105,000$ due to reductions in anticipated attendance at outreach events.


## Operating Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.

See Section B - Supplemental Financial Information for explanations of other variances between the 2018 and 2019 budgets.

## Training and Outreach Program Funding Sources and Expenditures

| Statement of Activities, Fixed Assets Expenditures, and Change in Working Capital 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRAINING AND OUTREACH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2018$ <br> Budget |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Projection } \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance 2018 Budget v 2018 Projection Over(Under) |  | $2019$ <br> Budget |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget Inc(Dec) |  |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statutory Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WECC Assessments | \$ | 357,225 | \$ | 357,225 | \$ | - | \$ | 481,798 | \$ | 124,573 |
| Penalty Sanctions |  | 26,686 |  | 26,686 |  | - |  | 11,194 |  | $(15,492)$ |
| Total Statutory Funding | \$ | 383,911 | \$ | 383,911 | \$ | - | \$ | 492,992 | \$ | 109,081 |
| Membership Fees | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  | 0.00 | \$ | - |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | 540,050 |  | 373,062 |  | $(166,988)$ |  | 424,500 |  | $(115,550)$ |
| Interest |  | 953 |  | 5,663 |  | 4,710 |  | 2,286 |  | 1,333 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Revenue (A) | \$ | 924,914 | \$ | 762,636 | \$ | $(162,278)$ | \$ | 919,778 | \$ | $(5,136)$ |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 174,914 | \$ | 245,678 | \$ | 70,764 | \$ | 254,696 | \$ | 79,782 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 12,496 |  | 18,607 |  | 6,111 |  | 18,305 |  | 5,809 |
| Benefits |  | 19,229 |  | 27,824 |  | 8,595 |  | 29,484 |  | 10,255 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 15,656 |  | 21,446 |  | 5,790 |  | 21,064 |  | 5,408 |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 222,295 | \$ | 313,555 | \$ | 91,260 | \$ | 323,549 | \$ | 101,254 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 514,130 | \$ | 284,877 | \$ | $(229,253)$ | \$ | 409,173 | \$ | $(104,957)$ |
| Travel |  | 10,315 |  | 5,463 |  | $(4,852)$ |  | 10,603 |  | 288 |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 524,445 | \$ | 290,340 | \$ | $(234,105)$ | \$ | 419,776 | \$ | $(104,669)$ |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 4,560 | \$ | - | \$ | $(4,560)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(4,560)$ |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 27,325 |  | 20,973 |  | $(6,352)$ |  | 19,517 |  | $(7,808)$ |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 31,885 | \$ | 20,973 | \$ | $(10,912)$ | \$ | 19,517 | \$ | $(12,368)$ |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 778,625 | \$ | 624,868 | \$ | $(153,757)$ | \$ | 762,842 | \$ | $(15,783)$ |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 118,148 | \$ | 197,874 | \$ | 79,726 | \$ | 177,636 | \$ | 59,488 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (B) | \$ | 896,773 | \$ | 822,742 | \$ | $(74,031)$ | \$ | 940,478 | \$ | 43,705 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 28,141 | \$ | $(60,106)$ | \$ | $(88,247)$ | \$ | $(20,700)$ | \$ | $(48,841)$ |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | $(1,582)$ |  | $(2,851)$ |  | $(1,269)$ |  | $(2,022)$ |  | (440) |
| Incr(Dec) in Fixed Assets (C) | \$ | $(1,582)$ | \$ | $(2,851)$ | \$ | $(1,269)$ | \$ | $(2,022)$ | \$ | (440) |
| TOTAL BUDGET (B+C) | \$ | 895,191 | \$ | 819,891 | \$ | $(75,300)$ | \$ | 938,456 | \$ | 43,265 |
| TOTAL CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL (A-B-C) | \$ | 29,723 | \$ | $(57,255)$ | \$ | $(86,978)$ | \$ | $(18,678)$ | \$ | $(48,401)$ |
| FTEs |  | 1.3 |  | 2.1 |  | 0.8 |  | 2.0 |  | 0.7 |
| HC |  | 1.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 1.0 |

## Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security Program

| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | (Decrease) |  |
| Total FTEs |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  | - |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 134,221 | \$ | 127,569 | \$ | $(6,652)$ |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 90,883 | \$ | 88,818 | \$ | $(2,065)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets | \$ | $(1,217)$ | \$ | $(1,011)$ | \$ | 206 |
| Total Funding Requirement | \$ | 223,887 | \$ | 215,376 | \$ | $(8,511)$ |

## Program Scope and Functional Description

WECC's Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security (SAIS) Program Area maintains near-Real-time awareness about the conditions and significant occurrences on the BPS in the Western Interconnection, with the objective of recognizing conditions and situations that could impact the reliability of the BPS. WECC has access to limited Real-time data via the Situation Awareness for FERC, NERC, and the Regions (SAFNR) tool, Genscape Real-time Power Application, and the University of Tennessee Frequency Monitoring NETwork (FNET).

This program is part of WECC's delegation-related accountabilities to NERC and does not in any way duplicate the Real-time situation awareness and operating coordination provided by other entities within the Western Interconnection. WECC's role is to understand system issues when they emerge and coordinate with relevant parties (typically NERC and FERC) about the conditions of the BPS. Through this coordination, WECC is seeking to discern patterns and identify trends that will help in building a stronger and more resilient system. Additionally, WECC staff responds to events by providing coordination, assistance and communication with the Reliability Coordinator(s), stakeholders, WECC management, and NERC SAIS personnel.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

The SAIS Program Area incorporates the Regional Entity-specific contributing activities as described in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, and includes the following additional WECCspecific assumptions. WECC will:

- Continue using the SAFNR tool and Genscape Real-time Power Application to provide situation awareness capabilities to WECC.
- Use WECC's situation awareness capabilities to support NERC and FERC's efforts for situation awareness of current system conditions.
- Continue working with stakeholders, government agencies, NERC, and the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center (E-ISAC) to ensure appropriate event information is being disseminated to industry entities in a timely manner.
- Maximize sharing of operating and system data, within agreed parameters, and insights from Events Analysis, including near-misses, to optimize understanding of reliability issues, promote operational excellence, share best practices/lessons learned in a timely manner, and engage third-party experts to expand capabilities and resources applied to critical reliability issues.
- Collaborate with specific stakeholder groups in the development of lessons learned and recommendations from events and identified risks.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Monitor system events, collect information, and coordinate the distribution of timely updates on system events to WECC management, industry stakeholders, and NERC SAIS personnel;
- Continue to work with NERC to monitor system data, weather, and technological developments to understand trends that affect reliability for the near- and long-term horizons;
- Participate on daily NERC SAIS calls to coordinate, report, and receive any critical information;
- Continue to support efforts and work to develop and enhance ways to improve the use of SAFNR and Genscape Real-time Power Application data to further support SAIS;
- Ensure the Western Interconnection is represented in reliability matters by participating in various NERC committees and industry forums;
- Participate as appropriate in periodic wide-area security exercises (e.g., GridEx, Monitoring and Situation Awareness Workshop, NERC Human Performance Conference); and
- Ensure support for critical infrastructure security by promoting rapid and appropriate sharing of situation awareness information regarding security occurrences.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Meeting Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Operating Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.

See Section B - Supplemental Financial Information for explanations of other variances between the 2018 and 2019 budgets.

Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security Program Funding Sources and Expenditures


## Corporate Services


*WECC's 2019 Corporate Services budget (expenses plus fixed asset activity) is $\$ 9,746,599$, of which $\$ 526,844$ is allocated to nonstatutory activities. As a result of the allocation to the non-statutory function, the Corporate Services expenses included in the 2019 statutory budget are $\$ 9,219,755$, which is a $\$ 46,878$ decrease from the 2018 budget of $\$ 9,172,877$.

## Program Scope and Functional Description

WECC's Corporate Services encompasses the following program areas and includes all business and administrative functions of the organization:

These functions are necessary for the existence and operation of the organization and support the performance of WECC's statutory activities. This area provides executive leadership; communications and external affairs; and administrative support for WECC staff, committees, members, and management. Corporate Services includes Board fees and expenses, and provides logistics support for the Salt Lake City office and meeting facilities, and the Vancouver office.

Methodology for Allocation of Corporate Services Expenses to Programs
Corporate Services expenses are allocated to statutory and non-statutory program areas based on FTEs.

## Technical Committees and Member Forums

## Program Scope and Functional Description

WECC provides forums for members and other interested stakeholders within its footprint to discuss and share reliability, compliance, and operating concerns through the Standing Committees and the JGC.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

- The Standing Committees (OC, MIC, and RAC) meet three times each year. In 2019, all Standing Committee meeting will be held in Salt Lake City.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Meeting Expenses

- Meetings decrease by $\$ 30,000$ due to all Standing Committee meetings being held in Salt Lake City.


## Operating Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.


## General and Administrative

## Program Scope and Functional Description

The General and Administrative Department provides executive leadership; communications; and administrative support for WECC staff, committees, members, and management; as well as logistics support of the Salt Lake City office and meeting facilities. In addition, indirect costs such as Office Rent that benefit multiple functional areas are accounted for in this budget.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

- Transfer 0.3 FTE from Training and Outreach based on changes in roles and responsibilities.
- Provide the same level of meetings and meeting support for the Board of Directors and Board Committees in 2019.
- Hold the 2019 Annual Meeting in Seattle.
- Compensate Board members for meeting participation in accordance with the current Board compensation structure.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Provide excellent executive leadership and strong strategic guidance for the activities undertaken by WECC and ensure that WECC supports the ERO Enterprise Long-Term Strategy and ERO Enterprise Operating Plan.
- Support and coordinate the logistics for the Board of Directors and Board Committees.
- Continue to enhance the meetings team and stakeholder services groups to drive efficiencies and effective services throughout WECC.
- Continue to enhance the external relations and outreach programs.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses increase by $\$ 135,000$ due to a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.


## Meeting Expenses

- Meetings increase by $\$ 20,000$ primarily due to an estimated increase in the cost of off-site meetings.
- Travel decreases by $\$ 20,000$ primarily due to the alignment of Board Director travel with historical trends.
- Conference Calls decrease by $\$ 17,000$ to align budget with actual usage trends.


## Operating Expenses

- Consultants and Contracts increase by $\$ 84,000$ primarily due to organizational and leadership development consulting.
- Office Rent increases by $\$ 29,000$ due a new lease for the Vancouver, WA office.
- Office Costs increase by $\$ 53,000$ primarily due to the replacement of some office furniture, expansion of WECC stakeholder's recognition wall and updating WECC's corporate collateral.


## Fixed Assets

- Leasehold Improvements increase by $\$ 12,000$ due to improvements for the Salt Lake City office space.


## Legal and Regulatory

## Program Scope and Functional Description

The Legal and Regulatory Department provides coordinated legal services to the WECC Board, committees, and staff, in addition to consistent legal interpretations of relevant statutes, regulations, court opinions, and regulatory decisions. The department also develops specific subject matter expertise to further assist WECC with its legal needs. On occasion, major efforts may be outsourced to select law firms, but the responsibility for all legal matters remains with the Legal and Regulatory Department.

WECC's international operations and its broad scope of activities require significant legal support and review. Arranging for legal support is complicated by the technical nature of this developing area of law and there are many potential areas of conflict prohibiting the use of law firms with energy practices.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

- Maintain the scope of its current operations and ensure that WECC contributes positively to the ERO Enterprise's activities.
- Transfer one position to Training and Outreach to realign resources based on business need and due to efficiencies gained in Legal and Regulatory.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Provide efficient, cost-effective legal support to the WECC Board, committees and staff through a combination of in-house and outside resources.
- Advise WECC departments on specified legal matters and general matters relating to WECC business.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses decrease by a net of $\$ 54,000$ due to one FTE transferred to Training and Outreach, a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.


## Meeting Expenses

- Travel increases by $\$ 14,000$ due to increased travel requirements and attendance at off-site meetings.


## Operating Expenses

- Professional Services decrease by $\$ 24,000$ primarily based on estimates derived from current insurance premiums.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.


## Information Technology

## Program Scope and Functional Description

WECC's Information Technology (IT) Department provides systems support including: servers, data, email, telephone systems, and internet and Intranet website maintenance. In addition, IT includes development of new technology solutions using both internal staff and working with external service providers. IT provides resources and tools to enable the organization to meet evolving requirements to support activities and responsibilities as directed by NERC and FERC.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

The Information Technology Program Area incorporates the Regional Entity-specific contributing activities as described in the ERO Enterprise Operating Plan, and includes the following additional WECC-specific assumptions.

- Use consultants as needed instead of increasing headcount.
- Achieve long-term levelized costs by obtaining subscription services for software and infrastructure when practical.
- Replace personal computer equipment on a four-year refresh cycle, refresh servers every five years, and replace network equipment every seven-to-10 years.
- Support the ERO Enterprise IT Strategy and continue working collaboratively to minimize duplication of effort and investments and improve operational efficiency.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Continue to provide increased data support, analysis, and communication.
- Create centralized databases, automated processes, and tools to organize a growing volume of electronic data that will be in high demand.
- Add to WECC's security capabilities with additional authentication controls and enhanced threat detection.
- Enhance document management, business process workflow and records retention solutions.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses increase by $\$ 40,000$ due to a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.


## Meeting Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Operating Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Fixed Assets

- Fixed Assets increase by a net of $\$ 48,000$ primarily due to planned 2019 refreshes of file servers and storage area networks. Additionally, one-time software purchases in 2018 were not replaced with additional tools in 2019.


## Human Resources

## Program Scope and Functional Description

Human Resources (HR) is responsible for the delivery of all HR functions to WECC, including: recruitment, staffing, compensation, benefits, safety, health and wellness, employee relations, performance management, succession planning, and employee training and development. HR maintains Human Resources-related databases and ensures compliance with all federal and state requirements.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

- Hold WECC's total headcount flat.
- Maintain current benefit levels and negotiate minimal premium increases.
- Ensure gaps in skills are minimalized through training and development.
- Transfer one FTE to RAPA to realign resources based on business need and efficiencies gained in Human Resources.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Improve the effectiveness of performance management processes through manager training and development.
- Enhance the scope of succession planning and employee development and training, which are vital to ensuring that WECC maintains a highly skilled, qualified and diverse workforce.
- Manage all employee benefits to deliver an attractive benefit package to employees, and to attract potential employees, while managing overall costs to the organization.
- Expand recruiting efforts through college campus outreach, social media platforms, and employee referral programs to attract desired candidates.
- Offer one technical writing course.
- Provide access for all employees to the NERC Learning Management System and develop learning plans for employee training using computer-based training modules and classroom training.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

Personnel Expenses

- Personnel Expenses increase by a net of $\$ 194,000$ due to one FTE transferred to RAPA, a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages, and the refinement of payroll tax and benefits rates.


## Meeting Expenses

- Travel increases by $\$ 16,000$ due to travel related to human resource information system training and job applicant travel.


## Operating Expenses

- Consultants and Contracts decrease by $\$ 70,000$ primarily due to the completion of compensation consulting in 2018.
- Office Costs decrease by $\$ 25,000$ due to the end of compensation data subscriptions in 2018 and a reduction in the number of job posting sites used.


## Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.


## Finance and Accounting

## Program Scope and Functional Description

The Finance and Accounting Department provides accounting and financial analysis support to WECC. The department is responsible for accounts payable, billing, accounts receivable, budgeting, fixed asset management, banking, cash management, payroll, and financial reporting.

## 2019 Key Assumptions

- Convert one position from staff-level to senior-level.
- Transfer one FTE to Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement to realign resources based on business need and efficiencies gained in Finance and Accounting.
- Implement secure and reliable cloud-based software.
- Interest rates remain flat.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Identify and implement efficiencies in financial processes.
- Ensure WECC has effective financial controls.
- Provide quality reporting and financial analysis to WECC managers, the FAC and the WECC Board.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Personnel Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Meeting Expenses

- No significant changes.

Operating Expenses

- No significant changes.

Fixed Assets

- No significant changes.

See Section B - Supplemental Financial Information for explanations of other variances between the 2018 and 2019 budgets.

## Corporate Services Funding Sources and Expenditures



## Section B

## Supplemental Financial Information

## 2019 Business Plan and Budget

## Section B - Supplemental Financial Information

## Reserve Analysis

## Table B-1

## Working Capital Reserve Analysis 2018-2019 <br> STATUTORY

## Beginning Working Capital Reserve (Deficit), December 31, 2017

\$
5,418,775

Plus: 2018 Funding (from Load-Serving Entities (LSE) or designees)
27,382,000
Plus: 2018 Other funding sources
640,255

Less: 2018 Projected expenses \& capital expenditures
$(27,602,629)$

Projected Working Capital Reserve (Deficit), December 31, 2018

Projected Working Capital Reserve, December 31, $2019{ }^{1}$

Less: Projected Working Capital Reserve, December 31, 2018
\$ $\quad 5,838,401$

Increase(Decrease) in Assessments to Achieve Projected Working Capital Reserve

2019 Expenses and Capital Expenditures
\$ 26,950,566
Less: Penalty Sanctions ${ }^{2}$
$(587,686)$
Less: Other Funding Sources
Adjustment to achieve desired Working Capital Reserve
$(536,380)$

2019 WECC Assessment

1 - On June 20, 2018, the WECC Board of Directors approved this reserve level.
2 - Represents collections of Penalty Sanctions from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. See page 45 for full disclosure.

WECC's Board has approved a Working Capital Reserve balance equal to one-to-three months of Personnel, Meeting, and Operating Expenses per its Reserve Policy, approved by the FAC on June 19, 2018.

## Breakdown of Statement of Activities

The following detailed schedules are in support of the Statutory Statement of Activities and Capital Expenditures on page 10.

## Monetary Penalties

As documented in the NERC Policy Accounting, Financial Statement and Budgetary Treatment of Penalties Imposed and Received for Violations of Reliability Standards, penalty monies received on or prior to June 30, 2018, will be used to offset assessments in the 2019 WECC budget.

All penalty monies received on or prior to June 30, 2018, are listed in Table B-2, including the amount and the date received.

Allocation Method: Penalty monies received have been allocated to the following Statutory Programs to reduce assessments:

- Reliability Standards;
- Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification;
- Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis;
- Training and Outreach; and
- Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security.

Penalty monies are allocated based on the number of FTEs in the functional areas divided by the aggregate total FTEs in the programs receiving the allocation.

## Penalty Sanctions

Table B-2

## Penalty Sanctions Received on or Prior to June 30, 2018 <br> Date Received <br> Amount Received

| $7 / 5 / 2017$ | 54,000 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $7 / 19 / 2017$ | 9,000 |
| $7 / 24 / 2017$ | 95,086 |
| $7 / 27 / 2017$ | 26,000 |
| $8 / 4 / 2017$ | 54,000 |
| $8 / 14 / 2017$ | 74,000 |
| $9 / 6 / 2017$ | 30,000 |
| $11 / 13 / 2017$ | 55,000 |
| $1 / 17 / 2018$ | 22,000 |
| $3 / 6 / 2018$ | 84,600 |
| $5 / 30 / 2018$ | 84,000 |

Total Penalties Received 587,686

Penalties Offset to Assessments 587,686

## Other Revenue

## Table B-3



Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget
WECC anticipates its investments will earn interest of approximately $\$ 120,000$ in 2019 . This revenue is allocated to the Statutory Programs based on FTEs.

## Reliability Standards

- No significant changes.


## Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification

- No significant changes.


## Training and Outreach

- Workshops revenue decreases by $\$ 116,000$ due to reductions in anticipated attendance at outreach events.


## Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security

- No significant changes.


## Corporate Services

- Not applicable.


## Personnel Expenses

Table B-4

| Personnel Expenses |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projection } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance 2018 Budget v 2019 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries |  | \$ | 15,199,337 | \$ | 15,527,975 | \$ | 15,865,019 | \$ | 665,682 | 4.4\% |
| Employment Agency Fees |  |  | - |  | 145,500 |  | - |  | - |  |
| Temporary Office Services |  |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total Salaries |  | \$ | 15,199,337 | \$ | 15,673,475 | \$ | 15,865,019 | \$ | 665,682 | 4.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Payroll Taxes |  | \$ | 1,089,355 | \$ | 995,682 | \$ | 1,037,394 | \$ | $(51,961)$ | (4.8\%) |
| Benefits |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workers Compensation |  | \$ | 20,004 | \$ | 14,033 | \$ | 14,800 | \$ | $(5,204)$ | (26.0\%) |
| Medical Insurance |  |  | 1,826,810 |  | 1,901,351 |  | 1,826,239 |  | (571) | (0.0\%) |
| Life-LTD-STD Insurance |  |  | 78,404 |  | 96,627 |  | 87,974 |  | 9,570 | 12.2\% |
| Education |  |  | 297,150 |  | 262,514 |  | 300,704 |  | 3,554 | 1.2\% |
| Relocation |  |  | 56,000 |  | 49,922 |  | 55,992 |  | (8) | (0.0\%) |
| Other |  |  | 15,487 |  | 17,050 |  | 17,000 |  | 1,513 | 9.8\% |
| Total Benefits |  | \$ | 2,293,855 | \$ | 2,341,497 | \$ | 2,302,709 | \$ | 8,854 | 0.4\% |
| Retirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discretionary 401k Contribution |  | \$ | 1,286,223 | \$ | 1,359,441 | \$ | 1,311,109 | \$ | 24,886 | 1.9\% |
| Retirement Administration Fees |  |  | 2,500 |  | 2,500 |  | - |  | $(2,500)$ | (100.0\%) |
| Total Retirement |  | \$ | 1,288,723 | \$ | 1,361,941 | \$ | 1,311,109 | \$ | 22,386 | 1.7\% |
| Total Personnel Costs |  | \$ | 19,871,270 | \$ | 20,372,595 | \$ | 20,516,231 | \$ | 644,961 | 3.2\% |
| FTEs |  |  | 143.0 |  | 137.4 |  | 143.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0\% |
| Cost per FTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Salaries | \$ | 106,289 | \$ | 114,103 | \$ | 110,944 | \$ | 4,655 | 4.4\% |
|  | Payroll Taxes |  | 7,618 |  | 7,249 |  | 7,255 |  | (363) | (4.8\%) |
|  | Benefits |  | $16,041$ |  | 17,046 |  | 16,103 |  | 62 | 0.4\% |
|  | Retirement |  | 9,012 |  | 9,915 |  | 9,169 |  | 157 | 1.7\% |
| Total Cost per FTE |  | \$ | 138,960 | \$ | 148,312 | \$ | 143,470 | \$ | 4,510 | 3.2\% |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

## Salaries

- Salaries increase by a net of $\$ 666,000$ primarily due to a budgeted 3-percent merit pool, continued refinement of labor float percentages and changes in position levels.


## Payroll Taxes

- Payroll Taxes decrease by $\$ 52,000$ primarily due to the refinement of budgeted payroll tax rates.


## Benefits

- Life-LTD-STD Insurance increases by $\$ 10,000$ primarily due to the refinement of budgeted insurance rates.


## Retirement

- Discretionary 401(k) Contribution increases by $\$ 25,000$ primarily due to increases in salaries and retirement plan participation.


## Meeting Expenses

Table B-5

| Meeting Expense | Budget$2018$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projection } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | Budget$2019$ |  | Variance 2018 Budget v 2019 Budget |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reliability Standards | \$ | 520 | \$ | 260 | \$ | 260 | \$ | (260) | (50.0\%) |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification |  | 5,400 |  | 9,138 |  | 4,910 |  | (490) | (9.1\%) |
| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis |  | 126,812 |  | 87,506 |  | 128,110 |  | 1,298 | 1.0\% |
| Training and Outreach |  | 514,130 |  | 284,877 |  | 409,173 |  | $(104,957)$ | (20.4\%) |
| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
| Corporate Services |  | 108,923 |  | 157,109 |  | 98,500 |  | $(10,423)$ | (9.6\%) |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 755,785 | \$ | 538,890 | \$ | 640,953 | \$ | $(114,832)$ | (15.2\%) |
| Travel Expense |  | Budget $2018$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projection } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | Budget $2019$ |  | riance <br> Budget v <br> Budget | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| Reliability Standards | \$ | 20,200 | \$ | 20,311 | \$ | 18,290 | \$ | $(1,910)$ | (9.5\%) |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification |  | 843,277 |  | 788,169 |  | 835,205 |  | $(8,072)$ | (1.0\%) |
| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis |  | 239,345 |  | 296,578 |  | 244,640 |  | 5,295 | 2.2\% |
| Training and Outreach |  | 10,315 |  | 5,463 |  | 10,603 |  | 288 | 2.8\% |
| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Corporate Services |  | 288,072 |  | 304,029 |  | 300,130 |  | 12,058 | 4.2\% |
| Total Travel Expenses | \$ | 1,401,209 | \$ | 1,414,550 | \$ | 1,408,868 | \$ | 7,659 | 0.5\% |
| Conference Call Expense |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projection } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | Budget $2019$ |  | riance <br> Budget v <br> Budget | Variance \% |
| Reliability Standards | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Training and Outreach |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Corporate Services |  | 75,000 |  | 53,527 |  | 57,600 |  | $(17,400)$ | (23.2\%) |
| Total Conference Call Expenses | \$ | 75,000 | \$ | 53,527 | \$ | 57,600 | \$ | $(17,400)$ | (23.2\%) |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

## Meeting Expense

- Training and Outreach decreases by $\$ 105,000$ due to reductions in anticipated attendance at outreach events.
- Corporate Services decreases by a net of $\$ 10,000$ due to all Standing Committee meetings being held in Salt Lake City.


## Travel Expense

- Corporate Services increases by $\$ 12,000$ due to increased travel requirements and attendance at off-site meetings.


## Conference Call Expense

- Corporate Services decreases by $\$ 17,000$ to align budget with actual usage trends.


## Consultants and Contracts

Table B-6

| Consultants | Budget <br> 2018 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projection } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | Budget <br> 2019 |  | Variance 2018 Budget v 2019 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reliability Standards | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification |  | - |  | 200,000 |  | - |  | - |  |
| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis |  | 1,185,000 |  | 1,228,828 |  | 590,000 |  | $(595,000)$ | (50.2\%) |
| Training and Outreach |  | 4,560 |  | - |  | - |  | $(4,560)$ | (100.0\%) |
| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Corporate Services |  | 411,500 |  | 481,336 |  | 441,000 |  | 29,500 | 7.2\% |
| Consultants Total | \$ | 1,601,060 | \$ | 1,910,164 | \$ | 1,031,000 | \$ | $(570,060)$ | (35.6\%) |
| Contracts |  | Budget 2018 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projection } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | Budget 2019 |  | ariance <br> Budget v <br> 9 Budget | Variance \% |
| Contracts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reliability Standards | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement and Organization Registration and Certification |  | 397,221 |  | 362,348 |  | 261,890 |  | $(135,331)$ | (34.1\%) |
| Reliability Assessment and Performance Analysis |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Training and Outreach |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Situation Awareness and Infrastructure Security |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Corporate Services |  | 25,000 |  | - |  | - |  | $(25,000)$ | (100.0\%) |
| Contracts Total | \$ | 422,221 | \$ | 362,348 | \$ | 261,890 | \$ | $(160,331)$ | (38.0\%) |
| Total Consulting and Contracts | \$ | 2,023,281 | \$ | 2,272,512 | \$ | 1,292,890 | \$ | $(730,391)$ | (36.1\%) |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

## Consultants

- RAPA decreases by a net of $\$ 595,000$ primarily due to the completion of the Gas/Electric Interdependence Study.
- Corporate Services increases by a net of $\$ 30,000$ due to the following:
o General and Administrative increases primarily due to organizational and leadership development consulting, and
o Human Resources decreases primarily due to the completion of compensation consulting in 2018.


## Contracts

- Compliance decreases by $\$ 135,000$ due to reduced reliance on contract labor and broadened staff skill sets.
- Corporate Services decreases by $\$ 25,000$ due to lower reliance on contract labor in lieu of staff for IT projects.


## Office Rent

Table B-7

| Office Rent | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projection } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance2018 Budget v2019 Budget |  | Variance <br> \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office Rent | \$ | 925,056 | \$ | 948,181 | \$ | 953,484 | \$ | 28,428 | 3.1\% |
| Utilities |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Maintenance |  | 19,405 |  | 14,703 |  | 19,425 |  | 20 | 0.1\% |
| Security |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Total Office Rent | \$ | 944,461 | \$ | 962,884 | \$ | 972,909 | \$ | 28,448 | 3.0\% |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

- Office Rent increases by $\$ 28,000$ due a new lease for the Vancouver, WA office and anticipated increases in operating expenses for the Salt Lake City office.


## Office Costs

Table B-8

| Office Costs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projection } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | Variance2018 Budget v2019 Budget |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telephone | \$ | 73,320 | \$ | 67,938 | \$ | 57,316 | \$ | $(16,004)$ | (21.8\%) |
| Internet |  | 71,120 |  | 82,114 |  | 69,252 |  | $(1,868)$ | (2.6\%) |
| Office Supplies |  | 104,540 |  | 101,660 |  | 129,751 |  | 25,211 | 24.1\% |
| Computer Supplies and Maintenance |  | 878,690 |  | 786,007 |  | 850,566 |  | $(28,124)$ | (3.2\%) |
| Publications \& Subscriptions |  | 54,894 |  | 48,801 |  | 29,556 |  | $(25,338)$ | (46.2\%) |
| Dues and Fees |  | 277,243 |  | 254,745 |  | 280,438 |  | 3,195 | 1.2\% |
| Postage |  | 4,240 |  | 3,731 |  | 4,520 |  | 280 | 6.6\% |
| Express Shipping |  | 4,424 |  | 5,557 |  | 3,319 |  | $(1,105)$ | (25.0\%) |
| Copying |  | 10,903 |  | 18,804 |  | 23,837 |  | 12,934 | 118.6\% |
| Bank Charges |  | 60,279 |  | 59,557 |  | 57,275 |  | $(3,004)$ | (5.0\%) |
| Taxes |  | 58,975 |  | 49,101 |  | 51,849 |  | $(7,126)$ | (12.1\%) |
| Total Office Costs | \$ | 1,598,628 | \$ | 1,478,015 | \$ | 1,557,679 | \$ | $(40,949)$ | (2.6\%) |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

- Telephone decreases by $\$ 16,000$ due to a renegotiated contract.
- Office Supplies increase by $\$ 25,000$ primarily due to the expansion of WECC's stakeholder recognition wall and updating WECC's corporate collateral.
- Computer Supplies and Maintenance decreases by a net of $\$ 28,000$ primarily due to a reduction in webCDMS fees and the replacement of some office furniture.
- Publications and Subscriptions decrease by $\$ 25,000$ due to the completion of a Human Resources compensation study.
- Copying increases by $\$ 13,000$ primarily due to the triennial refresh of WECC pamphlets and booklets.


## Professional Services

Table B-9

| Professional Services | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projection } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  | iance <br> udget v <br> Budget | Variance <br> \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Board Director Fees | \$ | 763,750 | \$ | 803,045 | \$ | 797,500 | \$ | 33,750 | 4.4\% |
| Outside Legal |  | 16,200 |  | 17,221 |  | 9,000 |  | $(7,200)$ | (44.4\%) |
| Accounting \& Auditing Fees |  | 38,760 |  | 30,913 |  | 31,700 |  | $(7,060)$ | (18.2\%) |
| Insurance Commercial |  | 85,000 |  | 70,187 |  | 70,080 |  | $(14,920)$ | (17.6\%) |
| Total Services | \$ | 903,710 | \$ | 921,366 | \$ | 908,280 | \$ | 4,570 | 0.5\% |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

- Board Director Fees increase by $\$ 34,000$ due to increases in Board Director retainer compensation.
- Insurance Commercial decreases by $\$ 15,000$ based on estimates derived from current premiums.


## Miscellaneous Expenses

Table B-10

| Miscellaneous Expenses |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projection } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ | Variance 2018 Budget v 2019 Budget | Variance \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miscellaneous | \$ | - | \$ | \$ | \$ |  |
| Total Micellaneous Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | \$ | \$ |  |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

- Not applicable.


## Other Non-Operating

Table B-11

| Other Non-Operating Expenses | Budget$2018$ |  | Projection$2018$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | et v get | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interest Expense | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| Line of Credit Payment |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Office Relocation |  | - |  | 45,000 |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | 45,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | (100.0\%) |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

- Not applicable.


## Fixed Assets

Table B-12

| Fixed Assets | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projection } \\ & 2018 \end{aligned}$ |  |  Variance <br> Budget 2018 Budget v <br> 2019 2019 Budget |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Computer \& Software CapEx | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 50,000 | \$ | 5,000 | \$ | $(45,000)$ | (90.0\%) |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Equipment CapEx |  | 12,000 |  | 12,000 |  | 105,000 |  | 93,000 | 775.0\% |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | 12,000 |  | 12,000 |  |
|  | \$ | 62,000 | \$ | 62,000 | \$ | 122,000 | \$ | 60,000 | 96.8\% |

## Explanation of Significant Variances - 2019 Budget versus 2018 Budget

- Computer and Software CapEx decreases by $\$ 45,000$ due to one-time software purchases in 2018 that were not replaced with additional tools in 2019.
- Equipment CapEx increases by $\$ 93,000$ primarily due to planned refreshes of file servers and storage area networks.
- Leasehold Improvements increase by $\$ 12,000$ due to necessary maintenance-related updates to the Salt Lake City office space.


## Section C <br> Non-Statutory Program

## 2019 Business Plan and Budget

## Section C - Non-Statutory Program

| Western Renewable Energy Generation Information System (in whole dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 Budget |  | 2019 Budget |  | (Decrease) |  |
| Total FTEs |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| Direct Expenses | \$ | 1,228,780 | \$ | 1,248,601 | \$ | 19,821 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 545,300 | \$ | 532,909 | \$ | $(12,391)$ |
| Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets | \$ | $(7,301)$ | \$ | $(6,065)$ | \$ | 1,236 |
| Total Funding Requirement | \$ | 32,536 | \$ | 352,326 | \$ | 319,790 |

## Western Renewable Energy Generation Information System (WREGIS)

WREGIS is an independent, renewable energy database for the Western Interconnection. WREGIS creates renewable energy certificates (REC) for verifiable renewable generation from units that are registered in the database.

WREGIS was developed through a collaborative process between the Western Governors' Association, the Western Regional Air Partnership, and the California Energy Commission (CEC). This development was further guided by stakeholder input from more than 400 participants over a period greater than three years.

The program's governance was integrated into WECC on March 31, 2012 following the expiration of WECC's contract that had previously provided for backstop funding from the CEC. WREGIS is overseen by a WECC Member Committee consisting of representatives from the WECC membership and various WREGIS stakeholder groups.

WREGIS costs fall outside Section 215 of the Federal Power Act. Participants fund WREGIS through registration and transaction fees. To avoid any crossover of Section 215 dollars, WREGIS pays a portion of WECC's overhead costs based on a formula implemented following a FERC audit.

WREGIS consists of two parts: 1) the information system software, and 2) the administrative operations. The WREGIS staff oversees the software contractor and performs all the administrative tasks required to operate the program including:

- registering account holders and generation units;
- training WREGIS users;
- auditing generation and other data; and
- managing the budgeting, billing, and financial reporting.


## Major 2019 Assumptions and Cost Impacts

WREGIS is funded entirely by user fees and is not subsidized by Section 215 funding. There are several types of user fees. Annual fees are paid by all users and are based on size (generation capacity) and user type. Usage fees are paid by all but micro, small, and medium generation owners (as defined by
the WREGIS fee matrix). WREGIS also charges various fees for specific usage to only those requesting the services.

- User fees are based on size (generation capacity) and user type.
o Approximately 4 percent of revenues are based on size.
o Approximately 92 percent of revenues are based on usage levels, which can depend on factors such as weather (wind and solar generation levels) and state regulatory policies (retirement, transfers, etc.).
o Approximately 4 percent of revenues are attributable to fees for specific, requested functions such as tracking e-Tags.
- Revenues can vary greatly from year to year; WECC holds large WREGIS reserves to allow for normal operations during years in which fee levels are low and to fund large, non-recurring expenditures such as major software upgrades.


## 2019 Goals and Key Deliverables

- Implement the WREGIS program as required by the participating states, provinces, and voluntary programs.
- Register program participants, whether mandatory or voluntary.
- Refine the WREGIS software to ensure optimum performance both in terms of efficiency and ease of use for account holders.
- Refine and improve data collection to ensure high-quality data.
- Keep abreast of possible needs to increase WREGIS's functionality.


## Resource Requirements/Explanation of Significant Changes

## Funding Sources (other than ERO Assessments)

- Membership Fees increase by $\$ 314,000$ due to anticipated increases in account holders and certificate volumes.
- Interest increases by $\$ 15,000$ due to anticipated increases in rate of return on reserves.


## Personnel Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Meeting Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Operating Expenses

- Office Costs increase by $\$ 18,000$ mainly due to anticipated increases in monthly WREGIS fees and updates to the WREGIS system.


## Indirect Expenses

- Indirect Expenses are allocated to statutory and non-statutory program areas based on FTEs.


## Other Non-Operating Expenses

- No significant changes.


## Section C - Non-Statutory Program

WREGIS Program Funding Sources and Expenditures

| Statement of Activities, Fixed Assets Expenditures, and Change in Working Capital 2018 Budget \& Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NON-STATUTORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2018 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | 2018 <br> Projection | v 20 | iance <br> Budget <br> Projection <br> Under) |  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | iance <br> Budget <br> Budget <br> (Dec) |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statutory Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WECC Assess ments | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Penalty Sanctions |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total Statutory Funding | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Membership Fees | \$ | 1,745,360 | \$ | 2,104,661 | \$ | 359,301 |  | 2,058,996 | \$ | 313,636 |
| Services \& Software |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Workshops |  | 1,875 |  | 1,725 |  | (150) |  | 1,875 |  | - |
| Interest |  | 52,080 |  | 74,695 |  | 22,615 |  | 66,900 |  | 14,820 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Revenue (A) | \$ | 1,799,315 | \$ | 2,181,081 | \$ | 381,766 | \$ | 2,127,771 | \$ | 328,456 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 478,621 | \$ | 487,859 | \$ | 9,238 | \$ | 477,082 | \$ | $(1,539)$ |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 36,772 |  | 34,167 |  | $(2,605)$ |  | 32,879 |  | $(3,893)$ |
| Benefits |  | 73,381 |  | 64,424 |  | $(8,957)$ |  | 83,974 |  | 10,593 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 40,478 |  | 41,558 |  | 1,080 |  | 39,420 |  | $(1,058)$ |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 629,252 | \$ | 628,008 | \$ | $(1,244)$ | \$ | 633,355 | \$ | 4,103 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 2,540 | \$ | (460) | \$ | 3,813 | \$ | 813 |
| Travel |  | 18,880 |  | 16,021 |  | $(2,859)$ |  | 17,265 |  | $(1,615)$ |
| Conference Calls |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 21,880 | \$ | 18,561 | \$ | $(3,319)$ | \$ | 21,078 | \$ | (802) |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 1,800 | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 200 | \$ | - | \$ | $(1,800)$ |
| Office Rent |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 575,848 |  | 541,737 |  | $(34,111)$ |  | 594,168 |  | 18,320 |
| Professional Services |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Depreciation |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 577,648 | \$ | 543,737 | \$ | $(33,911)$ | \$ | 594,168 | \$ | 16,520 |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 1,228,780 | \$ | 1,190,306 | \$ | $(38,474)$ | \$ | 1,248,601 | \$ | 19,821 |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 545,300 | \$ | 526,294 | \$ | $(19,006)$ | \$ | 532,909 | \$ | $(12,391)$ |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 45,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (B) | \$ | 1,774,080 | \$ | 1,716,600 | \$ | $(12,480)$ | \$ | 1,781,510 | \$ | 7,430 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | 25,235 | \$ | 464,481 | \$ | 394,246 | \$ | 346,261 | \$ | 321,026 |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Leas ehold Improvements |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | $(7,301)$ |  | $(7,582)$ |  | (281) |  | $(6,065)$ |  | 1,236 |
| Incr(Dec) in Fixed Assets (C) | \$ | $(7,301)$ | \$ | $(7,582)$ | \$ | (281) | \$ | $(6,065)$ | \$ | 1,236 |
| TOTAL BUDGET ( $=\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}$ ) | \$ | 1,766,779 | \$ | 1,709,018 | \$ | $(12,761)$ | \$ | 1,775,445 | \$ | 8,666 |
| TOTAL CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL ( $=A-B-C$ | \$ | 32,536 | \$ | 472,063 | \$ | 394,527 | \$ | 352,326 | \$ | 319,790 |
| fTEs |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | - |  | 6.0 |  | - |
| HC |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | - |  | 6.0 |  | - |

## Personnel Analysis

FTEs are defined as full-time equivalent employees only. Fractional FTEs reflect part-time employees or employees who worked in fewer than all four quarters of the year.

|  | Budget | Projection | Direct FTEs | Shared FTEs* | Total FTEs | Change from |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total FTEs by Program Area | 2018 | 2018 | 2019 Budget | 2019 Budget | 2019 Budget | 2018 Budget |

Operational Programs

| Total FTEs Operational Programs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Programs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WREGIS | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 |
| Total FTEs Administrative Programs | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 |
| Total FTEs | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 |

*A shared FTE is defined as an employee who performs both Statutory and Non-Statutory functions.

## Reserve Analysis

## Working Capital Reserve Analysis NON-STATUTORY

Beginning Working Capital Reserve (Deficit), December 31, 2017

Plus: 2018 Funding
Plus: 2018 Other funding sources

Less: 2018 Projected expenses \& capital expenditures
Projected Working Capital Reserve (Deficit), December 31, 2018

Projected Working Capital Reserve, December 31, 2019

Less: Projected Working Capital Reserve, December 31, 2018

2019 Reserve Increase (Decrease)
\$ 352,326

## Section D

## Additional Financial Information

## 2019 Business Plan and Budget

## Section D - Additional Financial Information

## Section D - Additional Financial Information

## 2019 Consolidated Statement of Activities by Program, Statutory, and Non-Statutory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Statutory Functions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non-Statutory Functions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statement of Activities and Capital Expenditures by Program |  | Total |  | Statutory Total |  | on-Statutory Total |  | Satutory Total | Reliability Standards |  |  | Compliance <br> and <br> rganization Registration and Certification |  | Reliability ssessment and rformance Analysis | Training and Outreach |  |  |  | Corporate Services |  | Non-Statutory Total |  | WREGIS |  |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Statutory Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WECC Assess ments |  | \$ 25,282,000 |  | 25,282,000 | \$ | - |  | 25,282,000 | \$ | 771,224 |  | 14,264,214 | \$ | 9,560,414 | \$ | 481,798 | \$ | 204,350 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Penalty Sanctions |  | 587,686 |  | 587,686 |  | - |  | 587,686 |  | 16,791 |  | 335,821 |  | 218,283 |  | 11,194 |  | 5,597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Statutory Funding |  | \$ 25,869,686 |  | 25,869,686 | \$ | - |  | 25,869,686 | \$ | 788,015 |  | 14,600,035 | \$ | 9,778,697 | \$ | 492,992 | \$ | 209,947 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Non-statutory Funding |  | \$ 2,058,996 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,058,996 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 2,058,996 | \$ | 2,058,996 |
| Workshops |  | 426,375 |  | 424,500 |  | 1,875 |  | 424,500 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 424,500 |  | - |  |  |  | 1,875 |  | 1,875 |
| Interest |  | 186,900 |  | 120,000 |  | 66,900 |  | 120,000 |  | 3,429 |  | 68,571 |  | 44,571 |  | 2,286 |  | 1,143 |  | - |  | 66,900 |  | 66,900 |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | . |  | - |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  | - |
| Total Revenue (A) |  | \$ 28,541,957 |  | 26,414,186 |  | 2,127,771 |  | 26,414,186 | \$ | 791,444 |  | 14,668,606 | \$ | 9,823,268 | \$ | 919,778 | \$ | 211,090 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,127,771 | \$ | 2,127,771 |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries |  | \$ 16,342,100 |  | 15,865,018 | \$ | 477,082 |  | 15,865,018 | \$ | 423,024 | \$ | 6,521,216 | \$ | 4,278,285 | \$ | 254,696 | \$ | 100,159 | \$ | 4,287,638 | \$ | 477,082 | \$ | 477,082 |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 1,070,272 |  | 1,037,393 |  | 32,879 |  | 1,037,393 |  | 26,828 |  | 449,911 |  | 294,608 |  | 18,305 |  | 7,516 |  | 240,225 |  | 32,879 |  | 32,879 |
| Benefits |  | 2,386,684 |  | 2,302,710 |  | 83,974 |  | 2,302,710 |  | 37,174 |  | 789,012 |  | 494,397 |  | 29,484 |  | 11,620 |  | 941,023 |  | 83,974 |  | 83,974 |
| Retirement Costs |  | 1,350,530 |  | 1,311,110 |  | 39,420 |  | 1,311,110 |  | 34,984 |  | 538,748 |  | 353,659 |  | 21,064 |  | 8,274 |  | 354,381 |  | 39,420 |  | 39,420 |
| Total Personnel Expenses |  | \$ 21,149,586 |  | 20,516,231 |  | 633,355 |  | 20,516,231 | \$ | 522,010 |  | 8,298,887 |  | 5,420,949 | \$ | 323,549 | \$ | 127,569 | \$ | 5,823,267 | \$ | 633,355 | \$ | 633,355 |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings |  | \$ 644,766 |  | 640,953 |  | 3,813 | \$ | 640,953 | \$ | 260 | \$ | 4,910 |  | 128,110 | \$ | 409,173 | \$ | - | \$ | 98,500 | \$ | 3,813 | \$ | 3,813 |
| Travel |  | 1,426,133 |  | 1,408,868 |  | 17,265 |  | 1,408,868 |  | 18,290 |  | 835,205 |  | 244,640 |  | 10,603 |  | - |  | 300,130 |  | 17,265 |  | 17,265 |
| Conference Calls |  | 57,600 |  | 57,600 |  | . |  | 57,600 |  | - |  | . |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 57,600 |  | . |  | . |
| Total Meeting Expenses |  | \$ 2,128,499 |  | 2,107,421 | \$ | 21,078 | \$ | 2,107,421 | \$ | 18,550 | \$ | 840,115 | \$ | 372,750 | \$ | 419,776 | \$ | - | \$ | 456,230 | \$ | 21,078 | \$ | 21,078 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts |  | \$ 1,292,890 |  | 1,292,890 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,292,890 | \$ | - | \$ | 261,890 | \$ | 590,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 441,000 | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Office Rent |  | 972,909 |  | 972,909 |  | - |  | 972,909 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 972,909 |  | - |  | - |
| Office Costs |  | 2,151,847 |  | 1,557,679 |  | 594,168 |  | 1,557,679 |  | 3,535 |  | 297,150 |  | 214,564 |  | 19,517 |  | - |  | 1,022,913 |  | 594,168 |  | 594,168 |
| Professional Services |  | 908,280 |  | 908,280 |  | - |  | 908,280 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 908,280 |  | - |  | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Depreciation |  | 238,545 |  | 238,545 |  | - |  | 238,545 |  | - |  | - |  | 4,336 |  | - |  | - |  | 234,209 |  | - |  | - |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | \$ 5,564,471 |  | 4,970,303 |  | 594,168 | \$ | 4,970,303 | \$ | 3,535 |  | 559,040 | \$ | 808,900 | \$ | 19,517 | \$ | - | \$ | 3,579,311 | \$ | 594,168 | \$ | 594,168 |
| Total Direct Expenses |  | \$ 28,842,556 |  | 27,593,955 |  | 1,248,601 |  | 27,593,955 | \$ | 544,095 |  | 9,698,042 | \$ | 6,602,599 | \$ | 762,842 | \$ | 127,569 | \$ | 9,858,808 | \$ | 1,248,601 | \$ | 1,248,601 |
| Indirect Expenses |  | \$ |  | ( 532,909 ) | \$ | 532,909 | \$ | $(532,909)$ | \$ | 266,454 |  | 5,329,085 |  | 3,463,906 | \$ | 177,636 | \$ | 88,818 | \$ | $(9,858,808)$ | \$ | 532,909 | \$ | 532,909 |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses |  | \$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Total Expenses (B) |  | \$ 28,842,556 |  | 27,061,046 |  | 1,781,510 |  | 27,061,046 | \$ | 810,549 |  | 15,027,127 |  | 10,066,505 | \$ | 940,478 | \$ | 216,387 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,781,510 | \$ | 1,781,510 |
| Change in Assets | \$ | \$ $(300,599)$ | \$ | ( 646,860$)$ | \$ | 346,261 | \$ | $(646,860)$ | \$ | $(19,105)$ |  | $(358,521)$ | \$ | $(243,237)$ | \$ | $(20,700)$ | \$ | $(5,297)$ | \$ | - | \$ | 346,261 | \$ | 346,261 |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation |  | \$ (238,545) | \$ | (238,545) | \$ | - | \$ | (238,545) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $(4,336)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | $(234,209)$ | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 5,000 |  | 5,000 |  | - |  | 5,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 5,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |
| Equipment Capex |  | 105,000 |  | 105,000 |  |  |  | 105,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 105,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | 12,000 |  | 12,000 |  | - |  | 12,000 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 12,000 |  | - |  | - |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | - |  | 6,065 |  | $(6,065)$ |  | 6,065 |  | $(3,033)$ |  | $(60,653)$ |  | $(39,425)$ |  | $(2,022)$ |  | $(1,011)$ |  | 112,209 |  | $(6,065)$ |  | $(6,065)$ |
| $\operatorname{lnc}($ Dec) in Fixed Assets (C) |  | \$ (116,545) |  | $(110,480)$ |  | $(6,065)$ | \$ | $(110,480)$ | \$ | $(3,033)$ | \$ | $(60,653)$ | \$ | (43,761) | \$ | $(2,022)$ | \$ | $(1,011)$ | \$ | - | \$ | $(6,065)$ | \$ | $(6,065)$ |
| TOTAL BUDGEt ( $\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}$ ) |  | \$ 28,726,011 |  | 26,950,566 | \$ | 1,775,445 |  | 26,950,566 | \$ | 807,516 |  | 14,966,474 |  | 10,022,744 | \$ | 938,456 | \$ | 215,376 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,775,445 | \$ | 1,775,445 |
| TOTAL CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL (A-B-C) |  | \$ $(184,054)$ | \$ | (536,380) | \$ | 352,326 | \$ | $(536,380)$ | \$ | (16,072) | S | $(297,868)$ | \$ | $(199,476)$ | \$ | $(18,678)$ | \$ | $(4,286)$ | \$ | - | \$ | 352,326 | \$ | 352,326 |
| fTEs |  | 149.0 |  | 143.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 143.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 60.0 |  | 39.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 38.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |
| HC |  | 149.0 |  | 143.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 143.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 60.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 2.0 |  | - |  | 38.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |

2019 WECC Business Plan and Budget

## Statement of Financial Position

| Statement of Financial Position <br> 2017 Audited, 2018 Projection, and 2019 Budget |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATUTORY and NON-STATUTORY |  |  |  |
|  | (Per Audit) 31-Dec-17 | Projected <br> 31-Dec-18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ \text { 31-Dec-19 } \end{gathered}$ |
| ASSETS |  |  |  |
| Cash and cash equivalents | \$ 27,948,465 | \$ 22,075,362 | \$ 21,991,907 |
| Investments | 9,032,312 | 8,400,000 | 8,215,946 |
| Accounts receivable, net | 3,072,468 | 1,250,000 | 1,250,000 |
| Prepaid expenses and other assets | 638,958 | 500,000 | 500,000 |
| Property and equipment, net | 540,352 | 378,100 | 261,555 |
| Total Assets | \$ 41,232,555 | \$ 32,603,462 | \$ 32,219,408 |

## LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

Liabilities

| Accounts payable |  | \$ | 9,920,746 | \$ | 1,250,000 | \$ | 1,250,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accrued expenses |  |  | 1,829,711 |  | 1,750,000 |  | 1,750,000 |
| Deferred revenue |  |  | 16,440,418 |  | 15,400,000 |  | 15,400,000 |
| Other liabilities |  |  | 629,907 |  | 900,000 |  | 700,000 |
|  | Total Liabilities | \$ | 28,820,782 | \$ | 19,300,000 | \$ | 19,100,000 |
| Unrestricted net assets |  |  | 12,411,773 |  | 13,303,462 |  | 13,119,408 |
| Total Li | s and Net Assets | \$ | 41,232,555 | \$ | 32,603,462 | \$ | 32,219,408 |

## Appendix A: Organizational Chart - Changes in Budgeted FTE by Program Area



Statutory Program Area
Corporate Services Program Area
Non-statutory Program Area

## Appendix B: 2019 Budget \& Projected 2020 and 2021 Budgets

## Key Assumptions

## Assessments

- A 1-percent increase per WECC's assessment stabilization initiative.


## Personnel Expenses

- A 3-percent average merit increase in Salaries.
- A 3-percent increase in Payroll Taxes and Retirements Costs.
- A 4-percent increase in Benefits premiums.


## Meeting Expenses

- Travel and Meeting Expenses will be impacted by Standing Committee meeting locations. Standing Committee meetings will be held outside of Salt Lake City in even-numbered years and in Salt Lake City in odd-numbered years.
- All other Travel, Meeting and Conference Call Expenses are assumed to remain at 2019 budgeted levels.


## Operating Expenses

- A net increase in Consultants and Contracts of $\$ 195,000$ in 2020 due to one-time RAPA consulting projects budgeted in 2020, reduced use of contractors in the CMEP, reduced use of organizational and leadership consultants and the addition of new 2019 one-time projects. Consultants used for ongoing studies and assessments remain at current levels.
- An increase in office rent in 2020 due to the renegotiation and renewal of WECC's Salt Lake City office lease.

| Statement of Activities and Capital Expenditures 2019 Budget \& Projected 2020 and 2021 Budgets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statutory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Budget } \end{gathered}$ |  | $2020$ <br> Projection |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \$ Change } \\ 19 \text { v } 20 \end{gathered}$ | \% Change $19 \text { v } 20$ |  | $2021$ <br> Projection |  | \$ Change $20 \text { v } 21$ | \% Change $20 \text { v } 21$ |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WECC Assessments | \$ | 25,282,000 | \$ | 25,534,820 | \$ | 252,820 | 1.0\% | \$ | 25,790,168 | \$ | 255,348 | 1.0\% |
| Penalty Sanctions |  | 587,686 |  | - |  | $(587,686)$ | (100.0\%) |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total Statutory Funding | \$ | 25,869,686 | \$ | 25,534,820 | \$ | $(334,866)$ | (1.3\%) | \$ | 25,790,168 | \$ | 255,348 | 1.0\% |
| Membership Fees | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| Workshops |  | 424,500 |  | 428,745 |  | 4,245 | 1.0\% |  | 433,032 |  | 4,287 | 1.0\% |
| Interest |  | 120,000 |  | 120,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 120,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total Revenue (A) | \$ | 26,414,186 | \$ | 26,083,565 | \$ | $(330,621)$ | (1.3\%) | \$ | 26,343,201 | \$ | 259,636 | 1.0\% |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries | \$ | 15,865,018 | \$ | 16,340,969 | \$ | 475,951 | 3.0\% | \$ | 16,831,198 | \$ | 490,229 | 3.0\% |
| Payroll Taxes |  | 1,037,393 |  | 1,068,515 |  | 31,122 | 3.0\% |  | 1,100,570 |  | 32,055 | 3.0\% |
| Benefits |  | 2,302,710 |  | 2,394,818 |  | 92,108 | 4.0\% |  | 2,490,611 |  | 95,793 | 4.0\% |
| Retirement Costs |  | 1,311,110 |  | 1,350,443 |  | 39,333 | 3.0\% |  | 1,390,957 |  | 40,513 | 3.0\% |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 20,516,231 | \$ | 21,154,745 | \$ | 638,514 | 3.1\% | \$ | 21,813,336 | \$ | 658,591 | 3.1\% |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meetings | \$ | 640,953 | \$ | 670,953 | \$ | 30,000 | 4.7\% | \$ | 645,953 | \$ | $(25,000)$ | (3.7\%) |
| Travel |  | 1,408,868 |  | 1,428,868 |  | 20,000 | 1.4\% |  | 1,408,868 |  | $(20,000)$ | (1.4\%) |
| Conference Calls |  | 57,600 |  | 57,600 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 57,600 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 2,107,421 | \$ | 2,157,421 | \$ | 50,000 | 2.4\% | \$ | 2,112,421 | \$ | $(45,000)$ | (2.1\%) |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 1,292,890 | \$ | 1,487,890 | \$ | 195,000 | 15.1\% | \$ | 1,042,890 | \$ | $(445,000)$ | (29.9\%) |
| Office Rent |  | 972,909 |  | 1,100,000 |  | 127,091 | 13.1\% |  | 1,100,000 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Office Costs |  | 1,557,679 |  | 1,573,256 |  | 15,577 | 1.0\% |  | 1,588,988 |  | 15,733 | 1.0\% |
| Professional Services |  | 908,280 |  | 908,280 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 908,280 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| Miscellaneous |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |
| Depreciation |  | 238,545 |  | 200,000 |  | $(38,545)$ | (16.2\%) |  | 175,000 |  | $(25,000)$ | (12.5\%) |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 4,970,303 | \$ | 5,269,426 | \$ | 299,123 | 6.0\% | \$ | 4,815,158 | \$ | $(454,267)$ | (8.6\%) |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 27,593,955 | \$ | 28,581,592 | \$ | 987,637 | 3.6\% | \$ | 28,740,915 | \$ | 159,323 | 0.6\% |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | $(532,909)$ | \$ | $(532,909)$ | \$ | - | 0.0\% | \$ | $(532,909)$ | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| Total Expenses (B) | \$ | 27,061,046 | \$ | 28,048,683 | \$ | 987,637 | 3.6\% | \$ | 28,208,006 | \$ | 159,323 | 0.6\% |
| Change in Assets | \$ | $(646,860)$ | \$ | (1,965,118) | \$ | $(1,318,258)$ | 203.8\% | \$ | (1,864,805) | \$ | 100,313 | (5.1\%) |
| Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation | \$ | $(238,545)$ | \$ | $(200,000)$ | \$ | 38,545 | (16.2\%) | \$ | $(175,000)$ | \$ | 25,000 | (12.5\%) |
| Computer \& Software CapEx |  | 5,000 |  | - |  | $(5,000)$ | (100.0\%) |  | - |  | - |  |
| Furniture \& Fixtures CapEx |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |
| Equipment CapEx |  | 105,000 |  | - |  | $(105,000)$ | (100.0\%) |  | - |  | - |  |
| Leasehold Improvements |  | 12,000 |  | - |  | $(12,000)$ | (100.0\%) |  | - |  | - |  |
| Allocation of Fixed Assets |  | 6,065 |  | - |  | $(6,065)$ | (100.0\%) |  | - |  | - |  |
| Incr(Dec) in Fixed Assets (C) | \$ | $(110,480)$ | \$ | $(200,000)$ | \$ | $(89,520)$ | 81.0\% | \$ | $(175,000)$ | \$ | 25,000 | (12.5\%) |
| TOTAL BUDGET ( $\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}$ ) | \$ | 26,950,566 | \$ | 27,848,683 | \$ | 898,117 | 3.3\% | \$ | 28,033,006 | \$ | 184,323 | 0.7\% |
| TOTAL CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL (A-B-C) | \$ | $(536,380)$ | \$ | $(1,765,118)$ | \$ | $(1,228,738)$ | (100.0\%) | \$ | $(1,689,805)$ | \$ | 75,313 | (4.3\%) |
| FTEs |  | 143.0 |  | 143.0 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 143.0 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| HC |  | 143.0 |  | 143.0 |  | - | 0.0\% |  | 143.0 |  | - | 0.0\% |

## Appendix C: Adjustment to the Alberta Electric System Operator (AESO) Assessment

| Adjustment to the AESO Assessments |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Credit for WECC Compliance Costs |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2018 |  | 2019 |  |
|  | Compliance Budget |  | Compliance Budget |  |
|  | AESO NEL Allocation |  | AESO NEL Allocation |  |
| WECC Compliance Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Costs less Direct Revenue | \$ | 9,310,101 | \$ | 9,629,471 |
| Indirect Costs |  | 5,362,114 |  | 5,329,085 |
| Fixed Asset Expenditures |  | $(71,794)$ |  | $(60,653)$ |
| Total Net Costs, including Fixed Assets | \$ | 14,600,421 | \$ | 14,897,903 |
| Net total to be allocated | \$ | 14,600,421 | \$ | 14,897,903 |
| AESO NEL Share (2016 \& 2017) |  | 6.892\% |  | 7.173\% |
| AESO Proportional Share of Compliance Costs, including Fixed Assets | \$ | 1,006,327 | \$ | 1,068,692 |
| \% Credit (56.54 of 59 FTE for 2018; 58 of 60 FTE for 2019) |  | 95.83\% |  | 96.67\% |
| AESO Credit for Compliance Costs | \$ | 964,368 | \$ | 1,033,069 |

## Appendix D: Statutory and Non-Statutory Budget History Charts




# NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY CORPORATION 

# 2019 BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET FILING 

## ATTACHMENT 4

WESTERN INTERCONNECTION REGIONAL ADVISORY BODY

PROPOSED 2019 BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET

# Western Interconnection Regional Advisory Body 

# 2019 Business Plan and Budget 

## June 29, 2018

Approved by: Appointed Members of the Western Interconnection Regional Advisory Body

1600 Broadway, Suite 1700
Denver, CO 80202
303-573-8910
www.westernenergyboard.org

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction ..... 3
Organizational Overview ..... 3
Membership and Governance ..... 6
Statutory Functional Scope ..... 7
2019 Strategic Priorities and Goals ..... 8
2019 Budget and Assessment Impacts ..... 15
Section A - Statutory Activities ..... 21
Governance and Strategic Planning ..... 22
Emerging Trends and System Risks ..... 22
Periodic Reliability Assessments ..... 25
Reliability Standards and Proactive Enforcement ..... 27
Section B - Supplemental Financial Information ..... 30
Working Capital Reserve ..... 30
Budget Projections for 2019-2020 ..... 32
Section C - Non-Statutory Activities ..... 35
Section D - Additional Consolidated Financial Statements ..... 37
Statement of Financial Position ..... 37
Appendix A Organization Chart ..... 38

## Introduction

The Western Interconnection Regional Advisory Body (WIRAB) proposed budget for 2019 is $\$ 1,162,700$. This amount is $\$ 94,915$ ( $8.9 \%$ ) higher than the amount in WIRAB's approved budget for 2018. Total proposed FTEs for 2019 are 5.0. WIRAB's total funding requirement is $\$ 750,600$. WIRAB's proposed funding assessment is $\$ 750,000$, an increase of $\$ 38,974$ (5.5\%) from the 2018 funding assessment. WIRAB's proposed funding assessment is allocated $\$ 629,550$ (84\%) to the U.S. portion, $\$ 109,050$ (14.5\%) to the Canadian portion, and $\$ 11,400$ (1.5\%) to the Mexican portion of the Western Interconnection. The following table summarizes the WIRAB proposed budget for 2019.

| WIRAB - Total Resources (in whole dollars) | 2019 Budget | U.S. | Canada | Mexico |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statutory FTEs | 5.00 |  |  |  |
| Non-statutory FTEs |  |  |  |  |
| Total FTEs | 5.00 |  |  |  |
| Statutory Expenses | \$ 1,162,700 |  |  |  |
| Non-Statutory Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| Total Expenses | \$ 1,162,700 |  |  |  |
| Statutory Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Statutory Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets |  |  |  |  |
| Total Inc(Dec) in Fixed Assets | \$ |  |  |  |
|  | \$ $(412,100)$ |  |  |  |
| Non-Statutory Working Capital Requirement | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total Working Capital Requirement | \$ $(412,100)$ |  |  |  |
| Total Statutory Funding Requirement | \$ 750,600 |  |  |  |
|  | \$ - |  |  |  |
| Total Non-Statutory Funding Requirement Total Funding Requirement | \$ 750,600 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Statutory Funding Assessments Non-Statutory Fees | \$ 750,000 | \$ 629,550 | \$ 109,050 | \$ 11,400 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| NEL | 867,701,562 | 728,328,390 | 126,140,685 | 13,232,487 |
| NEL\% | 100.00\% | 83.94\% | 14.54\% | 1.52\% |

Table 1. WIRAB Budget for 2019

## Organizational Overview

In April 2006, ten Western Governors petitioned the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) to create the Western Interconnection Regional

Advisory Body (WIRAB) under Section 215(j) of the Federal Power Act. The Governors indicated an interest in inviting all U.S. states, Canadian provinces, and Mexican jurisdictions with territory in the Western Interconnection to join WIRAB.

In July 2006, FERC issued an order granting the Governors' petition to establish WIRAB. ${ }^{1}$ In FERC's order, the Commission determined that WIRAB should receive funding for its Section 215(j) activities and directed WIRAB to annually develop a budget and related information for submission through the Electric Reliability Organization (ERO) budget approval process. The Commission instructed WIRAB to develop a budget in a form similar to that specified for regional entities as set forth in Order 672. ${ }^{2}$ The Commission also required WIRAB to identify the portion of its funding to be received from Canada and Mexico.

The Governors created WIRAB as a standing advisory committee to the Western Interstate Nuclear Board (WINB), which was formed pursuant to the Western Interstate Nuclear Compact, P.L. 91-461. WIRAB has the same status under the compact as the Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB). WIRAB operates under the bylaws of WINB, as revised on April 4, 2006. Below is a chart that illustrates these organizational relationships.

[^35]

Figure 1. Organizational Relationships

## Membership and Governance

All of the states with territory in the Western Interconnection (AZ, CA, CO, ID, MT, NE, NV, NM, OR, SD, TX, UT, WA, WY), the Canadian provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, and Mexico are eligible to appoint members to WIRAB. Member representatives of WIRAB are appointees of the Governors and Premiers, or designated alternates. Below is the list of current WIRAB member representatives:

| WIRAB Member Representatives |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alberta | Christine Lazaruk | Executive Director, Strategy and Integration, Alberta Energy |
| Arizona | Brian Goretzki | Chief, Bureau of Radiation Control, Arizona Department of Health Services |
| British Columbia | Les MacLaren | Assistant Deputy Minister, Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources |
| California | Janea Scott | Commissioner, California Energy Commission |
| Colorado | Frances Koncilja | Commissioner, Colorado Public Utilities Commission |
| Idaho | Kristine Raper | Commissioner, Idaho Public Utilities Commission |
| Montana | Jeff Blend | Tim Texel |
| Nebraska | Angie Dykema | Economist, Montana Department of Environmental Quality |
| Nevada | Executive Director, Nebraska Power Review Board |  |
| New Mexico | Ken McQueen | Cabinet Secretary, New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department |
| South Dakota | Greg Rislov | Commission Advisor, South Dakota Public Utilities Commission |
| Oregon | Janine Benner | Director, Oregon Department of Energy |
| Utah | David Clark | Commissioner, Utah Public Service Commission |
| Washington | Tony Usibelli | Sill Russell |

Figure 2. WIRAB Membership List

WIRAB holds two in-person meetings each year, typically in April and October. These meetings are open to the public. WIRAB also holds monthly conference calls to discuss emerging issues and hosts periodic webinars with presentations from subject matter experts on key reliability topics.

## Statutory Functional Scope

FERC established WIRAB as a Regional Advisory Body under section 215(j) of the Federal Power Act. The language in Section 215(j) specifically provides for WIRAB's authority to advise NERC, FERC and WECC on whether reliability standards, budgets and fees, governance, compliance, assessments, strategic direction and other activities conducted pursuant to Section 215 are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

Additionally, FERC authorized WIRAB to advise Peak Reliability, the Reliability Coordinator (RC) for the Western Interconnection, on these topics: "[D]eference to WIRAB is appropriate here because Peak Reliability funding implicates the following topics listed in FPA section 215(j) on which a Regional Advisory Body may give advice: 'governance of an existing or proposed regional entity ... [and] whether fees proposed to be assessed within the region are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.'" FERC Order on Rehearing, Docket No. EL13-52 et al., P. 46 (Dec. 6, 2013).

WIRAB's advice to FERC, NERC, WECC, and the RC can be grouped into four categories that are appropriately funded under Section 215 of the FPA:

1. Governance and Strategic Planning;
2. Emerging Trends and System Risks;
3. Periodic Reliability Assessments; and
4. Reliability Standards and Proactive Enforcement.

WIRAB's activities in each of these categories are described in Section A - Statutory Activities.

## 2019 Strategic Priorities and Goals

The resource mix of the Western power system is rapidly changing. Environmental regulations (including those to reduce regional haze and mercury emissions), efforts to transition to a lower carbon economy, and shifting market forces have resulted in announced retirements of coal-fired and nuclear generating units. Utility-scale wind and solar generation is being built in many parts of the West, and California and the Desert Southwest are experiencing rapid growth in the installation of distributed solar photovoltaic generation. State energy storage procurement mandates are also incentivizing a broader implementation of energy storage technologies that may support higher penetrations of asynchronous, variable energy resources (VER). These changes to the generation resource mix will present new reliability challenges and opportunities for the Western Interconnection as more asynchronous generation is added to the system and additional synchronous spinning mass generation is retired.

Grid modernization efforts also present new reliability challenges and opportunities for the West. Increased reliance on distributed energy resources (DER) and electric vehicles (EV) is creating a need for better coordination between Bulk Electric System (BES) operators and distribution system operators and a greater need for implementation, research, and development of new technologies and operational tools that can be used to improve system reliability throughout the West. Grid modernization also necessitates an increasing focus on cyber security, grid resilience, and physical hardening of electric grid infrastructure. Physical and cyber threats to the grid will continue to impact the availability of data and the transparency of periodic reliability assessments, creating a need for better data sharing protocols to improve information sharing, coordination, and overall situational awareness.

The structure of Western power markets is also undergoing significant change, creating new reliability challenges and opportunities for the Western Interconnection. The California Independent System Operator (ISO) Western Energy Imbalance Market (EIM) continues to gain new participants and the California ISO is considering offering day ahead market services to EIM participants. The Southwest Power Pool (SPP) and Peak Reliability-PJM Connext are offering market services to BAs and TOPs within the Western Interconnection. Finally, Alberta is expanding its energy-only market to an energy and capacity market. These market reforms could result in significant changes
to system operations (e.g., transmission scheduling, congestion management, and reliability coordination).

The fragmentation of Reliability Coordinator (RC) responsibilities across the Western Interconnection also raises questions about ongoing reliable operations of the BES. The California ISO and SPP have both announced their intent to offer RC services to Balancing Authorities (BAs) and Transmission Operators (TOPs) throughout the Western Interconnection. Starting in September 2019, Peak Reliability will no longer be the sole RC for the U.S. portion of the Western Interconnection; raising concerns about shared responsibilities for coordinated RC operations across RC boundaries and seams.

In response to these on-going changes in the Western Interconnection, WIRAB has identified four strategic initiatives that it will pursue in 2019:

Initiative 1: Work with WECC and NERC to ensure that all Reliability Coordinators (RCs) in the Western Interconnection work cooperatively and in the public interest to coordinate outages, study seams issues, and share information to maintain or improve the overall reliability of the Bulk Electric System.

In January 2018, the California ISO (CAISO) announced its intent to withdraw from Peak Reliability's Funding Agreement and to offer RC services to Balancing Authorities (BAs) and Transmission Operators (TOPs) within its own footprint and throughout the Western Interconnection starting in September 2019. The Southwest Power Pool (SPP) also expressed its intent to offer RC services to the Mountain West Transmission Group (MWTG) (along with market services) and to other BAs and TOPs within the Western Interconnection. Nearly all of Peak Reliability's Funding Parties have now submitted revocable notices to withdraw from Peak Reliability's Funding Agreement for RC Services by September 1, 2019 or at the end of 2019. The prospect of having multiple reliability coordinators in the Western Interconnection raises concerns about interconnection-wide coordination and shared responsibilities for operations across RC boundaries and seams.

In 2019, WIRAB will encourage Western Interconnection RCs to maintain or improve reliability by working cooperatively and in the public interest to coordinate outages, study seams issues and share information.

The goals of this initiative are to:

- Maintain high-quality RC Services at Peak Reliability as other entities pursue RC certification.
- Maintain or improve reliability in a new, multiple RC environment by encouraging RC providers to analyze, coordinate, collaborate on seams issues.
- Maintain high-quality and cost-effective RC Services across the West.

The actions that WIRAB staff will take to achieve these goals include:

- Participating as an observer in the Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC)/NERC Certification Process for all RC Certifications in the Western Interconnection.
- Work with the RCs and WECC to establish a Western Interconnection seams coordination groups to ensure information is being shared between RCs, BAs, and TOPs.
- Work with the RCs and WECC to determine if WECC specific standards, criteria or guidance is necessary to maintain situational awareness at an interconnection-wide level.
- Work with NERC to ensure that any new or updated RC reliability standards appropriately account for the unique operating characteristics of the Western Interconnection.
- Advise RC providers on the RC governance structure to ensure that the RC remains independent within their organization.
- Advise all RCs on RC service rate structures, terms, and fees.

Initiative 2: Advise WECC on the implications of high levels of distributed solar photovoltaic (PV) deployment on the reliable operation of the Bulk Electric System.

In 2019, WIRAB will continue to advise WECC on the implications of high levels of distributed solar PV deployment. By 2026, solar PV generation in the Western U.S. is projected to total more than $16,000 \mathrm{MW}$ in nameplate capacity. While there are many
expected benefits of increasing distributed solar PV generation, several potential reliability concerns are also associated with this trend.

One such concern stems from the potential for many distributed solar PV systems to simultaneously "trip off" or disconnect from the grid. This event could be triggered by the effects of an original system contingency, such as loss of a significant generator. Inverters that interconnect distributed solar PV systems with the grid are typically configured to have narrow tolerance ranges for frequency and voltage deviations. If a system contingency alters grid frequency or voltage to a value outside of inverter tolerance ranges, distributed solar PV generation will disconnect from the grid. This simultaneous tripping of distributed solar systems can exacerbate the original system contingency and potentially result in load-shedding or system outages. Wider inverter tolerance ranges could mitigate the risk by allowing these generators to ridethrough some abnormal conditions and could, in some circumstances, provide additional benefits to BES reliability.

Another concern regarding increasing distributed solar PV generation is that this generation is often not visible to system operators. This lack of visibility has been recognized in California, where the Smart Inverter Working Group (SIWG) has provided recommendations to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) concerning deployment and utilization of advanced inverters. Advanced inverters can improve the visibility of distributed generation to system operators because they enable two-way communication between the generator and the utility.

In 2017, WIRAB's sister organization, WIEB, initiated a three-year project to mitigate or remove barriers to deployment of distributed solar PV generation in the Western Interconnection. WIEB is working with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) to address potential reliability barriers. WIRAB will share the key findings and insights of this research with WECC and its stakeholders.

The goals of this initiative are to:

- Inform WECC and its stakeholders of key findings and insights from research on potential reliability concerns with increasing deployment of distributed solar PV.
- Inform the WECC Reliability Assessment Committee of modeling techniques used by NREL to conduct its assessment of reliability concerns associated with distributed solar PV systems.
- Inform WECC and its RAC of reliability concerns that warrant further study and assessment.

The actions that WIRAB staff will take to achieve these goals include:

- Participating directly in RAC subcommittee meetings to share key findings and insights and new modelling techniques.
- Including key findings and insights in WIRAB's reports to the WECC Board of Directors.


## Initiative 3: Encourage WECC to systematically perform reliability assessments evaluating the availability of Essential Reliability Services under a wide range of future resource scenarios.

WIRAB continues to build upon a multi-year initiative to improve WECC's ability to assess the availability of essential reliability services under a wide range of future resource scenarios. WECC's Reliability Assessment Committee (RAC) continues to work to better integrate its power flow modeling and production cost modeling. WECC continues to work with stakeholders to develop an "Anchor Data Set," envisioned to be a common, unified data set for power flow and production cost modeling across the Western Interconnection. These steps, if properly implemented, would improve WECC's ability to perform reliability assessments of essential reliability services under a wide-range of future scenarios.

A systematic assessment of essential reliability services includes the evaluation of whether the power system has sufficient ramping capability, frequency response, and voltage stability under a variety of conditions as the resource mix in the Western Interconnection continues to change. It also includes evaluation of mitigation measures when reliability concerns are identified. ${ }^{3}$

[^36]The goals of this initiative are for WECC to:

- Complete integrated reliability assessments (i.e., ramping, frequency response, and voltage stability) of a future with: 1) high utility-scale development of nonsynchronous wind and solar generation; 2) significant retirements of coal-fired generation in the Western Interconnection; and 3) high-penetration of distributed energy resources, including rooftop solar photovoltaics.
- Complete the modeling and analysis, and then publicly disseminate written reports describing the methodology and results of the reliability assessments. The actions that WIRAB staff will take to achieve these goals include:
- Participating directly in the RAC Studies Subcommittee Governing Body and monitoring other RAC activities that provide the foundation for development of the integrated data set and analytical tools needed to conduct comprehensive reliability assessments of the Western Interconnection and the availability of essential reliability services under a wide-range of future scenarios.
- Advising WECC on the tools and data to be developed for reliability assessments.
- Advising and assisting WECC in reporting on reliability assessments to be completed by the RAC.
- Participating in the WECC process to identify reliability risk priorities and advising WECC on priorities in the Western Interconnection.

Initiative 4: Encourage WECC to share key findings and insights from its Event Analysis and Situational Awareness Program in public briefings with Western policymakers and regulators in an effort to increase awareness of the causes of system events and the actions that can be taken to prevent recurrences of the events.

Over the past year, WIRAB has hosted multiple webinars with policymakers and industry experts to discuss recent power system events, such as "Blue Cut Fire Event" in Southern California. During the Blue Cut Fire Event, solar PV inverter settings caused multiple solar PV plants to trip offline simultaneously in response to a brief, momentary decline in system frequency, resulting in a loss of nearly 1,200 MWs of PV power generation. The resulting imbalance between generation and load caused a significant decline in system frequency. The California ISO was able to quickly restore its load/resource balance without shedding load. WIRAB used this event and others as a tutorial to share information on the role of the Reliability Coordinator and Balancing Authorities in responding to deviations in system frequency. Peak and the California ISO discussed how they work together to maintain reliability during these types of events. Sharing lessons learned from these types of events with policymakers and regulators is an important way to raise awareness of key issues and to improve state energy policy. As the regional entity, it is appropriate that WECC share lesson learned from its Event Analysis and Situational Awareness Program in public briefings with Western policymakers and regulators to increase awareness of recent events and to inform future public policy.

The goals of this initiative are for:

- WECC to conduct periodic public briefings with Western policymakers and regulators in order to share lessons learned from the Event Analysis and Situational Awareness Program.
- WECC and WIRAB to increase awareness of the causes of system events and actions that can be taken to prevent recurrences of events with Western policymakers and regulators.

The actions that WIRAB staff will take to achieve these goals include:

- Work with WECC to identify potential power system events for discussion and frame information at a level that policymakers and stakeholders can understand.
- Work with WECC to disseminate information and lessons learned to an audience of Western policymakers and stakeholders.


## 2019 Budget and Assessment Impacts

The WIRAB proposed budget for 2019 is $\$ 1,162,700$. This amount is $\$ 94,915$ (8.9\%) higher than the amount in WIRAB's approved budget for 2018. Total proposed FTEs for 2019 are 5.0. WIRAB's total funding requirement is $\$ 750,600$. WIRAB's proposed funding assessment is \$750,000 an increase of \$38,974 (5.5\%) from the 2018 funding assessment.

## Personnel and Indirect Expenses

Personnel expenses increase from \$408,111 in the 2018 Budget to \$436,500 (7.0\%) in the 2019 Budget due to personnel changes and cost-of-living and merit-based salary increases. WIRAB uses a single rate method for indirect expenses. The indirect expenses include office expenses, medical and retirement expenses as well as holiday, vacation and sick leave for WIRAB staff. The indirect rate is a percent of direct staff time spent on WIRAB. The indirect rate increases from 96\% of direct labor costs in the 2018 Budget to 101\% in the 2019 Budget. The increase is due to increased expenses for office rent, medical insurance, employee retirement, and other office costs. Table 2 shows personnel and indirect expenses per FTE for the approved 2018 Budget and the proposed 2019 Budget.

| WIRAB - Personnel and Indirect Expense Analysis 2018-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATUTORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Budget } \\ 2018 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Projection } \\ 2018 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Budget 2019 |  | Variance 2019 Budget v 2018 Budget |  | Variance \% |
| Salary Expense | \$ | 408,111 | \$ | 408,200 | \$ | 436,500 | \$ | 28,389 | 7.0\% |
| FTEs |  | 5.50 |  | 5.50 |  | 5.00 |  | (0.50) | -9.1\% |
| Cost per FTE | \$ | 74,202 | \$ | 74,218 | \$ | 87,300 | \$ | 13,098 | 17.7\% |
| Indirect Rate |  | 96.0\% |  | 96.0\% |  | 101.3\% |  |  |  |
| Indirect Expense | \$ | 391,664 | \$ | 391,700 | \$ | 442,200 | \$ | 50,536 | 12.9\% |
| FTEs |  | 5.50 |  | 5.50 |  | 5.00 |  | (0.50) | -9.1\% |
| Cost per FTE | \$ | 71,212 | \$ | 71,218 | \$ | 88,440 | \$ | 17,228 | 24.2\% |

## Table 2. Personnel and Indirect Expense Analysis, 2018-2019.

## Meeting Expense

Meeting costs increase by $\$ 10,100$ to $\$ 80,800$. WIRAB will hold two major inperson meetings per year that include participation by state/provincial agencies with electric power responsibilities in the Western Interconnection. Wherever feasible, WIRAB meetings will be coordinated with other meetings of the Western states and provinces. Webinars on topics of concern will continue to be utilized between meetings. WIRAB also conducts monthly conference calls to update members on current activities and to develop positions on reliability issues in the Western Interconnection. Conference call costs increase by $\$ 1,180$ to $\$ 3,200$.

## Travel Expense

Travel costs increase by $\$ 4,720$ to $\$ 100,000$. WIRAB member travel to biannual meetings and reliability conferences accounts for $\$ 28,200$. WIRAB staff travel to attend meetings of WIRAB, WECC and Peak Reliability accounts for $\$ 71,800$. Hotel and travel costs are based on experience from the last year.

## Consultants and Contracts

The budget includes $\$ 100,000$ in contract funding for technical expertise on issues related to improved grid operating practices, reliability standards and compliance. This expertise will help WIRAB prepare technically-sound advice under Section 215(j).

## Budget Comparison

Table 3 shows the 2018 Budget and 2018 Projection compared to the 2019 Budget.


Table 3. Budget Comparison, 2018 to 2019.

## Statutory Assessments

WIRAB's proposed funding assessment of \$750,000 is allocated \$629,550 (84\%)
to the U.S. portion, $\$ 109,050$ (14.5\%) to the Canadian portion, and $\$ 11,400$ (1.5\%) to the Mexican portion of the Western Interconnection.

## Key Assumptions

The WIRAB 2019 Budget and Business Plan is based on the following assumptions:

- There will be no significant expansion of FERC, NERC, WECC, or Peak Reliability responsibilities as a result of legislation or administrative actions.
- WIRAB will continue to provide advice to Peak Reliability.
- WIRAB will hold two in-person meetings in 2019.
- WIRAB will organize and sponsor webinars and workshops on key reliability issues for WIRAB members, state and provincial representatives, industry representatives, and other interested stakeholders.
- WIRAB will attend all WECC and Peak Reliability Board of Directors and Member Advisory Committee (MAC) meetings.
- WIRAB will attend selected NERC meetings and workshops on relevant topics.
- WIRAB will annually visit with FERC in its offices.
- WIRAB will monitor all FERC business meetings.
- WIRAB will attend FERC technical conferences on reliability issues.


## Section A - Statutory Activities 2019 Business Plan and Budget

## Section A - Statutory Activities

WIRAB's advice to FERC, NERC, WECC, and Peak Reliability can be grouped into four categories that are appropriately funded under Section 215 of the FPA:

1. Governance and Strategic Planning: Section 215(j) of the FPA authorizes WIRAB to provide advice to FERC on the governance, strategic direction, budget and fees of WECC. FERC has previously authorized WIRAB to provide advice on the governance, strategic direction, budget and fees of Peak Reliability.
2. Emerging Trends and System Risks: WIRAB must maintain awareness of system conditions and emerging trends and system risks in order to provide effective and technically sound advice regarding the strategic direction of FERC and Peak Reliability. WIRAB also uses knowledge of emerging trends and risks to provide advice to WECC on reliability readiness activities and proactive compliance efforts. These activities are appropriately funded under Section 215(j) of the FPA.
3. Periodic Reliability Assessments: Section 215 (g) of the FPA requires NERC to conduct periodic assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the bulk-power system. WECC assists NERC in performing this statutory activity. WIRAB works closely with WECC to improve reliability assessment in the Western Interconnection.
4. Reliability Standards and Proactive Enforcement: Section 215(j) of the FPA authorizes WIRAB to provide advice to FERC on whether reliability standards are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest. WIRAB works closely with WECC and Peak Reliability to identify emerging problems or conditions that should be considered in the course of drafting and voting on amendments to existing standards or new standards. WIRAB also works closely with WECC to develop reliability readiness activities and to promote proactive compliance efforts.

WIRAB's activities in each of these categories are described in the following subsections.

## Governance and Strategic Planning

Section 215(j) of the FPA authorizes WIRAB to advise FERC on the governance, strategic direction, budget, and fees of WECC and Peak Reliability. The WIRAB staff engages with the WECC and Peak Reliability Boards of Directors, standing committees, staff, Member Advisory Committees (MACs), and MAC work groups to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of governance and operations at each organization and to ensure that all "activities conducted pursuant to Section 215 are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest."

The WIRAB staff attends meetings of the WECC and Peak Reliability Boards of Directors, standing committees, Member Advisory Committees (MAC), and MAC work groups, and monitors developments related to each organization's organizational governance, strategic direction, and budget. The WIRAB staff also conducts monthly webinars to provide WIRAB Members, WECC and Peak Reliability's Class 5 Representatives, and other interested stakeholders with regular updates on current and upcoming activities at WECC and Peak Reliability and to review and develop WIRAB's written advice and guidance to the Boards of Directors. WIRAB provides WECC and Peak Reliability with independent expert advice on operational practices and performance, annual business plans and budgets, strategic plans, committee charters, proposed bylaw amendments, fees, and other matters. WIRAB and the WIRAB staff will continue to engage with WECC and Peak Reliability and to provide advice and recommendations to each organization as necessary.

## Emerging Trends and System Risks

WIRAB staff will engage in the following on-going activities in order to provide independent expert advice on emerging reliability trends and system risks:

## Event Analysis and Situational Awareness:

Understanding important operational issues occurring today, as well as in the past, is key to ensuring reliability in the Western Interconnection. Event analysis and situational awareness topics need to be discussed in open and transparent forums that include both utility operators who see these types of issues on a day-to-day basis and thought leaders from diverse backgrounds. It is important to promote best practices and
lessons learned to ensure system operators have access to the tools and knowledge available to maintain a reliable grid in real-time.

WIRAB members and the WIRAB staff provide leadership by attending and participating in WECC's Operating Committee meetings, WECC's Market Implementation Committee meetings and Peak Reliability's RC User Group meetings, as well as other forums outside of WECC and Peak Reliability. The WIRAB staff also provides periodic outreach webinars and panel sessions at in-person meetings to identify and discuss emerging trends and risks associated with event analysis and situational awareness with Western policy makers and other stakeholders.

## Distributed Solar PV Generation Resources:

By 2026, solar photovoltaic (PV) generation in the Western U.S. is projected to total more than $16,000 \mathrm{MW}$ in nameplate capacity. While California is projected to contribute the majority of this capacity, several other Western states are also predicted to contribute to Western-wide distributed solar PV capacity. Significant benefits of this trend include distributed solar PV generation's increased capacity, partial coincidence with peak power demand, potential for the provision of grid support services, and reductions in greenhouse gas and conventional air pollutant emissions. Several potentially deleterious impacts are also associated with distributed solar PV capacity, including the potential for simultaneous disconnection of distributed solar PV generation systems with narrow tolerance ranges for frequency and/or voltage deviations, which may be triggered by and exacerbate deviations created by an original system contingency such as the loss of a significant generator. Advanced inverters permit wider tolerance range settings, could provide frequency and/or voltage ride-through in the event of a system contingency, and have other capabilities that could provide additional benefits.

In addition to the trend of increasing distributed solar PV generation, there is a trend for retirement of synchronous generators such as coal-fired power plants in Western states. Non-synchronous generation technologies, specifically solar PV generation, have historically been regarded as unable to provide the grid support services commonly associated with synchronous generation resources, such as frequency support and voltage control. New power electronic technologies, however,
enable non-synchronous generation to provide grid support more rapidly than synchronous generators.

WIEB and WIRAB are leading efforts to study potential reliability problems associated with increasing distributed solar PV generation in the Western Interconnection. WIEB and WIRAB support the technical advisory committees in their efforts to advise research partners and to provide feedback on study findings and interpretations. WIEB and WIRAB representatives and staff also work to disseminate research findings and policy recommendations on potential reliability concerns associated with distributed solar PV generation to regulators and policymakers in Western Interconnection states.

## Expanding Market Operations:

Expanding market operations is a growing trend in the Western Interconnection. Western states have engaged in discussions on the potential creation of a regional ISO that would involve a multi-state grid using the California ISO's technology to coordinate and optimize electric systems across the states. The Energy Imbalance Market (EIM), which began operation in 2014, has been continuously expanding to include new participants. Additionally, the California ISO is developing plans to extend day ahead market services to EIM participants. Other market opportunities are also being explored in the West. Peak Reliability and PJM Connext are exploring the possibility of engaging in a joint venture to provide Reliability Coordination ( RC ) services and energy markets in the West and the Mountain West Transmission Group (MWTG), formed by electricity service providers in the eastern part of the Western Interconnection, is evaluating various options, including membership in an existing regional transmission organization (RTO), the Southwest Power Pool (SPP). These market reforms could result in significant changes to system operations (e.g., transmission scheduling, congestion management) and create new reliability challenges and opportunities for the Western Interconnection.

The WIRAB staff monitors market reform efforts in the West and provides a forum for discussions about related issues such as the potential for a regional ISO, expansion of the EIM to new participants, extending the California ISO's day ahead market services to EIM participants, and opportunities and challenges for the MWTG. The WIRAB staff monitors and participates in other forums that are exploring these
issues, such as PUC and RTO meetings and workshops. Additionally, the WIRAB staff attends and participates in relevant WECC committee meetings and activities, such as those of the Market Interface Committee (MIC). WIRAB will continue to provide advice to WECC and Peak Reliability and to make recommendations as appropriate on reliability challenges and opportunities associated with expanding market operations.

## Essential Reliability Services:

With the rapidly changing resource mix, the BES is becoming increasingly reliant on more variable, asynchronous generating resources. It is important that the electric utility industry examine emerging issues and ensure that policies and practices set today do not adversely impact reliability, now and in the future. With the changing resource mix, some reliability services that are inherently provided by traditional generation resources may not be available to the same extent in the future. However, policies and practices accounting for these emerging technologies can ensure grid reliability, even if the future grid operates differently.

WIRAB staff provides leadership and advice by attending, participating in and monitoring WECC's Reliability Assessment Committee, Operating Committee and Market Implementation Committee meetings, Peak Reliability's RC User Group meetings, NERC's Essential Reliability Service Work Group meetings, FERC's Reliability Technical Conferences and other forums within the industry. WIRAB provides written advice to WECC, Peak, and FERC on policies regarding the provision of essential reliability services. WIRAB staff also provides periodic outreach webinars and develops panel sessions for WIRAB's in-person meetings to discuss emerging trends and to inform Western policy makers and other interested stakeholders of the emerging risks associated with the changing resource mix and the provision of essential reliability services.

## Periodic Reliability Assessments

WIRAB staff engage in the following on-going activities in order to provide guidance and independent expert advice on WECC's periodic reliability assessments:

## Variable Energy Resources:

High priority reliability topics for the Western Interconnection include the increasing penetration of variable renewable resources, increasing retirements of baseload coal generation that would reduce inertia on the grid, and the growth of distributed energy resources that interface with the Bulk Electric System. WIRAB strives for high quality resource assessments that address the reliability implications of the changing resource mix in the Western Interconnection over a 10- to 20-year timeframe. Production cost modeling can identify economic dispatch of a potential new resource mix for every hour over a future year and identify critical hours of system stress. Power flow analysis then examines these critical stress hours for traditional reliability parameters. The integrated use of production cost modeling and power flow analysis will be an essential tool for future reliability assessments of the Western Interconnection.

WIRAB monitors, advises, and participates in WECC's Reliability Assessment Committee (RAC) to promote improved reliability assessments of the Western Interconnection. WIRAB will encourage and support the RAC in its efforts to integrate WECC's data and modeling capability to perform roundtrip reliability assessments that combine power flow analysis and production cost modeling. WIRAB will also monitor, engage, and communicate findings on leading research about the integration of variable energy resources into the Western Interconnection, such as the work of NERC's Inverter-Based Resource Performance Joint Task Force. Further, WIRAB staff monitors and engages with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), the Utility Variable Integration Group, the California ISO, and other researchers investigating the flexibility and reliability of the power system to integrate higher levels of renewable energy. WIRAB also provides outreach to Western states and provinces on the policy implications associated with new research.

## Gas-Electric Interdependencies:

The North American power sector's reliance on natural gas for electric generation has grown significantly. Low natural gas prices, environmental regulations, and improving technologies have all contributed to rapid and sustained investment in new gas-fired power plants across the U.S. The natural gas and electricity industries evolved independently but are now inextricably interdependent. In the West, issues
surrounding the Aliso Canyon natural gas storage field in southern California highlighted these interdependencies. In response to growing concerns about electric reliability, both FERC and NERC directed focused inquiries into issues related to gas-electric coordination, including NERC's assessment of single points of disruption.

In 2014, WIRAB's sister organization, WIEB, commissioned a Western-Interconnection-wide assessment of gas-electric interdependencies. Phase 1 of the study assessed natural gas infrastructure. Phase 2 of the study assessed short term operational flexibility. In 2017-2018, WIRAB staff participated in WECC's Gas and Electric Interface Study, which analyzed potential vulnerabilities between the gas sector and the electric sector in the Western Interconnection. WIRAB members and the WIRAB staff continue to work with WIRAB's partners in the Western Interconnection to assess the adequacy, security, and risks associated with natural gas infrastructure and its ability to reliably meet evolving BES needs.

## Reliability Standards and Proactive Enforcement

WIRAB staff engage in the following on-going activities in order to provide independent expert advice on the development and proactive enforcement of reliability standards:

## Reliability Standards:

NERC reliability standards were created to provide minimum requirements for planning and operating the electric grid. The compliance and enforcement of these reliability standards ensures there is oversight and accountability of BES owners and operators and that system-wide reliability is maintained. It is important that reliability standards are strict enough to guarantee that system reliability is maintained, but flexible enough to respond to the changing industry. It is important to develop and review reliability standards to ensure they effectively preserve reliability while not being overly burdensome on the entities required to comply.

WIRAB staff provides independent expert advice on the development and proactive enforcement of reliability standards by contracting with subject matter experts with direct knowledge of the efficacy of reliability standards and the burden of compliance on regulated entities. WIRAB staff attends, participates and/or monitors

WECC's Operating Committee meetings, WECC's Standards Committee meetings, NERC's standard development process and other industry forums. When necessary, WIRAB provides written advice to WECC, NERC and FERC on the implementation of specific standards within the Western Interconnection. WIRAB staff also provide periodic outreach webinars and panel sessions at in-person meetings to lead discussions on emerging trends and risks associated with enforceable reliability standards and to inform Western policy makers and other stakeholders on these issues.

## Physical Security and Cybersecurity:

Physical security and cybersecurity of the electric grid are of great concern. Until recent years, physical and cyber security incidents were confined to other sectors. Recently, however, physical incidents (including two incidents at a California substation) and cyber incidents (including a late 2015 incident in the Ukraine that left one-quarter of a million customers without power) have impacted the power sector.

WIRAB has monitored incidents that have compromised the physical security and cybersecurity of the grid for several years. In 2014, 2015, and 2017, WIRAB conducted webinars on the physical security and/or cybersecurity of the grid. In addition, WIRAB has monitored NERC's Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) standards. As appropriate, WIRAB will provide updates on CIP standards during its Monthly Teleconference with WIRAB members.
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## Working Capital Reserve

WIRAB projects it will have a working capital reserve of $\$ 1,012,100$ on December 31, 2018, as compared to a desired working capital reserve at December 31, 2019, of $\$ 600,000$. The surplus working capital reserve results in a $\$ 412,100$ reduction in WIRAB's funding requirement for 2019. WIRAB is changing its reserve policy to stabilize statutory assessments over the next several budget cycles. WIRAB has traditionally maintained a working capital reserve of \$100,000. Higher working capital reserves in 2019 and 2020 are intended to stabilize assessments during the transition from the current high level of reserves. Starting in 2021, WIRAB will strive to maintain a reserve equal to $20 \%$ of budgeted expenses. Table B. 1 shows WIRAB's analysis of working capital reserve.


Table B-1. Working Capital Reserve Analysis 2018-2019.

## Budget Projections for 2019-2021

| WIRAB - Statement of Activities and Change in Working Capital 2019 Budget \& 2020 and 2021 Projections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STATUTORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2019 <br> Budget | 2020 <br> Projection |  | ariance Projection 19 Budget er(Under) | \% Change | 2021 <br> Projection |  | Variance 21 v 2020 <br> jections <br> er(Under) | \% Change |
| Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WIRAB Funding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessments | \$ | 750,000 | \$1,012,100 | \$ | 262,100 | 34.9\% | \$1,115,700 | \$ | 103,600 | 10.2\% |
| Penalty Sanctions |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total WIRAB Funding | \$ | 750,000 | \$1,012,100 | \$ | 262,100 | 34.9\% | \$1,115,700 | \$ | 103,600 | 10.2\% |
| Membership Dues |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Testing Fees |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Services \& Software |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Workshops |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Interest |  | 600 | 600 | \$ | - | 0.0\% | 600 | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
| Miscellaneous |  | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total Funding (A) | \$ | 750,600 | \$1,012,700 | \$ | 262,100 | 34.9\% | \$1,116,300 | \$ | 103,600 | 10.2\% |
| Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salaries |  | 436,500 | 449,600 |  | 13,100 | 3.0\% | 463,100 | \$ | 13,500 | 3.0\% |
| Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |
| Benefits |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |
| Retirement Costs |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |
| Total Personnel Expenses | \$ | 436,500 | \$ 449,600 | \$ | 13,100 | 3.0\% | \$ 463,100 | \$ | 13,500 | 3.0\% |
| Meeting Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WIRAB Meetings | \$ | 80,800 | \$ 83,200 | \$ | 2,400 | 3.0\% | \$ 85,700 | \$ | 2,500 | 3.0\% |
| State Travel | \$ | 28,200 | \$ 29,000 | \$ | 800 | 2.8\% | \$ 29,900 | \$ | 900 | 3.1\% |
| Staff Travel | \$ | 71,800 | \$ 74,000 | \$ | 2,200 | 3.1\% | \$ 76,200 | \$ | 2,200 | 3.0\% |
| Conference Calls | \$ | 3,200 | \$ 3,300 | \$ | 100 | 3.1\% | \$ 3,400 | \$ | 100 | 3.0\% |
| Total Meeting Expenses | \$ | 184,000 | \$ 189,500 | \$ | 5,500 | 3.0\% | \$ 195,200 | \$ | 5,700 | 3.0\% |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultants \& Contracts | \$ | 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ | - | 0.0\% | \$ 100,000 | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
| Office Rent |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
| Office Costs |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
| Professional Services |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
| Miscellaneous |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
| Depreciation |  | - | - |  | - | - | - |  | - | - |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 100,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ | - | 0.0\% | \$ 100,000 | \$ | - | 0.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Direct Expenses | \$ | 720,500 | \$ 739,100 | \$ | 18,600 | 2.6\% | \$ 758,300 | \$ | 19,200 | 2.6\% |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 442,200 | \$ 455,500 | \$ | 13,300 | 3.0\% | \$ 469,200 | \$ |  |  |
| Indirect Expenses | \$ | 442,200 | \$ 455,500 | \$ | 13,300 | 3.0\% | \$ 469,200 | \$ | 13,700 | 3.0\% |
| Other Non-Operating Expenses | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ | - | - | \$ | \$ | - | - |
| TOTAL BUDGET (B) | \$ | 1,162,700 | \$1,194,600 | \$ | 31,900 | 2.7\% | \$1,227,500 | \$ | 32,900 | 2.8\% |
| CHANGE IN WORKING CAPITAL (=A-B) ${ }^{1}$ | \$ | $(412,100)$ | \$ (181,900) | \$ | 230,200 | - | \$(111,200) | \$ | 70,700 | - |
| FTEs |  | 5.00 | 5.00 |  | - | 0.0\% | 5.00 |  | - | 0.0\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ Fixed Assest included in Indirect Expenses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B-2. Budget 2019 Compared with 2019-2020 Projections.

WIRAB projects a $2.7 \%$ increase to its annual budget in 2020 and a $2.8 \%$ increase in 2021. These increases reflect expected cost-of-living adjustments to personnel expenses for employees working in Denver, Colorado and increased costs for meetings and travel.

## Section C - Non-Statutory Activities 2019 Business Plan and Budget

## Section C - Non-Statutory Activities

WIRAB does not engage in non-statutory activities.

## Section D - Additional Consolidated Financial Statements

## Section D - Additional Consolidated Financial Statements

## Statement of Financial Position

Table D-1 provides WIRAB's Statement of Financial Position as of the following dates:

- As of December 31, 2016, per audit
- As of December 31, 2018, projected
- As of December 31, 2019, as budgeted

|  | WIRAB - Statement of Financial Position |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table D-1. Statement of Financial Position, Three-Year Comparison

## Appendix A Organization Chart

The WIRAB Organization Chart is shown below.
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## ATTACHMENT 5

NERC MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSES

TO STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS SUBMITTED
ON DRAFT \#1 AND DRAFT \#2 OF NERC'S

2019 BUSINESS PLAN AND BUDGET

## RE:

 Management Response to Comments
## Draft \#1

The stakeholder comment period on the first draft of NERC's 2019 Business Plan and Budget (BP\&B) was
May 18-June 29, 2018. Comments were submitted by six entities and covered a range of topics. Below is a summary of those comments and NERC management's responses as applicable.

## E-ISAC Member Executive Committee (MEC) ${ }^{1}$

The MEC, comprised of the leadership of several large electric utilities across the country, provided a resolution in support of the proposed 2019 budget for the E-ISAC, agreeing to the aggressive approach to strategy and funding. The MEC also expressed appreciation for the focus of the overall NERC budget on making investments in tools and technology to increase efficiency.

## American Public Power Association (APPA)

APPA expressed support for the 2019 E-ISAC budget and offered comments on the non-E-ISAC proposed 2019 budget increase. APPA requested additional clarity and explanation on the following: (1) the need for the upgrade to the situational awareness tool, SAFNR; (2) the associated savings from the SPP RE dissolution; (3) the additional costs for the CMEP Technology Project; and (4) the expected cost savings resulting from the office rent expense increase for facility expansion. APPA also encouraged NERC to consider benchmarking medical and other benefit expenses, and to use stakeholder engagement as much as possible for the CMEP Technology Project.

## 1. SAFNR Upgrade

SAFNR, a situation awareness system that was initiated in February 2010, is a critical tool for NERC situation awareness staff, as it provides valuable, near real-time information about the current operating conditions of the BPS from a wide-area view. The tool is also used during the E-ISAC's grid security exercises (GridEx) to provide E-ISAC and NERC situation awareness staff the ability to collaborate on a common relative operating picture. Though NERC funds SAFNR as the primary user, the tool is also used by and benefits Regional Entity and FERC staff. NERC continually coordinates and collaborates with these additional users to ensure the system is providing the necessary capabilities and not duplicative of other resources.

While the tool has been maintained and used successfully for more than eight years, the aging technology does not allow NERC staff to efficiently update the underlying power system information or real-time data feeds on risks to reliability. Re-platforming the tool will allow for a
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more a precise wide-area view of system conditions, and will also meet the GridEx IV recommendation to enhance the ability to provide reliable, timely, and accurate information regarding the state of grid reliability and security threats and events. Because the tool benefits both the situation awareness and E-ISAC teams, approximately one-third of the costs for the SAFNR upgrade are budgeted to the E-ISAC with the rest under the Situation Awareness program, which is subject to change as the benefits of the upgrade are realized. The upgrade to SAFNR will go through the same business case and approval process as other enterprise IT investments.
2. Associated Savings from SPP RE Dissolution

NERC does not expect any direct cost savings as a result of the dissolution, but anticipates that any savings realized by the ERO Enterprise will be felt primarily at the Regional Entity level by the registered entities in those Regions. During the budget approval process in 2019 and 2020, those Regions taking additional registered entities (MRO and SERC) will provide information on the impacts of the dissolution and related transition of entities and associated responsibilities.
3. CMEP Technology Project

There have been no additions to the existing scope and estimated costs for the CMEP Technology Project, and the current estimated annual operating costs are actually below the business case estimate based on recent contract negotiations. The additional costs in question are related to the Standards Database and Entity Registration IT projects. While these are separate projects that will go through their own business case and approval process, they complement the CMEP project and have been accelerated to more smoothly integrate them during development. These IT solutions have been part of the ERO Enterprise IT roadmap for several years.

NERC is currently engaging with stakeholders during the development of the new CMEP system, particularly through the Compliance and Certification Committee's (CCC's) Alignment Working Group, and NERC and the Regional Entities continue to look for new opportunities to engage stakeholders. NERC recognizes that the tool needs to provide greater transparency to registered entities on compliance monitoring and enforcement processes and enhance the consistency of the registered entity experience among the Regional Entities. Additionally, NERC is acutely aware of the importance of protecting registered entity data; in addition to the protection measures already in place, the CMEP solution will provide the opportunity for enhanced data security mechanisms, including multi-factor user authentication and additional data encryption, adopting federal standards to the greatest extent possible even though not required.

## 4. Office Rent Increase

The cost increase for office rent is due to the NERC Atlanta office expansion from two-and-half floors to three. The intent is to reconfigure one of the floors to be used almost entirely for meeting space, providing a larger footprint to accommodate additional meetings now being held off-site. The expected cost savings complement current ERO Enterprise initiatives to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the standing committees and overall stakeholder engagement. As both the meeting space is developed (likely later in 2018) and discussions continue on the strategy for standing committee engagement, NERC will work toward a more precise estimate of cost savings.

## 5. Medical and Other Benefits

NERC does benchmark benefit costs with industry and similar organizations and works actively with a broker to keep costs reasonable to stay competitive for talent acquisition and retention, and increases to medical benefits have been below market for several years. However, the past two years have shown increases closer to market, including the 2018 premiums that were slightly higher than originally budgeted. The increase in medical benefit costs in 2019 (compared to the 2018 budget) is partly because that budgeted number for 2018 was lower than the final negotiated amount, combined with an additional increase between the actual 2018 premiums and anticipated 2019 premiums. NERC continues to negotiate these premiums and will have final amounts for 2019 at the end of 2018.

## Canadian Electricity Association (CEA) and Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO)

The CEA and IESO, both Canadian entities, provided similar comments with respect to concern with the trend of NERC budget increases. Both organizations urged NERC to focus on maximizing efficiency and work to achieve budget increases that more closely align with economic realities and stakeholder expectations. Additionally, both organizations expressed concern with the E-ISAC budget increase in light of the Canadian entity engagement with the E-ISAC.

Overall NERC budget projections for 2020 and 2021 will be included in the second draft the NERC budget, with the expectation that those years will show a budget increase much lower than 2019. NERC believes the investments being made in ERO Enterprise technology and tools, such as the CMEP technology solution, along with initiatives in support of the ERO Enterprise Long-Term Strategy to improve efficiency and effectiveness of stakeholder engagement, the standing committees, and overall ERO operations, will result in efficiency gains that will be reflected in future budget cycles. NERC recognizes the Canadian entities' concern with the E-ISAC budget increases and is currently engaged with these entities to discuss and address their concerns.

## Edison Electric Institute (EEI)

EEI expressed support for NERC's investment in the E-ISAC. EEI also requested consideration of the following with regard to the rest of the NERC budget: (1) develop a business case for the SAFNR upgrade and coordinate with DOE, FERC, and others to leverage existing capabilities; (2) engage stakeholders in the CMEP Technology project and prioritize CMEP information security; (3) continue benchmarking medical benefit expenses with industry and similar organizations; and (4) provide additional clarity on the expected meeting cost savings that will occur with the planned facility expansion.

See responses to APPA above.

## National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA)

NRECA indicated support for the increased investment in E-ISAC and appreciation for NERC's effort to control non-E-ISAC costs. NRECA encouraged NERC to focus on long-term leveling of the budget, and requested NERC to (1) provide E-ISAC projected costs for additional years and (2) consider using additional funds from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve to reduce 2019 assessments.

As mentioned above in the response to CEA and IESO comments above, overall NERC budget projections for 2020 and 2021 will be included in the second draft the NERC budget, and the expectation is that those years will show a budget increase much lower than 2019. The second draft of the budget will also include projections for the E-ISAC strategy.

While the amount of funds released from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve (ASR) to reduce assessments is a Board of Trustees (Board) decision, the current NERC strategy and recommendation for the 2019 budget is to align assessments and budgets increases; therefore, at a minimum, ASR funds will buy down the proposed $10.3 \%$ assessment increase to match the proposed budget increase of $9.5 \%$.

## Draft \#2 and Additional Comments Received

The stakeholder comment period on the second draft of NERC's 2019 BP\&B was July 13-July 31, 2018. Comments were submitted by two entities. Comments were also received on the 2019 BP\&B as part of the Member Representative's Committee (MRC) policy input requested by the NERC Board for its August 2018 quarterly meetings. Below is a summary of those comments and NERC management's responses.

## APPA

APPA requested further clarity on the discussions occurring regarding Canadian entity engagement with the E-ISAC. APPA also requested NERC to consider delaying the SAFNR upgrade or work on other tools in light of other budget increases.

NERC has engaged with leadership of Canadian entities to discuss concerns regarding the value of the information being received from the E-ISAC in the context of the E-ISAC budget increase and availability of cyber threat information from other sources in Canada. NERC has expressed its commitment to demonstrate the value of E-ISAC through the ongoing implementation of its long-term strategy, particularly with respect to its position to integrate industry and government sources of information across North America.

The significant investments in tools for 2019 include the CMEP Technology Project and the upgrade to SAFNR. The CMEP Technology Project is approved and underway, and the SAFNR upgrade is necessary to meet the GridEx IV recommendation to enhance the ability to provide reliable, timely, and accurate information regarding the state of grid reliability and security threats and events. The current cost for the upgrade is a placeholder in the budget and is still subject to business case review and normal approvals.

## Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

BPA requested future information on the coordination of information sharing among the E-ISAC and the other various cyber and physical security organizations, as well as the costs savings resulting from the facility expansion at the NERC Atlanta office.

NERC will work to provide further information on coordination efforts of cyber and physical security information. NERC will also be tracking cost savings from the office expansion with respect to reducing meetings held offsite as the benefits are realized.

## EEI and State Municipal Transmission Dependent Utility Sectors (SM-TDUs)

Both EEI and SM-TDUs (supported by APPA, TAPS, and LPPC) provided policy input expressing the desire to further enhance the ERO's BP\&B development process to provide more transparency and engagement and therefore enable more timely and informed input by stakeholders. EEI also reiterated its support for the NERC's investment in the E-ISAC.

NERC's BP\&B development process provides for multiple touchpoints with and input from stakeholders, including opportunities for input through MRC policy input, public comment periods, webinars, and informal stakeholder groups and meetings. NERC remains committed to this open and transparent process and will work to provide opportunities for input earlier in the development of the BP\&B and to further engage stakeholder groups.
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## CALCULATION OF ADJUSTMENTS

THE AESO 2019 NERC ASSESSMENT,
THE IESO 2019 NERC ASSESSMENT,
THE NEW BRUNSWICK 2019 NERC ASSESSMENT,
AND THE QUEBEC 2019 NERC ASSESSMENT

## 2019 AESO Assessment Adjustment

## Credit for NERC Compliance Costs

Includes adjustment for 2017 Actual v Budgeted Costs


2019 Assessment
2019 NERC Assessment \$ 656,732
2019 RE Assessment (WECC \& WIRAB)
Total 2019 Assessment


2018 Assessment
2018 NERC Assessment $\$ 577,974$
2018 RE Assessment (WECC \& WIRAB)
Total 2018 Assessment


Change in Total Assessment
$\$ \quad(24,464)$

## 2019 IESO Assessment Adjustment

## Credit for NERC Compliance Costs

Includes adjustment for 2017 Actual v Budgeted Costs

|  |  |  |  | NEL Share <br> (2017) | 2019 C | mpliance |  |  |  |  | s Paid by |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ERC Budget |  | 2.968\% | Total | Credit | \% Credit |  | Credit |  | IESO |
| NERC Compliance Program Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compliance Assurance | \$ | 8,922,937 | \$ | 264,830 | 16.45 | 13.69 | 83.2\% | \$ | 220,339 | \$ | 44,491 |
| Analysis and Certification |  | 5,021,479 |  | 149,036 | 5.64 | 5.03 | 89.1\% |  | 132,791 |  | 16,245 |
| Enforcement |  | 6,857,235 |  | 203,521 | 13.16 | 13.16 | 100.0\% |  | 203,521 |  | - |
| Total Compliance Costs, including Fixed Assets | \$ | 20,801,651 | \$ | 617,387 | 35.25 | 31.87 |  | \$ | 556,651 | \$ | 60,736 |
| True-up 2017 Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39,628 |  |  |
| Additional Non-Compliance Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Event Analysis | \$ | 5,339,268 | \$ | 158,468 | 11.28 | 2.26 | 20.0\% | \$ | 31,694 | \$ | 126,774 |
| SAFNR v1 support and maintenance |  | 493,000 |  | 14,632 |  |  | 100.0\% |  | 14,632 |  | - |
| Total Compliance, Event Analysis and SAFNR | \$ | 26,633,919 | \$ | 790,487 | 46.53 | 34.13 |  | \$ | 642,605 | \$ | 187,511 |
| 2018 | \$ | 26,235,467 | \$ | 797,444 | 52.17 | 40.01 |  | \$ | 572,896 | \$ | 170,357 |
| Change from 2018 | \$ | 398,452 | \$ | $(6,956)$ | (5.64) | (5.89) |  | \$ | 69,709 | \$ | 17,154 |

## 2019 Assessment

| 2019 NERC Assessment | $\$$ | $1,418,177$ |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 2019 RE Assessment |  | $2,164,350$ |
| Total 2019 Assessment | $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 , 5 8 2 , 5 2 7}$ |
|  |  |  |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 2018 Assessment |  |  |
| 2018 NERC Assessment | $\$$ | $1,359,810$ |
| 2018 RE Assessment |  | $2,074,231$ |
| Total 2018 Assessment | $\$$ | $3,434,041$ |
|  |  |  |
| Change in Total ERO Assessment | $\$$ | 148,486 |
|  |  | $4.3 \%$ |

## 2019 New Brunswick Assessment Adjustment

## Credit for NERC Compliance Costs

Includes adjustment for 2017 Actual v Budgeted Costs

|  |  |  |  | EL Share (2017) | 2019 | mplianc |  |  |  |  | Paid by |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NERC Budget |  | 0.310\% | Total | Credit | \% Credit |  | redit |  | NB |
| NERC Compliance Program Budget |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compliance Assurance | \$ | 8,922,937 | \$ | 27,660 | 16.45 | 13.69 | 83.2\% | \$ | 23,013 | \$ | 4,647 |
| Analysis and Certification |  | 5,021,479 |  | 15,566 | 5.64 | 5.03 | 89.1\% |  | 13,869 |  | 1,697 |
| Enforcement |  | 6,857,235 |  | 21,256 | 13.16 | 13.16 | 100.0\% |  | 21,256 |  | - |
| Total Compliance Costs, including Fixed Assets | \$ | 20,801,651 | \$ | 64,482 | 35.25 | 31.87 |  | \$ | 58,138 | \$ | 6,344 |
| True-up 2017 Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,107 |  |  |
| Additional Non-Compliance Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Event Analysis | \$ | 5,339,268 |  | 16,551 | 11.28 | 2.26 | 20.0\% | \$ | 3,310 | \$ | 13,241 |
| SAFNR v1 support and maintenance |  | 493,000 |  | 1,528 |  |  | 100.0\% |  | 1,528 |  |  |
| 2019 Total Compliance, Event Analysis and SAFNR | \$ | 26,633,919 | \$ | 82,561 | 46.53 | 34.13 |  | \$ | 67,083 | \$ | 19,584 |
| 2018 | \$ | 26,235,467 | \$ | 79,739 | 52.17 | 40.01 |  | \$ | 57,288 | \$ | 17,034 |
| Change from 2018 | \$ | 398,452 | \$ | 2,822 | (5.64) | (5.89) |  | \$ | 9,795 | \$ | 2,550 |

## 2019 Assessment

| 2019 NERC Assessment | $\$$ | 148,152 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 RE Assessment |  | 354,392 |
| Total 2019 Assessment | $\$$ | $\mathbf{5 0 2 , 5 4 4}$ |
|  |  |  |

2018 Assessment

| 2018 NERC Assessment | $\$$ | 135,969 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 RE Assessment |  | 288,998 |
| Total 2018 Assessment | $\$$ | $\mathbf{4 2 4 , 9 6 7}$ |

Change in Total Assessment
\$ 77,577
18.3\%

## 2019 Quebec Assessment Adjustment

Credit for NERC Compliance Costs
Includes adjustment for 2017 Actual v Budget
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METRICS COMPARING REGIONAL ENTITY OPERATIONS BASED ON

THE 2019 BUDGETS

2019 Metrics for Budget Submissions

|  | Budget Metrics | FRCC | MRO | NPCC ${ }^{6}$ | ReliabilityFirst | SERC | Texas RE | WECC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Number of registered entities ${ }^{1}$ | 39 | 211 | 213 | 233 | 201 | 212 | 274 |
| 2 | Number of registered functions | 157 | 596 | 448 | 484 | 513 | 391 | 918 |
| 3 | Total NEL (GWh) | 232,720 | 485,381 | 605,097 | 871,790 | 1,028,837 | 359,022 | 867,702 |
| 4 | NEL (GWh) per registered entity | 5,967 | 2,300 | 2,841 | 3,742 | 5,119 | 1,694 | 3,167 |
| 5 | Total ERO Funding ${ }^{2}$ | \$ 5,827,925 | \$ 15,530,922 | \$ 15,003,411 | \$ 21,583,046 | \$ 17,455,215 | \$ 13,362,449 | \$ 25,869,686 |
| 6 | ERO Funding per registered entity | \$ 149,434 | \$ 73,606 | \$ 70,439 | \$ 92,631 | \$ 86,842 | \$ 63,030 | \$ 94,415 |
| 7 | ERO Funding per registered function | \$ 37,121 | \$ 26,059 | \$ 33,490 | \$ 44,593 | \$ 34,026 | \$ 34,175 | \$ 28,180 |
| 8 | Total Budget ${ }^{3}$ | \$ 6,695,787 | \$ 15,980,354 | \$ 15,803,891 | \$ 22,648,458 | \$ 18,144,949 | \$ 13,069,599 | \$ 26,950,566 |
| 9 | Total Budget per registered entity | \$ 171,687 | \$ 75,736 | \$ 74,197 | \$ 97,204 | \$ 90,273 | \$ 61,649 | \$ 98,360 |
| 10 | Total Budget per registered function | \$ 42,648 | \$ 26,813 | \$ 35,277 | \$ 46,794 | \$ 35,370 | \$ 33,426 | 29357.91503 |
| 11 | Total Statutory FTE ${ }^{4}$ | 20.75 | 59.00 | 38.86 | 78.20 | 78.00 | 60.00 | 143.00 |
| 12 | Registered entity per Statutory FTE | 1.880 | 3.576 | 5.481 | 2.980 | 2.577 | 3.533 | 1.916 |
| 13 | Registered function per Statutory FTE | 7.566 | 10.102 | 11.529 | 6.189 | 6.577 | 6.517 | 6.420 |
| 14 | Total Compliance Budget ${ }^{5}$ | \$ 4,984,329 | \$ 10,763,709 | \$ 8,816,687 | \$ 16,163,392 | \$ 13,373,347 | \$ 10,068,946 | \$ 14,966,474 |
| 15 | Compliance budget per registered entity | \$ 127,803 | \$ 51,013 | \$ 41,393 | \$ 69,371 | \$ 66,534 | \$ 47,495 | \$ 54,622 |
| 16 | Compliance budget per registered function | \$ 31,747 | \$ 18,060 | \$ 19,680 | \$ 33,395 | \$ 26,069 | \$ 25,752 | \$ 16,303 |
| 17 | Total Compliance FTE | 12.18 | 32.35 | 17.00 | 44.00 | 34.00 | 35.75 | 60.00 |
| 18 | Registered entity per Compliance FTE | 3.2 | 6.5 | 12.5 | 5.3 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 4.6 |
| 19 | Registered function per Compliance FTE | 12.9 | 18.4 | 26.4 | 11.0 | 15.1 | 10.9 | 15.3 |

${ }^{1}$ As of June 2018.
${ }^{2}$ ERO Funding is the sum of Assessments and Penalty Sanctions only. (Excludes funding such as Membership Dues, Testing Fees, Services \& Software, Workshops, Interest, and Miscellaneous.)
${ }^{3}$ Total Budget is the sum of Total Expenses and the Increase/(Decrease) in Fixed Assets
${ }^{4}$ Each FTE that works 2,080 hours per year is counted as one FTE. An FTE working less than the 2,080 hours per year is counted as a fractional FTE.
${ }^{5}$ Total Compliance Budget is a sum of Direct Expenses, Indirect Expenses, and Capital Expenditures.
${ }^{6}$ Due to the specifics of the compliance program included in the individual provincial MOUs for cross-border regional entities, some of these metrics are not directly comparable.


2019 Compliance Budget Compared to


|  | FRCC | MRO | NPCC | Reliability <br> First | SERC | Texas RE | WECC | Avg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Compliance Budget/Registered Entity | $\$ 127,803$ | $\$ 51,013$ | $\$ 41,393$ | $\$ 69,371$ | $\$ 66,534$ | $\$ 47,495$ | $\$ 54,622$ | $\$ 65,462$ |
| Compliance Budget/Registered Function | $\$ 31,747$ | $\$ 18,060$ | $\$ 19,680$ | $\$ 33,395$ | $\$ 26,069$ | $\$ 25,752$ | $\$ 16,303$ | $\$ 24,430$ |

 2019 Budget



Regional Entity 2019 Compliance Program Budget as Function of Number of Registered Functions



2019 Budget - Compliance FTEs Compared to
\# Registered Entities


|  | FRCC | MRO | NPCC | Reliability <br> First | SERC | Texas RE | WECC | Avg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 Budget | 2.1 | 4.9 | 12.8 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 6.2 | 6.0 |
| 2019 Budget | 3.2 | 6.5 | 12.5 | 5.3 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 4.6 | 6.3 |

Comparison of Registered Entities per Compliance FTE 2018 to 2019 Budgets


|  | FRCC | MRO | NPCC | Reliability First | SERC | Texas RE | WECC | Avg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018 Budget | 8.3 | 14.9 | 26.7 | 10.5 | 15.6 | 10.5 | 15.1 | 14.5 |
| 2019 Budget | 12.9 | 18.4 | 26.4 | 11.0 | 15.1 | 10.9 | 15.3 | 15.7 |

Comparison of Registered Functions per Compliance FTE 2018 to 2019 Budgets
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METRICS ON NERC AND REGIONAL ENTITY ADMINISTRATIVE (INDIRECT) COSTS

BASED ON
THE 2018 AND 2019 BUDGETS

| 2018 BUDGET |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2019 BUDGET |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Statutory Budget | Total Statutory Direct Budget |  | Total Statutory Indirect Budget |  | \% Statutory Indirect <br> Budget to Total Statutory Budget | Ratio of Statutory Direct Budget to Indirect Budget |  | Total Statutory Budget |  | Total Statutory Direct Budget |  | Total Statutory Indirect Budget |  | \% Statutory Indirect <br> Budget to Total Statutory Budget | Ratio of Statutory Direct Budget to Indirect Budget |
| \$ | 73,135,156 | \$ | 43,145,222 | \$ | 29,989,934 | 41.0\% | 1.44 | NERC | \$ | 80,049,653 | \$ | 48,703,291 | \$ | 31,346,362 | 39.2\% | 1.55 |
|  | 7,514,112 |  | 6,506,605 |  | 1,007,507 | 13.4\% | 6.46 | FRCC |  | 6,695,787 |  | 5,634,096 |  | 1,061,691 | 15.9\% | 5.31 |
|  | 11,726,736 |  | 7,272,018 |  | 4,454,718 | 38.0\% | 1.63 | MRO |  | 15,980,354 |  | 10,967,562 |  | 5,012,792 | 31.4\% | 2.19 |
|  | 15,106,967 |  | 9,684,689 |  | 5,422,278 | 35.9\% | 1.79 | NPCC |  | 15,803,890 |  | 10,086,863 |  | 5,717,027 | 36.2\% | 1.76 |
|  | 21,393,899 |  | 15,185,134 |  | 6,208,764 | 29.0\% | 2.45 | RF |  | 22,648,458 |  | 15,832,553 |  | 6,815,905 | 30.1\% | 2.32 |
|  | 17,182,868 |  | 8,884,242 |  | 8,298,626 | 48.3\% | 1.07 | SERC |  | 18,144,949 |  | 8,637,442 |  | 9,507,507 | 52.4\% | 0.91 |
|  | 10,793,195 |  | 5,786,488 |  | 5,006,707 | 46.4\% | 1.16 | SPP RE |  | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |
|  | 12,656,953 |  | 8,007,811 |  | 4,649,142 | 36.7\% | 1.72 | Texas RE |  | 13,069,599 |  | 7,974,836 |  | 5,094,762 | 39.0\% | 1.57 |
| \$ | 27,097,344 | \$ | 17,924,467 | \$ | 9,172,877 | 33.9\% | 1.95 | WECC | \$ | 26,950,566 | \$ | 17,730,811 | \$ | 9,219,755 | 34.2\% | 1.92 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.8\% | 2.18 | AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.9\% | 1.95 |

## 2019 BUDGETED FTEs

| 2018 BUDGETED FTEs |  |  |  |  | 2019 BUDGETED FTEs |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Statutory FTEs | Total Statutory Direct FTEs | Total Statutory Indirect FTEs | Indirect FTE as \% of Total FTE | \# Direct to Indirect Statutory FTEs |  | Total Statutory FTEs | Total Statutory Direct FTEs | Total Statutory Indirect FTEs | Indirect FTE as \% of Total FTE | \# Direct to Indirect Statutory FTEs |
| 199.28 | 131.84 | 67.44 | 33.8\% | 1.95 | NERC | 204.92 | 137.24 | 67.68 | 33.0\% | 2.03 |
| 30.63 | 26.01 | 4.62 | 15.1\% | 5.63 | FRCC | 20.75 | 16.37 | 4.38 | 21.1\% | 3.74 |
| 45.00 | 33.59 | 11.41 | 25.4\% | 2.94 | MRO | 59.00 | 47.78 | 11.22 | 19.0\% | 4.26 |
| 36.86 | 28.86 | 8.00 | 21.7\% | 3.61 | NPCC | 38.86 | 29.86 | 9.00 | 23.2\% | 3.32 |
| 76.20 | 60.60 | 15.60 | 20.5\% | 3.88 | RF | 78.20 | 61.60 | 16.60 | 21.2\% | 3.71 |
| 75.00 | 44.70 | 30.30 | 40.4\% | 1.48 | SERC | 78.00 | 44.85 | 33.15 | 42.5\% | 1.35 |
| 32.30 | 27.80 | 4.50 | 13.9\% | 6.18 | SPP RE | - | - | - | - | - |
| 60.00 | 46.25 | 13.75 | 22.9\% | 3.36 | Texas RE | 60.00 | 45.25 | 14.75 | 24.6\% | 3.07 |
| 143.00 | 102.30 | 40.70 | 28.5\% | 2.51 | WECC | 143.00 | 105.00 | 38.00 | 26.6\% | 2.76 |
|  |  |  | 24.7\% | 3.51 | AVERAGE |  |  |  | 23.5\% | 2.69 |
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## North American Electric Reliability Corporation <br> Board of Trustee Remuneration Review

July 2018


## Introduction

## North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) engaged Willis Towers Watson to conduct a Board of Trustees' (or Directors') compensation and structure assessment examining four market perspectives

- Willis Towers Watson last performed this assessment for NERC in July 2015 and utilized the same methodology
- The four market perspectives examined are as follows (see the Appendix for peer companies):

1. Regional Entities (RE): 6 of 8 organizations ${ }^{1}$ are included in the analysis
2. Regional Transmission Organization I Independent System Operator (RTO/ISO): 7 of 9 organizations ${ }^{2}$ are included in the analysis
3. Investor Owned Utilities (IOU): 12 organizations with median revenues of $\$ 1.4$ billion
4. General Industry (GI): 13 organizations with median revenues of $\$ 474$ million and median asset size of \$711 million
[^38]
## Typical Trustee Total Remuneration

 provided by RE and RTO/ISO peers, but below the median value at IOU and GI peers - The chart below presents the range (minimum to maximum) and median of total remuneration provided to a "typical Director1" for each market perspective


[^39]
## Non-Executive Chair Total Remuneration

- NERC's total remuneration to the Non-Executive Chair of the Board of \$160,000 falls above the median value provided by RE and RTO/ISO peers, but below the median value at IOU and GI peers
- The chart below presents the range (minimum to maximum) and median of total remuneration provided to a Non-Executive Chairman for each market perspective


Notes:
(1) Average data was provided due to insufficient sample size to calculate the median.

## Committee Chair Additional Retainers

- The additional compensation provided to NERC Committee Chairs is comparable to or above the median (50th percentile) of Committee Chairs of the three most common types of committees for both the IOU and General Industry peers
- NERC provides an annual cash amount of \$10,000 to Committee Chairs and the independent Trustee serving on the Electricity Sub-Sector Coordinating Council


[^40]
## Workload

- Compared to all four market perspectives, NERC ranks among the highest in regards to average hours worked and number of meetings held (both Board and Committees)
- Findings do not include the regional board meetings NERC's Trustees attend throughout the year



## Notes

(1) Hours disclosed excludes the Chairman of the Board.
(2) NERC's 2017 average hours increased to 9.9 hours, but 2017 market data are currently unavailable.
(3) Market data for Investor Owned Utilities and General Industry is reflective of Compensation Committees.
(4) Market data for Investor Owned Utilities and General Industry is reflective of Corporate Governance and Nominating Committees.

## Pay Structure

- NERC's practice of paying retainers (in lieu of board of committee meeting fees) is consistent with IOU and GI peer practices and continues to align with broader market best practice


Notes:
(1) Data reflect constant sample of peer companies year-over-year.

## Director Compensation Trends

- The table below shows median total remuneration increases for NERC peers:

|  | RE $^{1}$ | ${\text { RTO } / \text { ISO }^{1}}^{1}$ | IOU $^{1}$ | GI $^{1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual \% Increase | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

- Consistent with prior years, companies continue to deliver cash compensation via retainers instead of per-meeting fees

|  | Prevalence |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Board |  | Committee |  |
| Market Perspective | Retainer | Meeting Fee | Retainer | Meeting Fee |
| IOU | $100 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| GI | $85 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $8 \%$ |

- Majority of companies continue to provide additional retainers for leadership positions within the board, such as Non-Executive Chairman of the Board and Committee Chairs, especially Audit, Compensation and Governance Committees
(1) Annual increase in total remuneration is based on companies included in both the 2015 and 2018 analyses.


## Design Considerations

## Pay Levels

- Maintain the practice of targeting pay between the market 50th percentile of RTO/ISO peers and market 25th percentile of IOU peers (lower market positioning reflects NERC's not-for-profit status)
- Given the greater workload carried by NERC Trustees versus peers, current positioning of NERC pay in the bottom half of the competitive pay range and the increase in market pay levels since the last study conducted by Willis Towers Watson, the following adjustments should be considered to maintain competitive market position of NERC Trustee compensation:

1. Increase Trustee annual cash retainer by \$5,000 a year, effective in 2019-2021
2. Increase Non-Executive Chairman annual cash retainer by \$5,000 a year, effective in 2019-2021

| Annual Cash Retainer | 2015 Analysis |  | 2018 Analysis |  | Proposed \$ and Annual \% Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NERC | Competitive Pay Range | NERC | Competitive Pay Range |  |
| Trustee | \$97,500 | \$80,000 - \$145,000 | \$112,500 | \$97,500 - \$165,000 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \$117,500 } \\ \text { 4\% increase } \end{gathered}$ |
| Committee Chair ${ }^{1}$ | \$10,000 | \$7,500 - \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$7,500 - \$10,000 | $\$ 10,000$ <br> No change |
| Non-Executive Chairman | \$132,500 | \$95,000 - \$225,000 | \$160,000 | \$130,000 - \$250,000 | \$165,000 3\% Increase |

## Pay Structure

- Maintain alignment with market best practices by continuing with current all retainer approach Trustee, Committee Chair and Non-Executive Chairman retainers

[^41]
## Appendix

## Appendix

## Peer Group Financial Data: Regional Entities

| $\quad$Organization | Operating <br> Budget <br> (millions) | Data <br> Effective Date |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Florida Reliability Coordinating Council (FRCC) | $\$ 16$ | 2016 |
| Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO) | $\$ 11$ | 2016 |
| Northeast Power Coordinating Council (NPCC) | $\$ 16$ | 2016 |
| ReliabilityFirst Corporation (RFC) | $\$ 22$ | 2016 |
| SERC Reliability Corporation (SERC) | $\$ 15$ | 2016 |
| Southwest Power Pool RE (SPP RE) | N/A | 2016 |
| Texas Reliability Entity (Texas RE) | $\$ 11$ | 2016 |
| Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) | $\$ 30$ | 2016 |

$\mathrm{n}=8$

| 25th \%ile | $\$ 13$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 50th \%ile | $\$ 16$ |
| Average | $\$ 17$ |
| 75th \%ile | $\$ 19$ |


| North American Electric Reliability Corporation |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Percentile Rank | Highest |

## Notes:

Data based on 2016 Form 990s unless footnoted otherwise.
N/A = Data are not available.
(1) Data provided by NERC and reflects their operating budget.

## Appendix

## Peer Group Financial Data: RTOs/ISOs

| Organization | Operating Budget (millions) | Data <br> Effective Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alberta Electric System Operator | N/A | 2017 |
| California ISO (CAISO) | \$214 | 2016 |
| Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT) | \$216 | 2016 |
| ISO New England (ISO - NE) | \$182 | 2016 |
| Midwest ISO (MISO) | \$340 | 2016 |
| New York ISO (NYISO) | \$175 | 2016 |
| Ontario Independent Electricity System Operator | \$151 | 2017 |
| PJM Interconnection (PJM) ${ }^{1}$ | \$366 | 2017 |
| Southwest Power Pool (SPP) | \$182 | 2016 |
| $\mathrm{n}=9$ |  |  |
| 25th \%ile | \$180 |  |
| 50th \%ile | \$198 |  |
| Average | \$228 |  |
| 75th \%ile | \$247 |  |
| North American Electric Reliability Corporation ${ }^{2}$ | \$200 |  |
| Percentile Rank | 51\% |  |

## Notes:

Data based on 2016 Form 990s unless footnoted otherwise.
N/A = Data are not available.
(1) Data based on its 2017 Financial Statement as the organization is not required to file a Form 990.
(2) Data provided by NERC and reflects their operating budget.

## Appendix <br> Peer Group Financial Data: Investor Owned Utilities

| Company | Revenues (millions) ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Great Plains Energy Incorporated | \$2,708 |
| Westar Energy, Inc. | \$2,571 |
| OGE Energy Corp. | \$2,261 |
| Portland General Electric Company | \$2,009 |
| Avista Corporation | \$1,446 |
| PNM Resources, Inc. | \$1,445 |
| ALLETE, Inc. | \$1,419 |
| IDACORP, Inc. | \$1,349 |
| NorthWestern Corporation | \$1,306 |
| El Paso Electric Company | \$917 |
| Otter Tail Corporation | \$849 |
| MGE Energy, Inc. | \$563 |
| $\mathrm{n}=12$ |  |
| 25th \%ile | \$1,014 |
| 50th \%ile | \$1,432 |
| 75th \%ile | \$2,198 |
| North American Electric Reliability Corporation ${ }^{2}$ Percentile Rank | $\begin{gathered} \hline \$ 200 \\ \text { Lowest } \end{gathered}$ |

[^42]
## Appendix

## Peer Group Financial Data: General Industry

| Company | Revenues (millions) $^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Assets } \\ \text { (millions) }^{1} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nasdaq, Inc. | \$3,965 | \$15,786 |
| Old National Bancorp | \$606 | \$17,518 |
| Trustmark Corporation | \$585 | \$13,798 |
| Emergent BioSolutions Inc. | \$561 | \$1,070 |
| FormFactor, Inc. | \$548 | \$647 |
| Seattle Genetics, Inc. | \$482 | \$878 |
| Cogent Communications Holdings, Inc. | \$474 | \$711 |
| Iridium Communications Inc. | \$448 | \$3,782 |
| Badger Meter, Inc. | \$402 | \$392 |
| Sun Hydraulics Corporation | \$343 | \$460 |
| NIC Inc. | \$337 | \$296 |
| Imperva, Inc. | \$322 | \$528 |
| AeroVironment, Inc. | \$265 | \$433 |

$\mathrm{n}=13$

| 25th \%ile | $\$ 340$ | $\$ 446$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50th \%ile | $\$ 474$ | $\$ 711$ |
| 75th \%ile | $\$ 573$ | $\$ 8,790$ |


| North American Electric Reliability Corporation${ }^{2}$ | \$200 <br> Lowest | -- |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Percentile Rank |  |  |

[^43]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Does not include the proposed provision for Working Capital reserve funding

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ NERC's standards, compliance, and enforcement activities are focused on the Bulk Electric System (BES), which is comprised of certain BPS facilities.
    ${ }^{2}$ British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia.
    ${ }^{3}$ The MRC comprises voting representatives elected from the 12 membership sectors. The MRC elects the independent trustees and, along with the Board, votes on amendments to the bylaws. The MRC also provides policy advice and recommendations to the Board on behalf of stakeholders with respect to annual budgets, business plans, and other matters pertinent to the purpose and operation of the organization.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Improving Coordinated Operations Across the ERO Enterprise

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ This was codified in §215 of the FPA, 16 United States C. 824o.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ ERO Reliability Risk Priorities Report (Board Accepted February 8, 2018)
    7 This includes input from the RISC, MRC, NERC standing and technical committees, trade associations and industry forums, as well as public comment periods.
    ${ }^{8}$ ERO Enterprise Long-Term Strategy (Board Approved November 9, 2017)
    ${ }^{9}$ ERO Enterprise Operating Plan (Board Approved November 9, 2017)
    ${ }^{10}$ Activities that are recommendations from the RISC report are labeled accordingly.
    ${ }^{11}$ The operating plan is reviewed in the same year the RISC reviews and updates its report.
    ${ }^{12} 2018$ ERO Enterprise Metrics (Board Approved November 9, 2017)
    ${ }^{13}$ Each ERO Enterprise entity establishes additional metrics to support performance-based compensation programs. These metrics typically measure achievement of specific objectives, tasks, and activities on a departmental or company-wide basis for the operating year.

[^5]:    ${ }^{14}$ MRC Agenda Package - May 9, 2018 (see agenda item 8)

[^6]:    ${ }^{15}$ North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Order on Compliance, 143 FERC 9 61,052 (2013).
    ${ }^{16}$ NERC and the Regional Entities budget depreciation as an operating expense with an equal and offsetting credit against budgeted Fixed Asset (capital) additions. As a result, the budgets do not include depreciation in the funding requirements.
    ${ }^{17}$ Accounting, Financial Statement and Budgetary Treatment of Penalties Imposed and Received for Violations of Reliability Standards, December 8, 2008 and as amended August 15, 2013.
    ${ }^{18}$ NERC's Working Capital and Operating Reserve Policy. NERC filed a petition with FERC on March 6, 2015 for approval of this policy; FERC conditionally approved the revised policy in an order issued June 18, 2015, in Docket No. RR15-8-000. North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Order Conditionally Accepting Revisions to Working Capital and Operating Reserve Policy, 151 FERC $\mathbb{1} 61,225$ (2015). On August 14, 2015, NERC submitted a compliance filing to the June 18 , 2015 order with a modification to the policy, which FERC accepted by letter order dated September 18, 2015 (Docket No. RR15-8-001).

[^7]:    ${ }^{19}$ In accordance with the approved Working Capital and Operating Reserve Policy, the Assessment Stabilization Reserve may be funded with penalty funds and surplus operating reserves. The actual amount of the contribution, as well as releases from the fund to reduce assessments, are determined annually as part of NERC's BP\&B process, based on recommendation by the FAC and requiring both Board and FERC approval.
    ${ }^{20}$ Expanded Policy on Allocation of Certain Compliance and Enforcement Costs, July 29, 2008.

[^8]:    *Reflects 2019 additions and transfers between departments, anticipated timing of 2019 hires, and assumes 6\% attrition in all programs

[^9]:    *Refer to Table B-1 for a complete analysis of the Working Capital and Operating Reserve balance.

[^10]:    ${ }^{21}$ FERC Order 830 - Reliability Standard for Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events
    ${ }^{22}$ Revised Geomagnetic Disturbance Research Work Plan of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation
    ${ }^{23}$ Docket Nos. RM15-11-002 and RM15-11-003
    ${ }^{24}$ The ESCC formed the MEC in March 2016 to provide industry leadership and expertise to guide and support the E-ISAC, including but not limited to the development of strategic plans and budgets.

[^11]:    ${ }^{25}$ North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Midwest Reliability Organization, and SERC Reliability Corporation, Order Granting Approvals in Connection with the Dissolution of the Southwest Power Pool regional Entity, 163 FERC 9 61,094 (2018).

[^12]:    ${ }^{26}$ As required by $\S 215(\mathrm{e})(6)$ of the Federal Power Act and the Commission's regulations at 18 C.F.R. $\S 39.7(\mathrm{~g})$, the Sanction Guidelines, Appendix 4B to the NERC ROP, provide that penalties and sanctions imposed for the violation of a Reliability Standard shall bear a reasonable relation to the seriousness of the violation while also reflecting consideration of the other factors specified in the Sanction Guidelines. The Sanction Guidelines are available on NERC's website.

[^13]:    ${ }^{27}$ NERC Rules of Procedure
    ${ }^{28}$ Posted compliance exceptions, Spreadsheet Notices of Penalty, and Full Notices of Penalty
    ${ }^{29}$ The CMEP reports can be found in the Compliance Committee meeting agenda packages on the Compliance Committee website.
    30 Id.

[^14]:    ${ }^{31}$ FNet - Operated by the Power Information Technology Laboratory at the University of Tennessee, FNet is a low-cost, quickly deployable global positioning system (GPS)-synchronized wide-area frequency measurement network. High dynamic accuracy Frequency Disturbance Recorders are used to measure the frequency, phase angle, and voltage of the power system at ordinary 120 V outlets. The measurement data are continuously transmitted via the Internet to the FNet servers hosted at the University of Tennessee and Virginia Tech.

[^15]:    32 The core process for Event Analysis is outlined in the approved process: ERO Event Analysis Process - Version 3.1 (December 2016).

[^16]:    ${ }^{33}$ In 1998, US Government authorities that were derived from Presidential Decision Directive 63, established the Information Security Analysis Center (ISAC) construct. The E-ISAC focuses specifically on information sharing, analytics and sector activities directly related to the protection of critical infrastructure.
    ${ }^{34}$ Subsequent administrations have sought to continue and strengthen information sharing in other sectors by establishing other sector-specific ISACs. In 2013, the DOE again reaffirmed its desire for NERC to continue to operate the E-ISAC

[^17]:    35 The Human Resources department is also engaged in training initiatives.

[^18]:    ${ }^{36}$ NERC's total 2019 fixed asset (capital) budget is $\$ 4.8 \mathrm{M}$ and includes $\$ 3.3 \mathrm{M}$ for ERO Application Development. These ERO projects are managed by NERC's IT department but the costs are budgeted in the applicable NERC program area.

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ As further explained in the discussion of the Working Capital Reserve amount in Exhibit D, the Future Obligations Reserve offsets future, non-current liabilities.
    ${ }^{2}$ Proceeds from financing activities amount is equal to two-thirds of the amount financed or to be financed in the year. See Exhibit D .
    ${ }^{3}$ Debt Service amount is equal to Annual Payments for Debt Service less Interest Expense. See Exhibit C.
    ${ }^{4}$ Represents transactions recorded only on the Statement of Financial Position (balance sheet) and do not impact the Statement of Activities (income statement), including recording of capitalized leases, amortization of future obligations, and funding the 457 f plan.

[^20]:    ${ }^{37}$ North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Order Accepting 2013 Business Plan and Budget of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation and Ordering Compliance Filing, 141 FERC 961,086 (2012) ("2013 Budget Order"). Recommendation 38, as adopted in the 2013 Budget Order, is: "In its annual business plan and budget filings, [NERC should] provide an explanation as to why the proposed activities to be undertaken by each program area for the budget year are statutory, including, at a minimum: a description and the purpose of the major activities to be taken by each program area and an explanation for why the activity is a statutory activity." Id. at P 16.
    ${ }^{38}$ Compliance Filing of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation in Response to Paragraph 30 of November 2, 2012 Commission Order NERC Written Criteria for Determining Whether a Reliability Activity is Eligible to be Funded Under Federal Power Act Section 215, filed February 1, 2013 in Docket No. FA 11-21-000 ("February 1, 2013 Compliance Filing").
    ${ }^{39}$ North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Order on Compliance, 143 FERC 9 61,052 (2013) ("Compliance Order").
    ${ }^{40}$ For ease of reference, the complete NERC written criteria, as modified in accordance with the Compliance Order, are provided at the end of this Exhibit.

[^21]:    ${ }^{41}$ This document uses the term "Bulk Power System" because that is the term defined and used in FPA §215. NERC recognizes that a different term, "Bulk Electric System," is used to define the current reach of reliability standards.

[^22]:    ${ }^{42}$ Although certification of system operating personnel is an activity falling within the scope of, and eligible to be funded pursuant to, FPA §215, NERC strives to fully fund the costs of this activity through fees charged to participants.

[^23]:    ${ }^{43}$ Initially called the Electricity Sector Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ES-ISAC), the name was changed in September 2015 to the Electricity Information Sharing and Analysis Center (E-ISAC) as part of a rebranding and role-clarification initiative.

[^24]:    44 "Addressing Dynamic Threats to the Electric Power Grid Through Resilience" https://www.chertoffgroup.com/files/docs/Addressing-Dynamic-Threats.compressed.pdf

[^25]:    ${ }^{45}$ Two such events include attacks by the hacker group WannaCry, which was believed to be responsible for network compromises primarily located in Asia, and the Petya/NotPetya ransomware attack that affected computers across Europe.
    ${ }^{46}$ Based on the Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community
    ${ }^{47}$ https://www.curotec.com/insights/christmas-hackers-attacks-increase-around-holidays/
    ${ }^{48}$ Research has been conducted on how the Cyber Kill Chain model can specifically apply to the sector. For one such endeavor, see the SANS Institute report The Industrial Control System Cyber Kill Chain
    ${ }^{49}$ Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, located in Washington State, is a key source of CRISP analysis. Moving to $24 \times 7$ operations will expand the opportunities for analysts in Washington, D.C. to communicate with their counterparts at the lab.

[^26]:    ${ }^{50}$ E-ISAC portal posting Update 2 - Continuing Cyber Attacks Affecting U.S., Overseas Entities
    ${ }^{51}$ Pilots are currently being negotiated with Dragos and N -Dimension.

[^27]:    ${ }^{52}$ Section 1000 contains NERC's responsibilities for Situation Awareness and Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP), including its role as the E-ISAC. Additional expectations are outlined in Sections 807, 808, and 810 regarding analysis of events and the dissemination of lessons learned, advisories, recommendations, and essential actions.

[^28]:    Appendix 2-A, NEL Data

[^29]:    Appendix 2-A, NEL Data

[^30]:    Appendix 2-B, Total Assessments

[^31]:    Appendix 2-B, Total Assessments

[^32]:    Appendix 2-D, Total Regional Assessments

[^33]:    ${ }^{1}$ As of April 20, 2018.
    ${ }^{2}$ Non-WECC members may participate in standards drafting teams and Participating Stakeholders may vote on Regional Reliability Standards. A Participating Stakeholder is defined in Section 3.23 of the WECC Bylaws and the Participating Stakeholder Application Process is described in Section 8.7.4. WECC's Reliability Standards Voting Procedures are detailed in the Reliability Standards Development Procedures.

[^34]:    ${ }^{3}$ As of April 20, 2018.
    2019 WECC Business Plan and Budget
    Approved by Board of Directors: June 20, 2018

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ Order on Petition to Establish a Regional Advisory Body for the Western Interconnection, 116 FERC $\mathbb{I}$ 61,061, Docket No. RR06-2-000, July 20, 2006.
    ${ }^{2}$ Rules Concerning Certification of the Electric Reliability Organization; and Procedures for the Establishment, Approval, and Enforcement of Reliability Standards, Order 672, Docket RM05-30-000, Feb. 3, 2006, P. 228. "Each Regional Entity must submit its complete business plan, entire budget and organizational chart to the ERO for it to submit to the Commission. The complete business plan and the entire budget will provide the Commission with necessary information about any non-statutory activities, the source of their funding, and whether the pursuit of such activities presents a conflict of interest for the Regional Entity. For a Cross-Border Regional Entity, this information will also inform the Commission as to what portion of the budget is expended upon activities within the United States."

[^36]:    ${ }^{3}$ See GE Energy Consulting, Final Report: Potential Mitigation of Dynamic Reliability Challenges with High Levels of Variable Energy Resources (discussing the types of analysis and data needed to identify

[^37]:    ${ }^{1}$ The MEC is a sub-group of the Electricity Subsector Coordinating Council (ESCC). For more information, please see the ESCC website.

[^38]:    Notes:
    (1) 2 of 8 organizations have all stakeholder boards and thus do not compensate their board members.
    (2) PJM Interconnection and Ontario Independent Electric System Operator do not publicly disclose their Director compensation program. We received data from them in 2015, but were not able to secure data for this year's study.

[^39]:    $\frac{\text { Notes: }}{(1)}$ A "typical Trustee" or "Director" cannot be in a Board leadership position, an employee of the company or serve as a Director for less than a full year.
    (2) Compensation for Regional Entities, RTOs / ISOs, and NERC includes Committee Chair compensation while it has been excluded from IOUs and the General Industry market perspectives, given applicable disclosure.

[^40]:    Notes
    (1) Market data for Investor Owned Utilities and General Industry are reflective of Compensation Committees.
    (2) Market data for Investor Owned Utilities and General Industry are reflective of Corporate Governance and Nominating Committees.

[^41]:    (1) Reflects IOU market data reference points only, as RTO/ISO data are not available.

[^42]:    Notes
    (1) Financial figures are as reported by S\&P Capital IQ. All financials are as of 2017 fiscal year end.
    (2) The data was provided by NERC and reflects their operating budget.

[^43]:    Notes
    (1) Financial figures are as reported by S\&P Capital IQ. All financials are as of 2017 fiscal year end.
    (2) The data was provided by NERC and reflects their operating budget.

