

## CISO Update & Poll Results

Christina Stotesbury
Sr. Engineer, Advanced Analytics
Planning Committee
September 1, 2020



- Acknowledgements
- Review poll results
- Request feedback on next steps



- Acknowledgements
  - Poll Timing
  - Modification to Package Proposals
    - Package E is out of scope of the revised issue charge
  - If needed, Member feedback will be incorporated in a future poll
    - Longer response time
    - Additional options like "Other" or "None of the Above"
  - More work to be completed at the Sept 22 CISO
  - First Read will occur in October





| Member Type | Votes | Percent |  |
|-------------|-------|---------|--|
| Voting      | 27    | 23%     |  |
| Affiliate   | 88    | 77%     |  |
| Total       | 115   |         |  |



- 1. Please select the preferred type of analysis used to *mitigate* CIP-014 facilities?
  - Consistent with the analysis associated with NERC CIP-014 requirements that control to a level of load loss consistent with the NERC standard. (PJM Package)

98% (113)

 Maximum Credible Disturbance Analysis that controls to a thermal, voltage and stability limit violations as a conservative surrogate/proxy for CIP-014 facilities. (AMP Package)

2% (2)

www.pjm.com | Public 5



2. Is stakeholder training required in the area of Extreme Events / Maximum Credible Contingencies (AMP Package proposal)?

- **Yes 87%** (100)
- No − 15% (15)
- Abstain (0)



3. Can you support *mitigation* of CIP-014 facilities being open to competition via an RFP process to those entities that have a prequalified Designated Entity Status and have executed an NDA consistent with the PJM package?

- Yes 43% (49)
- **No 57%** (66)
- Abstain (0)



4. Please rank the existing *mitigation* packages in order of preference with 1 being the most preferred package.

|                               | #1  | #2  | #3  |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Pavised Advantas (Packago E)  | 32  | 4   | 79  |
| Revised Advocates (Package E) | 28% | 3%  | 69% |
| PJM (Package C)               | 81  | 0   | 34  |
| FJIVI (Fackage C)             | 70% | 0%  | 30% |
| AMP (Package D)               | 2   | 111 | 2   |
| AIVIF (Fackage D)             | 2%  | 97% | 2%  |



5. Can you support the Revised Advocates Package E for mitigation?

- Yes 28% (32)
- **No 72%** (83)
- Abstain (0)



6. Can you support the PJM Package C for mitigation?

- Yes 1% (1)
- **No 99%** (111)
- Abstain (3)



7. Can you support the AMP Package D for *mitigation*?

- Yes 30% (34)
- **No 70** (81)
- Abstain (0)



8. Can you support the PJM Package A for avoidance?

- Yes 86% (96)
- No − 14% (16)
- Abstain (3)



9. Can you support the AMP Package B for avoidance?

- Yes 28% (31)
- **No 72%** (81)
- Abstain (3)



- September 22 CISO Meeting
  - Provide education on Extreme Events / Max Cred Analysis
  - Present final modifications to package proposals
  - Look for opportunities to build consensus
- First Read of packages at the Oct. 6 PC & Oct. 29 MRC

Stakeholder Feedback & Suggestions?



Presenter:

Christina Stotesbury

christina.stotesbury@pjm.com

SME:

**Aaron Berner** 

aaron.berner@pjm.com

**Critical Infrastructure Stakeholder Oversight** 



## Member Hotline

(610) 666 - 8980

(866) 400 - 8980

custsvc@pjm.com