

Frequently Asked Questions

Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading

The following questions and answers are intended to facilitate understanding about the Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading process. Please contact [Laura Anderson](#) (via email) or at (404) 446-9671 with any additional questions you may have.

Periodic Review Standing Review Team – Standards Grading process FAQs

Q1: Why are standards being graded?

A1. The Standards Committee (SC), at its March 9, 2016 meeting, endorsed the use of the grading tool used by the Independent Expert Review Panel (IERP) as the metric to grade all NERC Reliability Standards. The Periodic Review Standing Team (PRST), with the SC chair facilitating the meetings, will conduct an initial grading of all currently-enforceable Reliability Standards with requirements that have been subject to enforcement in the United States for at least one year. The grading activity is conducted during pre-scheduled public meetings/calls open to stakeholders. The most up-to-date information can be found on the [2017 Periodic Review Standing Review Team - Standards Grading project page](#).

Upon completion of initial grading by the PRSRT, the grading tool will be posted for a 60-day industry comment period. The PRST will solicit input from stakeholders prior to finalizing the grading. The finalized grading will be appended to the Reliability Standards Development Plan (RSDP), which has been endorsed by the SC.

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

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

Q3: What are the grades used for?

A3: The final grade will be an early input to future PRs, along with additional information collected, as required under the [PR Template](#). If a PR team recommends revising standard requirements that were graded in 2016 or will be graded in 2017, the SRT will re-grade those standard requirements based on the recommended revision. The re-graded requirements will also be posted for additional stakeholder comment prior to final SRT grading.

Q4: What is the grading tool?

A4. The grading tool is based on the grading tool from the 2013 [Standards Independent Experts Review Project](#). The SC endorsed using the same decisions-tree and grading criteria, with the addition of one quality question on cost effectiveness. For purposes of the 2017 standards grading, the cost-effectiveness quality question does not contribute to the final numeric grade for quality. The grading

tool, upon completion by the PRSRT, will be available on the [2017 Periodic Review Standing Review Team - Standards Grading project page](#).

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

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

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

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

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

A6: Each PRSRT member will use a standards grading tool to develop initial grades, which the team discussed at its June 2, 2017 public meeting in Atlanta. The PRSRT focused its discussions on developing consensus grades on standards where there are individual grading variances. The PRSRT will request comments from industry on specific standards grades where the PRSRT may be unable to reach strong consensus or desired specific stakeholder input before finalizing a consensus position. In those instances, additional input from an industry perspective would assist the team’s final grading.