



Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
JOINT TWG/RCWG NET CONFERENCE
July 6, 2015
Net Conference – Little Rock, Arkansas

• Summary of Action Items •

1. None

Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

TWG NET CONFERENCE

June 19, 2015

Net Conference – Little Rock, Arkansas

• MINUTES •

Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items

TWG Vice-Chair Travis Hyde called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. The following TWG members were in attendance (Attachment 1a, 1b – Attendance, Proxies) or represented by proxy:

Jerry Bradshaw, City Utilities of Springfield proxy for John Boshears
Derek Brown, Westar Energy, Inc. proxy for Mo Awad
Alan Burbach, Lincoln Electric System proxy for Scott Benson
John Fulton, Southwestern Public Service Co.
Travis Hyde, Oklahoma Gas & Electric
Dan Lenihan, Omaha Public Power District
Randy Lindstrom, Nebraska Public Power District
Alan Myers, ITC Great Plains
Gayle Nansel, Western Area Power Authority
Katy Onnen, Kansas City Power & Light proxy for Harold Wyble
John Payne, Kansas Electric Power Cooperatives
Scott Rainbolt, American Electric Power proxy for Matt McGee
Tim Smith, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative

Kirk Hall, SPP staff, confirmed that there was a quorum for the TWG.

The following RCWG members were in attendance (Attachment 1a, 1b – Attendance, Proxies) or represented by proxy:

Jennifer Flandermeyer, Kansas City Power & Light
John Allen, City Utilities of Springfield
Michael DeLoach, American Electric Power
Tony Eddleman, Nebraska Public Power District
Louis Guidry, CLECO Power, LLC
Bo Jones, Westar Energy, Inc.
Jaime Strickland, Xcel Energy proxy for Brian Kauffman
Robert McClanahan, Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation
Fred Meyer, Empire District Electric Company
Mike Murray, City of Independence, MO
Doug Peterchuck, Omaha Public Power District
John Rhea, Oklahoma Gas & Electric
Eric Ruskamp, Lincoln Electric System
Mike Stafford, Grand River Dam Authority

Kim Van Brimer, SPP staff, confirmed that there was a quorum for the RCWG.

Agenda Item 2 – CIP-014-2 Scope Approval

Michael Odom, SPP staff, opened up discussion on the CIP-014-2 scope (Attachment 2a, 2b – CIP-014-2 Scope Redline, CIP-014-2 Clean) discussion by overviewing the changes to the document that were requested since it was originally sent to both groups on June 24th. Members of the RCWG had a few questions related to the document. The first question was related to the timing of the study. It was determined that language needed to be altered to that the 90 day window should be related to the completion of the Transmission Owner risk assessment. Additionally, a request was made to clarify language around the data submitted to SPP for their 3rd party review. Staff also suggested that SPP staff develop its own methodology for CIP-014-2, but had not reviewed that with SPP management yet. Members stated that if that were the case they would just adopt SPP's methodology for their own risk assessment. Members also questioned depth of the scope and if that would be sufficient for the Transmission Owner's RE audit. If more analysis was needed it would cause additional resources for staff as well as the cost for the review. Jennifer Flandermeyer, RCWG Chair, informed the members that she would request a vote from the RCWG because the document needed additional work before the MOPC. Kirk stated that he would like an approved recommendation from the TWG because this item would need to be approved for the MOPC agenda and background materials posting the following day. Travis suggested an email vote after the meeting. Kirk asked the TWG members if they still agreed that SPP should make itself available as a 3rd party reviewer. TWG members agreed that they felt staff should still perform this duty if requested by an individual Transmission Owner.

Both staff secretaries agreed to distribute the updated document to their respective groups to request an email vote.

Seeing there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kirk Hall
Secretary

After the meeting the TWG provided a motion and a second to approve the modified CIP-14-2 Scope document. Due to the timely nature of the MOPC posting and the discussion during the call the voting window was to be closed at 5 pm July 6th. There were not enough votes to maintain a quorum.

All sessions in Central Daylight Time (Chicago, GMT-05:00)

Session detail for 'TWG/RCWG Net Conference':

Participant Name	Email
1 Kirk Hall	khall@spp.org
2 Tony Gott (AECI)	tgott@aeci.org
3 Mike Murray	mmurray@indepmo.org
4 Louis Guidry (Cleco)	louis.guidry@cleco.com
5 John Payne (KEPCo)	jpayne@kepcoco.org
6 Eric Ruskamp	eruskamp@les.com
7 Alan Burbach	aburbach@les.com
8 Blake Poole	bpoole@spp.org
9 Travis Hyde	hydtd@oge.com
10 Derek Brown (Westar)	derek.brown@westarenergy.com
11 John Rhea	rheajd@oge.com
12 Randy Lindstrom	rrlinds@nppd.com
13 Bob Burner	g.burner@duke-energy.com
14 ed pfeiffer (quanta)	epfeiffer@quanta-technology.com
15 Mike Hughes	mhughes.re@spp.org
16 Andy	aberg@minnkota.com
17 Gimod Olapurayil	golapurayil@itctransco.com
18 Fred Meyer	fmeyer@empiredistrict.com
19 Tony Eddleman (NPPD)	tdedde@nppd.com
20 bo jones	bo.jones@westarenergy.com
21 John Knofczynski	jknofczynski@eastriver.coop
22 Jamie Strickland	jamie.g.strickland@xcelenergy.com
23 Josie Daggett	daggett@wapa.gov
24 Hollie Baker	bakerha@oge.com
25 Alan Myers	amyers@itctransco.com
26 Michael Wegner (ITC)	mwegner@itctransco.com
27 Matt McGee	mcmcgee@aep.com
28 David Spargo (OPPD)	dpspargo@gmail.com
29 mahendhar mareddy (SPS)	mahendhar.r.mareddy@xcelenergy.com
30 Gayle Nansel	nansel@wapa.gov
31 Eric Burkey	eburkey@ameren.com
32 Kim Van Brimer (SPP)	kvanbrimer@spp.org
33 Jennifer Flandermeyer	jennifer.flandermeyer@kcpl.com
34 Jerry Bradshaw (SPRM)	jerry.bradshaw@cityutilities.net
35 Lori Frisk-Thompson (BEPC)	lorift@becp.com
36 Liam Stringham (Sunflower)	lstringham@sunflower.net
37 John Turner (BPU)	jturner@bpu.com
38 Scott Rainbolt	skrainbolt@aep.com
39 Robert Gray	rgray@bpu.com
40 Brittany Millard	bmillard@nmppenergy.org
41 Jim McAvoy	jmavoy@ompa.com
42 Michael DeLoach	medeloach@aep.com
43 John Allen (SPRM)	john.allen@cityutilities.net
44 Katy Onnen (KCP&L)	katy.onnen@kcpl.com

45 Scott Williams (SPRM)	j.scott.williams@cityutilities.net
46 Doug Peterchuck	dpeterchuck@oppd.com
47 Robert McClanahan	robert.mcclanahan@aecc.com
48 Moses Rotich	mrotich@spp.org
49 Tim C. Smith (WFEC)	t_smith@wfec.com
50 Jason Terhune (SPP)	jterhune@spp.org
51 Doug Clark (SPP)	dclark@spp.org
52 Mike Stafford	mstaff@grda.com
53 matthew stoltz BEPC	mstoltz@bepc.com
54 Noumvi Ghomsi	noumvi.ghomsi@psc.mo.gov
55 Jim Krajecki (CES)	jkrajecki@ces-ltd.com
57 Michael DeLoach	medeloach@aep.com
59 Dee Edmondson	dedmondson@spp.org
61 Louis Guidry (Cleco)	louis.guidry@cleco.com
64 guest	lzaragoza@sunflower.net

Kirk Hall

From: Scott Benson <sbenson@les.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2015 9:09 AM
To: Kirk Hall
Cc: Burbach, Alan
Subject: RE: CIP-014-2 Scope

Kirk,

Please accept Alan Burbach of LES as my proxy for this meeting.

Thanks,

Scott J. Benson, P.E. | Manager, Resource & Transmission Planning
Lincoln Electric System
Phone: 402-473-3390
Fax: 402-473-3208
Email: sbenson@les.com
1040 O St.
PO Box 80869
Lincoln, NE 68501-0869
www.les.com

From: bounce-47414-54283@spplist.spp.org [mailto:bounce-47414-54283@spplist.spp.org] **On Behalf Of** Kirk Hall
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2015 11:36 AM
To: Transmission Working Group
Cc: Aaron Stewart; Michael Odom; Jonathan Hayes
Subject: RE: CIP-014-2 Scope

Members,

Just wanted to give you a friendly reminder that the TWG is having a joint net conference with the RCWG on Monday, July 6th to discuss the attached document. No agenda has been posted for this meeting since the document was included in the initial email below.

If you have not registered, please do so with this [link](#).

Also, be sure to provide me with a proxy if you are unavailable during the meeting. We anticipate this to be short meeting similar to the June 3rd call to approve the 2015 Flowgate Assessment.

Kirk Hall
Sr. Engineer
Steady State Planning
501.688.8230

From: Kirk Hall
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 11:54 AM

Kirk Hall

From: John Boshears <John.Boshears@cityutilities.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 1:50 PM
To: Kirk Hall
Cc: Bradshaw, Jerry; Knottek, Jeff
Subject: RE: CIP-014-2 Scope

Kirk,
Jerry Bradshaw has my proxy for the 7/6/15 TWG/RCWG Meeting.
John Boshears

From: bounce-47414-25442@spplist.spp.org [bounce-47414-25442@spplist.spp.org] on behalf of Kirk Hall [khall@spp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 11:35 AM
To: Transmission Working Group
Cc: Aaron Stewart; Michael Odom; Jonathan Hayes
Subject: RE: CIP-014-2 Scope

Members,

Just wanted to give you a friendly reminder that the TWG is having a joint net conference with the RCWG on Monday, July 6th to discuss the attached document. No agenda has been posted for this meeting since the document was included in the initial email below.

If you have not registered, please do so with this [link](#).

Also, be sure to provide me with a proxy if you are unavailable during the meeting. We anticipate this to be short meeting similar to the June 3rd call to approve the 2015 Flowgate Assessment.

Kirk Hall
Sr. Engineer
Steady State Planning
501.688.8230

From: Kirk Hall
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2015 11:54 AM
To: SPP TWG (EXPLODER)
Cc: Aaron Stewart
Subject: CIP-014-2 Scope
Importance: High

TWG Members,

Staff has put together a scope for the CIP-014-2 3rd party review. Please review the document and provide comments back to me. This item needs to go the July MOPC meeting to ensure that the MOPC reviews and approves it since it will be an unbudgeted expense.

I am in the process of setting up a net conference the afternoon of Monday, July 6th for a vote on this item. If you are unable to attend please be sure to provide a proxy for the meeting. The notification of the meeting will be sent out separately.

Kirk Hall

From: Mo Awad <Mo.Awad@westarenergy.com>
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2015 8:13 AM
To: Kirk Hall; Hyde, Travis
Cc: Brown, Derek; McNeil, Nathan
Subject: Proxy for July, 6th

Kirk and Travis,

Derek Brown has my proxy for the July, 6th joint TWG/RCWG conference call.

Thanks,

Mo Awad

Westar Energy

Mo.Awad@WestarEnergy.com

O (785) 575-1674 C (785) 393-6919

If you've received this private message in error, I apologize for the inconvenience. Please don't distribute it. Instead, please just delete it and respond to let me know of my error. Then, have a wonderful day.

If you've received this message in error, I apologize for the inconvenience. Please don't distribute it. Instead, please just delete it and respond to let me know of my error. Then, have a wonderful day.

Kirk Hall

From: Wyble Harold <Harold.Wyble@kcpl.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2015 8:19 AM
To: Kirk Hall; Awad, Mo
Cc: Onnen, Katy
Subject: TWG/RCWG 7/6/15 Joint Net Conference proxy

Katy Onnen will have my TWG proxy for the TWG/RCWG Joint Net Conference on Monday, July 6, 2015, 2-3 pm.

Harold Wyble
Manager Transmission Planning
Kansas City Power & Light
816-654-1213

Kirk Hall

From: Kim VanBrimer
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 3:32 PM
To: Kirk Hall
Subject: RE: CIP-014 Timeline Clarification

Bryan Kaufmann had a proxy with Jaime Strickland
No show/no proxy - Greg Froehling
No show/no proxy - Chris Lang

All other voting members present.

Kim

From: Kirk Hall
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 3:22 PM
To: Kim VanBrimer
Subject: RE: CIP-014 Timeline Clarification

Kim,

Can you send me your proxies from the call last week?

Kirk Hall
Sr. Engineer
Steady State Planning
501.688.8230

From: Kim VanBrimer
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 12:48 PM
To: Aaron Stewart
Cc: Kirk Hall; Michael Odom; Blake Poole
Subject: Re: CIP-014 Timeline Clarification

Let me touch base with my chair.

Thanks for putting this together.

Kim

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 13, 2015, at 12:16 PM, Aaron Stewart <astewart@spp.org> wrote:

All,

Just wanted to clarify the timeline for the scope with the voting that is required by the RCWG and the TWG. The RE is planning on hosting an informative webinar on the July 29th and they were asking for the scope to be ready by that date. So some questions so that we can be sure to have the scope completed:



SPP CIP-014 Assessment Review Scope

Engineering
6/23/2015

Revision History

Date or Version Number	Author	Change Description
6/23/2015	SPP Staff	Draft
7/6/2015	SPP Staff	Updated with Stakeholder Feedback

Table of Contents

Revision History	1
Overview	3
Data inputs	4
Data required by the PC.....	4
Data request to the Transmission Owner	4
Assessment Review	5
Analysis.....	5
Deliverables	6
Changes in Process and Assumptions	7
Appendix A	1

Overview

This document presents the scope of work for the NERC CIP-014 ~~Third party~~ Party review. This document will be reviewed by the Regional Compliance Working Group (RCWG), Transmission Working Group (TWG), and the Markets and Operations Policy Committee (MOPC). SPP, as the Planning Coordinator (PC), will coordinate with the Transmission Owner to exchange data in order to meet the requirements of an unaffiliated third party reviewer¹ as well as fulfill requirements of the Transmission Owner². The NERC CIP-014 standard is effective October 1, 2015 and the review process will be completed within 90 calendar days, per Requirement R2, of the acceptance of the Third Party Review Agreement completion of the Transmission Owner assessment. In order to perform a third party review, SPP must receive the Transmission Owner's risk assessment with no less than 75 days of the 90 day compliance requirement date to complete its review.

Comment [JS1]: Which transmission owners are eligible to have SPP perform the 3rd review? SPP RTO member TO? Any NERC registered TO? How about TO's in WECC or ERCOT?

Comment [JS2]: Is SPP charging a fee to perform the review? How much? Suppose the entity requesting the review is a non-SPP member?

¹ Requirement R2 of the NERC CIP-014 Standard

² Requirement R1 of the NERC CIP-014 Standard

Data inputs

Data required by the PC

Data request to the Transmission Owner

~~Modeling data~~ ~~Transmission analysis data~~ required in the review of the CIP-014 risk assessment will be provided through the ~~Third Party Risk Assessment Request Form~~ [Third Party Risk Assessment Template \(Appendix A\)](#). If the Transmission Owner used models in their transmission analysis, the same models will be used during the third party review. The models that will be used during the review will be the same models that the Transmission Owner used during their assessments. The ~~transmission analysis data~~ ~~model~~ will be reviewed to ~~verify~~ identify the list of facilities identified in Applicability Section 4.1.1. The submitted ~~models~~ data will also be used in the review of the risk assessment to identify facilities that if rendered inoperable or damaged could cause instability, uncontrolled separation, or cascading within an interconnection.

Comment [JS3]: It is possible that the assessment performed by the TO did not use power flow models. The standard requires a transmission analysis, but doesn't explicitly require a power flow or dynamic study.

The Transmission Owner will provide a completed ~~Third Party Risk Assessment Request Form~~ [Third Party Risk Assessment Template](#) -that lists the data required by SPP to perform the review of the risk assessment.

Formatted: Level 1

Assessment Review

Analysis

Risk Assessment Review

~~CIP-014 Requirement R1 requires the Transmission Owner to perform a risk assessment. SPP will review the results of this risk assessment in accordance with Requirement R2 of the standard.~~

SPP will review the results of the risk assessment that is provided by the Transmission Owner. This assessment includes a list of the facilities that were identified in accordance with the criteria in Applicability 4.1.1 of the NERC CIP-014 standard. ~~SPP will apply a weighting system according to section 4.1.1.2 of the standard to verify the results of the risk assessment submitted by the~~ Transmission Owner.

SPP will review the Transmission Owner's submitted data, assessment methodology, and results.

SPP will ~~apply-utilize sound~~ engineering judgement to verify that the information provided is ~~just~~ and reasonable.

SPP will compare the list of facilities ~~evaluated identified during~~ the risk assessment performed by the Transmission Owner ~~,to -and~~ the current list of Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits (IROL) provided by the Reliability Coordinator (RC) and Planning Coordinator (PC). SPP will note if any of the identified facilities are part of a current IROL. ~~If A~~any facilities ~~that~~ are part of an existing IROL, but ~~are~~ not included in the list of applicable facilities, ~~then SPP will be added to the list recommend adding those facilities to the list of applicable facilities (R2.2).~~

~~CIP-014 Requirement R1 requires the Transmission Owner to perform a risk assessment. SPP will review the results of this risk assessment in accordance with Requirement R2 of the standard.~~ If the Transmission Owner identifies facilities that require additional physical security, SPP will select one or more ~~noted of the~~ facilities, and apply the ~~Transmission Owner's~~ appropriate methodology to verify the results. SPP will also choose one or more facilities ~~identified during the risk assessment~~ that were not shown to need additional physical security, and verify the results by applying the ~~Transmission Owner's~~ appropriate methodology.

~~In the case that the Transmission Owner concludes, through the risk assessment, that no additional physical security measures are required, SPP will select one or more facilities and apply the appropriate methodology to verify the results.~~

Comment [JS4]: Doesn't make sense. The weighting system was only to identify the facilities subject to the review. It has nothing to do with the assessment itself.

Comment [JS5]: Delete. This isn't a FERC pleading.

Comment [JS6]: Is "reasonable" the standard by which SPP will judge if it concurs with the TO's risk assessment results? What will SPP consider to be reasonable? If SPP believes the methodology is reasonable and that there were no errors made by the TO in applying the methodology, then does that automatically make the results of the risk assessment reasonable and therefore SPP concurs with the TO's risk assessment results?

Comment [JS7]: Meaning the methodology used by the TO? Or some other methodology developed by SPP?

Comment [JS8]: Meaning the methodology used by the TO? Or some other methodology developed by SPP?

Comment [JS9]: Delete. This is a repeat of the least sentence of the previous paragraph.

Formatted: Level 1

Deliverables

SPP will provide a written report to the Transmission Owner, within 90 days of the acceptance of the Third Party Review Agreement completion of the Transmission Owner's assessment, either concurring with the risk assessment performed or providing recommendations where deficiencies are found.

Changes in Process and Assumptions

In order to protect against changes in [the](#) process and assumptions that could present a significant risk to the completion of the CIP-014 assessment review, any such changes must be vetted. If TWG votes on any process steps or assumptions to be used in the study, those assumptions will be used. [Any review process changes or review assumptions will be applied only to those requests for Third Party review accepted by SPP subsequent to effective date of the changes.](#) Changes to process or assumptions recommended by stakeholders must be approved by the TWG. This process will allow for changes if they are deemed necessary and critical to the CIP-014 assessment review process, while also ensuring that changes, and the risks and benefits of those changes, will be fully vetted and discussed.

Comment [JS10]: If SPP is in the middle of a review when a change is made to the review process, use the old process for that review. Apply the new process only to new request for review.

Appendix A

CIP-014-1 Third Party Risk Assessment Template

Transmission Owners (TOs) should complete this template when requesting that SPP perform the Third Party Review of the required Risk Assessment for CIP-014-1. SPP will review the information provided and provide requestor notice of acceptance. The submitted information/methodologies should be adequately detailed for SPP to provide feedback.

Requestor Contact Information

Requestor Name:

5T

Requestor Contact:

5T

Requestor Address:

5T

Requestor Phone Number:

5T

Requestor Email:

5T

Risk Assessment Preparer Information (if other than requestor)

Vendor Name:

5T

Vendor Contact:

5T

Vendor Address:

5T

Vendor Phone Number:

5T

Vendor Email:

5T

CIP 014-1 R1 Evaluation Results
5T

Steady State Information / Model

Provide model used to perform Risk Assessment (True share)

List of Steady State Facilities That Meet CIP-014-1 Criteria (Substations):

5T

List of Facilities that are part of an IROL

5T

List of Facilities that are part of an NIPR

5T

MDWG Model Series:

Comment [JS11]: Off-system TO's will likely be using models other than MDWG.

Model Year:

Model Season:

Model Peak/Other Modifications:

5T

Please Specify the Type of Software Used if not PSSE: *If using software other than PSSE, please provide a .raw file*

5T

Assumptions / Planning Criteria

Cascading Definition:

5T

Methodology Used To Perform Assessment:

5T

Please provide Software powerflow parameters:

5T

SPP Criteria: or **Local Criteria:** (If local is selected please provide limits below)

Low Voltage Limit:

5T

High Voltage Limit:

5T

Thermal Limit:

5T

Base Case Topology Changes with response files (IDEVs/Python):

5T

Summary of why Base Case Topology changes were made:

Formatted: Level 1

5T

Generator Dispatch Changes with response files (IDEVs/Python):

5T

Summary of why Generator Dispatch Changes were made:

5T

Load Changes with response files (IDEVs/Python):

5T

Summary of why Load Changes were made:

5T

Study Information Including Bus Numbers, Format (Excel Word Doc, Txt File)

- Contingency Files
- Sub-System Files
- Monitored Files
- Automation Files

Steady State Results Table, Format (Excel Word Doc, Txt File)

- Provide Risk Assessment Report
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Caused Adverse Reliability Impacts (Substations)
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Did Not Cause Adverse Reliability Impacts.
- List Of Impacted Facilities Associated With Each Of The Facilities Listed Above (Other Facilities)
- Steady State – Voltage/Thermal Response Of Impacted Facilities

Transient Information / Model

Provide model used to perform Risk Assessment (True share)

List of Dynamic Facilities That Meet CIP-014-1 Criteria (Substations):

5T

MDWG Model Series:

Model Year:

Model Season:

Model Peak/Other modifications:

5T

Please Specify the Type of Software Used if not PSSE: *If using software other than PSSE, please provide a .raw file*

5T

Comment [JS12]: Some entities may not perform dynamic studies as part of the risk assessment.

Formatted: Level 1

Assumptions

Definition:

5T

List of DYR File Revisions Different From the SPP Dynamic Model:

5T

Summary of why DYR File Revisions Different From the SPP Dynamic Model were made:

5T

Assumed Relay Actions During Assessment: Describe Normal Clearing To Delayed Clearing By Summarizing Clearing Times Used For Simulated Events:

5T

Timeframe of Simulation:

5T

Assumed Fault Values (-j2e⁻⁹ MVA, Calculated Value) Single Line to Ground Or 3 Phase.

5T

Method used to calculate Fault – (I.E. ASCC or SCMU PSS/E activities)

5T

Please provide Software Solution parameters:

5T

Provide Contingencies Performed During Assessment (PSA Files If Available)

Provide All Transient Results In Following Format:

- Provide Risk Assessment Report
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Caused Adverse Reliability Impacts (Substations) In Your Dynamics Assessment.
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Did Not Cause Adverse Reliability Impacts In Your Dynamics Assessment.
- System Response Of Impacted Facilities With Bus Numbers In Your Dynamics Assessment (**Table Format In Excel Or Word**)
- Plots (I.E. Speed, Angle, Voltage, P, Q) (**PDF Of Dynamic Plots**)

DO NOT FILL OUT INFORMATION BEYOND THIS POINT

Formatted: Level 1

SPP Contact:

5T

SPP Address:

201 Worthen Drive Little Rock, AR 72223

SPP Phone Number:

5T

SPP Fax Number:

5T

SPP Date Received: 5T

Study Agreement Number: 5T

SPP Completion Date: 5T

SPP Return Submission Method: 5T

Via Email

Via Post

Disclaimer

The information contained herein or attached is compiled and maintained by the Steady State Planning Team and is provided to recipients for informational purposes only. The contents herein do not constitute advice upon which the recipient should solely rely, and should not be a substitute for direct guidance obtained by the recipient through due diligence, and based upon particular circumstances. The contents herein contain general information and recipients should not act, or refrain from acting, on the basis of the contents herein. Southwest Power Pool, Inc. expressly disclaims all liability relating to action taken or not taken based on any or all of the contents herein.



SPP CIP-014 Assessment Review Scope

Engineering
6/23/2015

Revision History

Date or Version Number	Author	Change Description
6/23/2015	SPP Staff	Draft
7/6/2015	SPP Staff	Updated with Stakeholder Feedback

Table of Contents

- Revision History1**
- Overview3**
- Data inputs.....4**
 - Data required by the PC4
 - Data request to the Transmission Owner4
- Assessment Review.....5**
 - Analysis.....5
- Deliverables6**
- Changes in Process and Assumptions7**
- Appendix A1**

Overview

This document presents the scope of work for the NERC CIP-014 third party review. This document will be reviewed by the Regional Compliance Working Group (RCWG), Transmission Working Group (TWG), and the Markets and Operations Policy Committee (MOPC). SPP, as the Planning Coordinator (PC), will coordinate with the Transmission Owner to exchange data in order to meet the requirements of an unaffiliated third party reviewer¹ as well as fulfill requirements of the Transmission Owner². The NERC CIP-014 standard is effective October 1, 2015 and the review process will be completed within 90 calendar days of the completion of the Transmission Owner assessment. In order to perform a third party review, SPP must receive the Transmission Owner's risk assessment with no less than 75 days of the 90 day compliance requirement date to complete its review.

¹ Requirement R2 of the NERC CIP-014 Standard

² Requirement R1 of the NERC CIP-014 Standard

Data inputs

Data required by the PC

Data request to the Transmission Owner

Transmission analysis data required in the review of the CIP-014 risk assessment will be provided through the Third Party Risk Assessment Template (Appendix A). If the Transmission Owner used models in their transmission analysis, the same models will be used during the third party review. The transmission analysis data will be reviewed to verify the list of facilities identified in Applicability Section 4.1.1. The submitted data will also be used in the review of the risk assessment to identify facilities that if rendered inoperable or damaged could cause instability, uncontrolled separation, or cascading within an interconnection.

The Transmission Owner will provide a completed Third Party Risk Assessment Template that lists the data required by SPP to perform the review of the risk assessment.

Assessment Review

Analysis

Risk Assessment Review

CIP-014 Requirement R1 requires the Transmission Owner to perform a risk assessment. SPP will review the results of this risk assessment in accordance with Requirement R2 of the standard. SPP will review the results of the risk assessment that is provided by the Transmission Owner. This assessment includes a list of the facilities that were identified in accordance with the criteria in Applicability 4.1.1 of the NERC CIP-014 standard. SPP will apply a weighting system according to section 4.1.1.2 of the standard to verify the results of the risk assessment submitted by the Transmission Owner.

SPP will review the Transmission Owner's submitted data, assessment methodology, and results. SPP will utilize engineering judgement to verify that the information provided is reasonable.

SPP will compare the list of facilities evaluated in the risk assessment performed by the Transmission Owner to the current list of Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits (IROL) provided by the Reliability Coordinator (RC) and Planning Coordinator (PC). SPP will note if any of the identified facilities are part of a current IROL. If any facilities are part of an existing IROL but are not included in the list of applicable facilities, then SPP will recommend adding those facilities to the list of applicable facilities.

If the Transmission Owner identifies facilities that require additional physical security, SPP will select one or more of the facilities and apply the Transmission Owner's methodology to verify the results. SPP will also choose one or more facilities that were not shown to need additional physical security and verify the results by applying the Transmission Owner's methodology.

Deliverables

SPP will provide a written report to the Transmission Owner, within 90 days of the completion of the Transmission Owner's assessment, either concurring with the risk assessment performed or providing recommendations where deficiencies are found.

Changes in Process and Assumptions

In order to protect against changes in the process and assumptions that could present a significant risk to the completion of the CIP-014 assessment review, any such changes must be vetted. If TWG votes on any process steps or assumptions to be used in the study, those assumptions will be used. Any review process changes or review assumptions will be applied only to those requests for Third Party review accepted by SPP subsequent to effective date of the changes. Changes to process or assumptions recommended by stakeholders must be approved by the TWG. This process will allow for changes if they are deemed necessary and critical to the CIP-014 assessment review process, while also ensuring that changes, and the risks and benefits of those changes, will be fully vetted and discussed.

Appendix A

CIP-014-1 Third Party Risk Assessment Template

Transmission Owners (TOs) should complete this template when requesting that SPP perform the Third Party Review of the required Risk Assessment for CIP-014-1. SPP will review the information provided and provide requestor notice of acceptance. The submitted information/methodologies should be adequately detailed for SPP to provide feedback.

Requestor Contact Information

Requestor Name:

5T

Requestor Contact:

5T

Requestor Address:

5T

Requestor Phone Number:

5T

Requestor Email:

5T

Risk Assessment Preparer Information (if other than requestor)

Vendor Name:

5T

Vendor Contact:

5T

Vendor Address:

5T

Vendor Phone Number:

5T

Vendor Email:

5T

CIP 014-1 R1 Evaluation Results

5T

Steady State Information / Model

Provide model used to perform Risk Assessment (True share)

List of Facilities That Meet CIP-014-1 Criteria (Substations):

5T

List of Facilities that are part of an IROL

5T

List of Facilities that are part of an NIPR

5T

Model Series:

Model Year:

Model Season:

Model Peak/Other Modifications:

5T

Please Specify the Type of Software Used if not PSSE: *If using software other than PSSE, please provide a .raw file*

5T

Assumptions / Planning Criteria

Cascading Definition:

5T

Methodology Used To Perform Assessment:

5T

Please provide Software powerflow parameters:

5T

SPP Criteria: or Local Criteria: (If local is selected please provide limits below)

Low Voltage Limit:

5T

High Voltage Limit:

5T

Thermal Limit:

5T

Base Case Topology Changes with response files (IDEVs/Python):

5T

Summary of why Base Case Topology changes were made:

5T

Generator Dispatch Changes with response files (IDEVs/Python):

5T

Summary of why Generator Dispatch Changes were made:

5T

Load Changes with response files (IDEVs/Python):

5T

Summary of why Load Changes were made:

5T

Study Information Including Bus Numbers, Format (Excel Word Doc, Txt File)

- Contingency Files
- Sub-System Files
- Monitored Files
- Automation Files

Steady State Results Table, Format (Excel Word Doc, Txt File)

- Provide Risk Assessment Report
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Caused Adverse Reliability Impacts (Substations)
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Did Not Cause Adverse Reliability Impacts.
- List Of Impacted Facilities Associated With Each Of The Facilities Listed Above (Other Facilities)
- Steady State – Voltage/Thermal Response Of Impacted Facilities

Transient Information / Model

Provide model used to perform Risk Assessment (True share)

List of Facilities That Meet CIP-014-1 Criteria (Substations):

5T

MDWG Model Series:

Model Year:

Model Season:

Model Peak/Other modifications:

5T

Please Specify the Type of Software Used if not PSSE: *If using software other than PSSE, please provide a .raw file*

5T

Assumptions

Definition:

5T

List of DYR File Revisions Different From the SPP Dynamic Model:

5T

Summary of why DYR File Revisions Different From the SPP Dynamic Model were made:

5T

Assumed Relay Actions During Assessment: Describe Normal Clearing To Delayed Clearing By Summarizing Clearing Times Used For Simulated Events:

5T

Timeframe of Simulation:

5T

Assumed Fault Values (-j2e⁻⁹ MVA, Calculated Value) Single Line to Ground Or 3 Phase.

5T

Method used to calculate Fault – (I.E. ASCC or SCMU PSS/E activities)

5T

Please provide Software Solution parameters:

5T

Provide Contingencies Performed During Assessment (PSA Files If Available)

Provide All Transient Results In Following Format:

- Provide Risk Assessment Report
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Caused Adverse Reliability Impacts (Substations) In Your Dynamics Assessment.
- Provide The List Of Facilities That Did Not Cause Adverse Reliability Impacts In Your Dynamics Assessment.
- System Response Of Impacted Facilities With Bus Numbers In Your Dynamics Assessment (**Table Format In Excel Or Word**)
- Plots (I.E. Speed, Angle, Voltage, P, Q) (**PDF Of Dynamic Plots**)

DO NOT FILL OUT INFORMATION BEYOND THIS POINT

SPP Contact:

5T

SPP Address:

201 Worthen Drive Little Rock, AR 72223

SPP Phone Number:

5T

SPP Fax Number:

5T

SPP Date Received: 5T

Study Agreement Number: 5T

SPP Completion Date: 5T

SPP Return Submission Method: 5T

Via Email

Via Post

Disclaimer

The information contained herein or attached is compiled and maintained by the Steady State Planning Team and is provided to recipients for informational purposes only. The contents herein do not constitute advice upon which the recipient should solely rely, and should not be a substitute for direct guidance obtained by the recipient through due diligence, and based upon particular circumstances. The contents herein contain general information and recipients should not act, or refrain from acting, on the basis of the contents herein. Southwest Power Pool, Inc. expressly disclaims all liability relating to action taken or not taken based on any or all of the contents herein.