

Unofficial Comment Form for Standards Committee's Project Prioritization Reference Document and Tool

Please do not use this form to submit comments on the draft standard prioritization tool and associated reference document. Please use the [electronic comment form](#) to submit your comments. Comments must be submitted by **February 10, 2011**. If you have questions please contact **Maureen Long** at maureen.long@nerc.net or by telephone at 813-468-5998.

Background Information:

The Standards Committee has posted a draft standard project prioritization tool and reference document (Standards Committee Process for Standard Project Identification, Prioritization, and Monitoring) proposed for use in prioritizing standard projects. Comments will be accepted through February 10, 2011.

During the past few years, the Standards Committee has been presented with more proposals for developing new or revised projects than can be accomplished at one time. The project prioritization tool is an excel spreadsheet that provides a transparent method of identifying the reliability-related benefits associated with each standard development project. The tool provides the flexibility to accommodate new projects and to adjust project priorities and completion schedules in response to changing conditions and will be used to assign a priority to each standard project proposed for development.

The reference document provides an explanation of the project prioritization tool and identifies how the Standards Committee envisions using the tool.

You are encouraged to read the reference document and then review the tool and the ratings assigned to each of the proposed projects.

We ask that you provide comments on the tool, and then comments on the initial set of ratings. If you disagree with the rating assigned to a specific project, please identify why you believe the rating is incorrect and identify what rating you believe is more appropriate. Please be as specific as possible to help the Standards Committee in making adjustments to the ratings already assigned. For example, if you believe that the proposed project will fill a reliability gap that is not properly rated, identify the reliability gap that is addressed in the project

You do not have to answer all questions. Enter All Comments in Simple Text Format.

Insert a "check" mark in the appropriate boxes by double-clicking the gray areas.

Standards Committee Process for Standard Project Identification, Prioritization, and Monitoring

1. Please provide any comments you have on the draft reference document.
Comments: Oftentimes, prioritization of projects relies on experience, engineering and technical judgment. This tool and reference document provide useful and helpful guidance to the Project Prioritization activity, bringing objectivity to what can be a very subjective process.

Refer also to question 8 below.

Project Prioritization Tool:

2. Do you agree with the range of questions (column headings) in the tool?
 Yes
 No
Comments:
3. Do you agree that the range (0-100) for the red and orange columns in the tool?
 Yes
 No
Comments: The range in Red Column "g" is 0 to 50. Otherwise agree.
4. Do you agree that the range (0-50) for four of the yellow columns, with the column identifying the investment already made in the project rated with a possible rating of 0-100?
 Yes
 No
Comments:
5. Do you agree that the range (0-100) for the blue column in the tool?
 Yes
 No
Comments:
6. What factors do you believe the Standards Committee should consider in the "Other" column?
 Yes
 No
Comments: The "Explanation" column "p" allows room for explanations of the "Other" column.

Proposed Ratings for Projects Included in the Reliability Standard Development Plan:

7. Please review the ratings assigned to each of the individual projects. If you feel that any of the draft ratings are inaccurate, please identify the project number and the specific rating that you believe is inaccurate. Please be specific in identifying what you believe is the correct rating, and provide a justification for that proposed rating.

Comments:

8. Please provide any other comments you feel would be beneficial to the Standards Committee in making improvements to the reference document and project prioritization tool.

Comments: In NERC's 2011 Plan, there are 17 Priority Standards identified. This exceeds the resources available, quoting from p. 5 Section 3,

"Recent Standards Committee and NERC staff experience generally supports the conclusion that NERC and the industry can manage the development of no more than ten to twelve standards projects under active development at any one time. ... our informed judgment is that attempts to develop more than ten or twelve projects during the same period will result in an actual loss of throughput and/or a reduction in standards quality."

There are no explanations supporting the scoring values. Why is one criteria worth 10 while another 25 or 100? Weighted Criteria-Based Scoring Systems for Project Management, under Resource Constraints, are widely used to select and prioritize projects. Generally, the projected sum-of-the-projects results are indicative of some bottom-line measure, like impact on profits. Here the bottom-line impact on reliability is only indirectly indicated through the very qualitative unsupported values assigned to the various criteria/measures, e.g., 10, 25 or 100. Shouldn't some more quantitative Reliability measure be used for scoring, such as some threshold improvement in LOLP or a minimum benefit/cost ratio, e.g., 1.2:1?

Why are certain cells highlighted yellow in the body of the Prioritization Tool?