

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

**COMMENT FORM
Proposed System Personnel Training Standard**

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

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

- DO: **Do** enter text only, with no formatting or styles added.
 Do use punctuation and capitalization as needed (except quotations).
 Do use more than one form if responses do not fit in the spaces provided.
 Do submit any formatted text or markups in a separate WORD file.

- DO NOT: **Do not** insert tabs or paragraph returns in any data field.
 Do not use numbering or bullets in any data field.
 Do not use quotation marks in any data field.
 Do not submit a response in an unprotected copy of this form.

Individual Commenter Information	
(Complete this page for comments from one organization or individual.)	
Name:	Peter Henderson
Organization:	IESO
Telephone:	905 855 6258
Email:	peter.henderson@ieso.ca
NERC Region	Registered Ballot Body Segment
<input type="checkbox"/> ERCOT	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Transmission Owners
<input type="checkbox"/> ECAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 - RTOs, ISOs, Regional Reliability Councils
<input type="checkbox"/> FRCC	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 - Load-serving Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> MAAC	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
<input type="checkbox"/> MAIN	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 - Electric Generators
<input type="checkbox"/> MAPP	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
<input type="checkbox"/> NPCC	<input type="checkbox"/> 7 - Large Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> SERC	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 - Small Electricity End Users
<input type="checkbox"/> SPP	<input type="checkbox"/> 9 - Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
<input type="checkbox"/> WECC	
<input type="checkbox"/> NA - Not Applicable	

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

Background Information:

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

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

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

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

Yes

No

Comments

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

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

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

Question 2: Regarding the applicability of the SAR:

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| Reliability Authority/Coordinator | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Balancing Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Interchange Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Planning Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Resource Planner | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Transmission Service Provider | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Transmission Planner | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Transmission Service Provider | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Transmission Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Transmission Operator | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Distribution Provider | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Generator Owner | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Generator Operator | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Purchasing-Selling Entity | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Market Operator | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Load-Serving Entity | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

Comments

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

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

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

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

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

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain.

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

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

Yes

No

If yes, please explain.

Again, if the approach is "one size fits all", this will cause problems. What type of emergency (or situational awareness, or simulator) training should PSE, IA or PA participate in?

On the other hand, if the intention is to have different courses/certification streamlined for each involved function, then we can understand the approach. However, not all of the functions listed in Q2 should be part of this standard. See comments on Q2.

Comments

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

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

Yes

No

If yes, please list the region-specific differences.

.

Comments

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

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

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

Yes

No

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

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

Comments

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

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

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

Comments

Comment Form – Proposed System Personnel Training Standard

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

Comments

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

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