

PJM Package for Avoidance - Critical Infrastructure Stakeholder Oversight

Aaron Berner
PC Special Session - Critical
Infrastructure Stakeholder Oversight
July 17, 2020

Avoidance vs. Mitigation

Avoidance is different than Mitigation

Avoidance is not subject to CIP-014 standard

 Avoidance solution must balance transparency and risk to include the appropriate level of confidentiality requirements.



Resilience Criteria Analysis

- Resilience Driver/Criteria Analysis
 - PJM will perform RTEP Resilience criteria analysis, utilizing the cascading trees tool, to attempt to avoid the creation of any new CIP-014 facilities via the RTEP Process.
- Metrics/Measurements/Factors
 - Consistent with RTEP Resilience criteria analytical methods incorporated in cascading trees tool software.
- Sensitivity Testing
 - Consistent with analysis methods as indicated in the resilience criteria analysis described above.



Communications with Proposer

Communication Procedures

 If a proposed project violates PJM's Resilience criteria, PJM will communicate this failure, by way of a verbal update, to the entity who submitted the project proposal. Information is limited to analytical results only.



Transparency to Stakeholders

Transparency

- PJM will communicate the failure of a proposed project to meet RTEP Resilience criteria requirements
- If a project proposal violates PJM's Resilience criteria, PJM shall provide limited/restricted level of information to entity proposing project through the competitive window.



Competition

- PJM's competitive Planning Process (Order 1000 Proposal windows) will continue to be the avenue for competition.
- Proposing entities retain ability to mitigate initial issue identified in competitive process.
- No opportunity to revise a proposal submitted through a competitive window to address issues that trigger potential violations associated with the Resilience criteria. (Status Quo)
- Failure of resilience criteria analysis will be treated the same as failure of existing reliability criteria.



Integration into RTEP

- Confidentiality
 - If project proposal violates PJM's Resilience criteria, PJM shall provide limited/restricted level of information to project proposal.
- CEII Status Quo
- Re-evaluation Process N/A
- Cost Allocation/Cost Recovery Status Quo



Roles and Responsibilities

Entity	Role/Responsibility
PJM	Performs RTEP Resilience criteria analysis with cascading trees tool. Communicates information in accordance with confidentiality requirements as described above. E.g., release limited/restricted level of information to proposing entity.
State Commissioners	Provide feedback consistent with the confidentiality provisions in the Operating Agreement
PJM Stakeholders	Status Quo with limited/restricted level of communications to entity proposing project triggering potential violations of PJM's RTEP Resilience criteria.
Asset Owners	Status quo with limited/restricted level of communications to entity proposing project triggering potential violation of PJM's RTEP Resilience criteria.



Examples



Process Example



Note: For the purposes of this example we are focusing on Resilience Criteria, but please note this example is applicable to all RTEP criteria



Process Example

Passes Resilience Criteria (from slide 10)



Passes full RTEP analysis



Continued examination of the entities proposal in the competitive process to allow entity to potentially become the Designated Entity to mitigate posted violation(s)

Fails Resilience Criteria (from slide 10)



Not considered for inclusion in the RTEP



PJM/Proposer high level discussion - Proposal no longer evaluated for entities implementation to mitigate posted violation(s)



Questions?

Questions?