

Unofficial Comment Form

Modernization of Standard Processes and Procedures (MSPP)

2026 Rules of Procedure and Standing Committee Charters MSPP Revisions

Use the electronic form to submit comments on the 2026 Rules of Procedure and Standing Committee Charters MSPP Revisions by **8 p.m. Eastern, Wednesday, June 17, 2026**.

Additional information is available on the [Modernization of Standards Processes and Procedures](#) page. If you have questions, contact [MSPP Implementation](#).

Background Information

In February 2026, the NERC Board of Trustees accepted the [Recommendations for Transforming the Reliability Standard Framework](#) developed by the Modernization of Standards Processes and Procedures (MSPP) Task Force throughout 2025. Following this action, NERC staff launched the Implementation phase of this initiative to develop the processes and procedures necessary to implement the MSPP Task Force's recommendations. Implementation requires revising the Rules of Procedure (ROP), including the Standard Processes Manual (Appendix 3A); both revising existing and developing new governance documents for certain standing committees or their subcommittees; and retiring the Standards Committee. On May 18, 2026, NERC initiated an informal comment period on the initial draft of the proposed revisions to the ROP and standing committee charters. A section-by-section summary of the proposed revisions is available on the [Modernization of Standards Processes and Procedures](#) page. This comment period will run through June 17, 2026. NERC welcomes comments from all interested stakeholders.

Questions

1. Do you support the proposed revisions in Rules of Procedure Section 300 which establishes the general framework for standards and aligns to the changes in the Standard Processes Manual and Registered Ballot Body Criteria (Appendix 3D)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

2. If no, please provide detailed comments and suggestions on revisions to Rules of Procedure Section 300.

Comments:

Identity of the Commenters: These comments are being submitted on behalf of the American Public Power Association (APPA), the Large Public Power Council (LPPC), and the Transmission Access Policy Study Group (TAPS). APPA, LPPC, and TAPS are collectively referred to in these comments as the Public Power Trade Associations.

(1) RSB Composition

The composition of the RSB, particularly the inclusion of elected sector representatives, was crucial to securing broad industry support of the MSPP Task Force's Final Recommendations. Indeed, in its February 2026 comments on the MSPP Task Force's Final Recommendations, one of the Public Power Trade Associations:

"highlight[ed as] a particularly important element of the Final Recommendations[]the recommended structure and composition of the proposed RISC Subcommittee [now referred to as the Reliability Standards Body (RSB)] As envisioned, the RISC Subcommittee will consist of 'RISC members, elected sector representatives, and other individuals with strategic or technical expertise,' Final Recommendations at 13, with eleven of fifteen members consisting of elected industry representatives. *Id.* Given the level of discretion the RISC Subcommittee will have over critical decisions required throughout significant phases of the standards development process, . . . TAPS believe[s] industry involvement in the Subcommittee is critical to its success and is thus highly supportive of the substantial role for industry contemplated in the Final Recommendations."

To fully capture the important contours of the MSPP Task Force's Final Recommendations, NERC should (1) revise ROP § 306 to include the word "elected" in the description of the RSB composition, as follows immediately below, and (2) develop a revised Appendix to the ROP that sets out the nomination and election procedures for the RSB in comparable depth to that provided in current Appendix 3B (as discussed in more detail in question 9).

Public Power Trade Associations propose to revise ROP § 306 (addition indicated in square brackets) as follows: "The membership and responsibilities for this body shall be specified in governing documents approved by the NERC Board of Trustees. The Reliability Standards Body shall consist of at least one [elected] representative from NERC Membership Sectors 1–10 and 12, as those Membership Sectors are defined in the NERC Bylaws, an equitable number of Canadian representatives, and other members as specified by the NERC Board of Trustees."

(2) Access to Standards Information

First, NERC proposes to add a new paragraph in ROP § 319, which would require NERC to maintain an electronic library of information regarding currently proposed and currently in effect Reliability Standards. As proposed, “[t]his information shall provide a record, for a minimum of the previous five years, of the review and approval process for each Reliability Standard, including public comments received during the development and approval process.” Public Power Trade Associations request that, instead of removing the information after the proposed minimum 5 years, the information in the electronic library should transition to a permanent accessible archive that can serve as a long-term industry resource. If maintaining 100% of the information is infeasible, NERC should explain why and consider whether retention of certain information on a permanent basis is feasible.

Additionally, NERC proposes to revise the current ROP § 319 to shorten the minimum period of time that archived information (i.e., the historical record of Reliability Standards information that is no longer maintained on-line) will be retained. Specifically, NERC proposes to shorten the retention period from six years, the current practice, to five years. See Proposed ROP § 319 (“Archived information shall be retained indefinitely as practical, but in no case less than five years or one complete Reliability Standards review cycle from the date on which the Reliability Standard was no longer in effect.”). The minimum period should be kept at six years, as smaller (Tier 3) entities are on a six-year compliance audit schedule and may need access to that archived information for compliance purposes.

3. Do you support the proposed revisions in Section 4 of the Standard Processes Manual to implement the MSPPTF recommendations?

☐ Yes
☒ No

4. If no, please provide detailed comments and suggestions on revisions to Section 4 of the Standard Processes Manual.

Comments:

(1) Waiver Authority.

Public Power Trade Associations strongly oppose the proposal in proposed SPM § 14 to grant additional waiver authority to the NERC Board. This new waiver authority is overbroad and a major substantive change that was not included in the MSPP Task Force’s Final Recommendations and has not previously been vetted by industry.

Existing SPM § 16 (renumbered § 14 in the proposed SPM) gives the Standards Committee authority to waive SPM provisions in certain limited circumstances (i.e., in response to a national emergency, where necessary to meet a regulatory deadline or Board-imposed deadline, or in the case of a pre-vetted or insubstantial change). Proposed SPM § 14 retains this structure, replacing the Standards Committee with the RSB. However, it also adds a new provision stating that the Board of Trustees “shall have the independent authority to waive any of the provisions contained in this manual for good cause shown. The Board of Trustees’ waiver authority is not limited to the specific circumstances identified above.”

As noted, this additional Board of Trustees waiver authority was not recommended by the MSPP Task Force and is far too broad. The SPM is an industry-balloted, FERC-approved document that sets out the fundamental governing processes for developing binding reliability standards enforceable against industry participants, and industry counts on NERC following the SPM in an orderly and predictable fashion. Granting the NERC Board discretion to waive “for good cause” any aspect of this foundational standards development governing document (except voting requirements for standards) undermines this certainty and has not been shown to be warranted.

NERC’s Summary of the proposed ROP revisions only provides one example of when the waiver authority might be warranted, which is to accommodate field testing. Summary at 12. In advance of the June 5 industry webinar, Public Power Trade Associations requested examples of additional circumstances where this waiver authority might be used and NERC did not provide any. To the degree that NERC believes additional waiver authority is necessary to accommodate field testing or other identified specific purposes, it should add a limited exception allowing waiver for such purposes.

Public Power Trade Associations also respectfully disagree with comments made by NERC staff at the June 5 industry webinar that the proposed new waiver authority is “not unbounded” because of the 5-day notice period and because the record of development will eventually be filed with FERC. Providing a 5-day notice of the Board’s intent to exercise a waiver, without any formal recourse at that time, is not a meaningful constraint on discretion.

Overall, the standards development process improvements reflected in the MSPP Task Force’s Final Recommendations already provide sufficient flexibility for the ERO and industry to adapt and respond to emerging reliability risks in an expeditious manner. Indeed, the MSPP reforms allow for significantly more procedural flexibility than was the case previously. There is simply no need to add a novel and expansive waiver provision that was never considered by the MSPP Task Force or the industry in the intensive process of commenting on those proposed changes.

NERC should therefore remove the final two paragraphs of proposed SPM § 14 concerning the additional Board waiver authority. If NERC maintains that the Board requires some waiver authority independent from the RSB, that authority should be limited to the same (or similarly limited) circumstances as for the RSB (i.e., emergencies, necessity related to a deadline, etc.), plus field testing and any other identified specific purpose.

(2) Clarification of Minimum Duration of Comment Period for Fast-Track Standards.

SPM § 4.10 should be revised to reflect the minimum 15-20 day posting timeline included in the Board-approved MSPP Task Force’s Final Recommendations.

The MSPP Task Force’s Final Recommendations included specific minimum timelines for postings for regular and Fast Track standards. These minimums were intentionally included in response to feedback from Public Power Trade Associations and other industry participants that timeframes shorter than 15-20 days could materially inhibit their ability to meaningfully review and comment on draft standards. Specifically, the MSPP Task Force’s Final Recommendations provided that initial comment periods for draft standards should be at least 45 days (regular) and 25-30 days (Fast Track) and that subsequent comment periods should be at least 30 days (regular) and 15-20 days (Fast Track). Final Recommendations at 29-30. The Task Force further recommended that Fast Track project

teams endeavor to provide 30 days for comment wherever it is practical to do so and would not jeopardize NERC's ability to meet a regulatory or Board deadline. Id. at 30 n.15.

The proposed SPM (at § 4.9) correctly reflects the minimum periods for initial postings of draft standards and the requirement to endeavor to provide at least 30 days wherever practical (at § 4.4 n.18). However, proposed SPM § 4.10 fails to incorporate the 15-20 day minimum period for subsequent postings of Fast Track Standards. Indeed, the MSPP Task Force's recommended fast track minimum comment period for subsequent postings was never acknowledged by NERC in the Summary or in the July 5 industry workshop. Omitting the minimum comment period is an unacceptable divergence from the Board-approved MSPP Task Force's Final Recommendations and conflicts with the intended purpose of building industry consensus.

Accordingly, proposed SPM § 4.10 should be revised as follows (revisions indicated in square brackets): "Additional Formal Comment Periods may be as few as 30 days, with [as few as 15 days] allowed for Reliability Standards developed to address directives issued by Applicable Governmental Authorities or the NERC Board of Trustees."

Public Power Trade Associations' view is that 15-20 days is already too short to provide for robust industry feedback, but we were willing to accept the Task Force's 15-20 day minimum proposal as a compromise within the overall package of recommendations. Comment periods of fewer than 15 days are simply unreasonable except in truly exceptional circumstances, in which case it is appropriate that NERC Board should pursue a formal waiver of the 15-day minimum (which is the same process that would need to occur to waive the 25-day minimum initial comment period already proposed to be codified in proposed SPM § 4.9). It is inappropriate for NERC to effectively rewrite the MSPP Task Force's carefully considered Final Recommendations by excluding the 15-day minimum comment period.

(3) Treatment of Compliance Elements

Public Power Trade Associations urge NERC to revise the proposed SPM to require that NERC consult with the project team and stakeholder SMEs when developing Compliance Elements and any other documents supporting the draft standard, which is consistent with the status quo process. See, e.g., Current SPM § 2.5 (defining a Compliance Element and explaining that they are "developed by the drafting team, working with NERC Staff, at the same time as the associated Reliability Standard, but are not part of the Reliability Standard"); see also Current SPM § 4.4.4 ("The drafting team shall work with NERC Staff in developing [Compliance Elements] that meet the latest criteria established by NERC and Applicable Governmental Authorities").

In contrast, as currently proposed, consultation with the project team appears to be permitted but not required. See, e.g., Proposed SPM § 4.6 (stating that stakeholder SMEs "*may* provide advice on compliance elements"). Given the close interrelationship between the Compliance Elements and the draft standard, it would not be appropriate for NERC staff to develop these elements in isolation from the project team (nor do we believe that is NERC's intent).

(4) Technical Documents.

NERC proposes to remove current SPM § 11 (pertaining to the development of technical documents), and to revise proposed SPM § 4.6.1 to state that:

“The project team may, at its discretion, develop one or more supporting technical documents to help explain or facilitate understanding of the draft Reliability Standard, implementation plan, VSL, or VRF. These supporting technical documents may include, among other things: (1) reference documents designed to provide the project team’s technical rationale, analysis, or explanatory information to support the understanding of the draft Reliability Standard or related element; or (2) white papers designed to explain a technical position or concept underlying the draft Reliability Standard or related element.”

While Public Power Trade Associations acknowledges NERC’s explanation in its Summary (at 10) that “[p]roject teams may continue to develop supporting documents, which will either be posted as supporting documents to standards or considered for ERO endorsement through the Compliance Guidance Process,” the SPM itself does not make clear how any technical documents supporting a draft standard will be made publicly available so that they can be considered by stakeholders. While the omission may be unintentional, timely posting of these documents is important “to support the understanding of the draft Reliability Standard or related element” (as stated in proposed SPM § 4.6.1). The SPM should be revised to state that any supporting technical documents must be posted with the draft Reliability Standard when Formal Comments and ballots are solicited, to ensure that stakeholders have the opportunity to consider these documents in evaluating and voting on proposed standards and provide feedback as appropriate. NERC should also clarify that these documents will remain publicly available for reference after the Reliability Standard they support is approved, so that stakeholders can continue to reference them to understand the scope and intent of the Standard.

5. NERC proposes to revise Sections 7 and 12 of the Standard Processes Manual, relating to interpretations and periodic review projects, to follow the Standard Initiation Request intake process to allow for a more comprehensive and holistic evaluation of standards needs for the coming period.

NERC has also considered the potential retirement of either or both sections. NERC has historically maintained processes for Interpretations and Periodic Reviews to maintain ANSI accreditation, but NERC no longer maintains ANSI accreditation following the 2022-2023 Standards Process Stakeholder Engagement Group effort. If these sections are retired, an entity could submit a Standard Initiation Request to address clarity issues or make needed updates to a standard at any time to follow the usual intake process.

In providing your response below, please indicate if you would prefer NERC retain either or both of these sections, or if you would support retirement of either or both of these sections. If you support

retaining with revisions, but do not agree with the proposed revisions, please provide detailed comments and suggestions on revisions.

- ☒ Retain both Sections 7 and 12, with revisions
- ☐ Retire both Sections 7 and 12
- ☐ Retain Section 7, with revisions, and retire Section 12
- ☐ Retain Section 12 with revisions, and retire Section 7

6. If you support retiring one or both Sections 7 or 12 of the Standard Processes Manual, please also provide comments.

Comments:

We note that questions 6 and 7 are identical and neither asks for comments supporting retaining these sections, with revisions. To be clear, Public Power Trade Associations support retaining both Sections 7 and 12, with revisions to align these processes with the Standard Initiation Request process. Recognizing that NERC is no longer required to strictly follow ANSI procedures, there is no reason to abandon good standards development practices. Retirement of these provisions was not recommended in the MSPP Task Force's Final Recommendations.

7. If you support retiring one or both Sections 7 or 12 of the Standard Processes Manual, please also provide comments.

Comments:

See Public Power Trade Associations' answer to Question 6, above.

8. Do you support the proposed retirement of Rules of Procedure Appendix 3B – Election Procedure for Members of the NERC Standards Committee due to the proposed sunset of this committee?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

9. If no, please provide detailed comments and suggestions on revisions to the Rules of Procedure Appendix 3B – Election Procedure for Members of the NERC Standards Committee.

Comments:

Public Power Trade Associations recognize that Appendix 3B refers to the Standards Committee and cannot be retained in its current form. However, Public Power Trade Associations strongly recommend that NERC develop a revised document describing the Procedures for Election of Members of the RSB in comparable depth, to be included as a new Appendix to the ROP. The revised document should reflect any necessary changes to reflect the makeup and function of the RSB, as well as lessons learned from experience with Appendix 3B.

Although Public Power Trade Associations understand NERC's view that removing Appendix 3B would be consistent with the level of detail afforded to other committees, the RSB (much like the Standards Committee) is not like other subcommittees. The RSB is the primary body responsible for overseeing

the entire standards development process and elections are the primary means of ensuring that the RSB serves its intended purpose of fairly representing stakeholder segment interests and building consensus. The role of elected sector representatives is particularly important given the flexibility given to the RSB under the proposed MSPP implementation documents (including, e.g., whether a formal stakeholder project team is appointed for transparent development of a particular standard). Further, written procedures are important for good governance. See ANSI, Essential Requirements for Due Process § 1.9. Recognizing that NERC is no longer required to strictly follow ANSI procedures, there is no reason to abandon this best practice. Codifying the election procedures for the RSB in an ROP Appendix will improve governance and transparency and encourage needed industry buy-in and participation.

At the June 5 industry webinar, NERC staff indicated that details on election procedures are included in the RSB scope document. Public Power Trade Associations respectfully disagree—the RSB scope document is only high-level and does not include the kind of detail necessary for robust and transparent election procedures. Nothing in the MSPP Task Force’s Final Recommendations mandated removing the existing ROP Appendix 3B without replacing it with an updated, RSB-tailored version that includes the specificity needed to ensure proper administration of its recommendation that segment representatives to the RSB be elected.

In any case, the appropriate place for RSB election procedures is in a revised ROP Appendix 3B, as an essential companion to ROP Appendix 3A, the SPM, to ensure appropriate implementation of the SPM. Unlike a scope document, changes to an ROP Appendix must proceed through formal stakeholder review and be filed at FERC. This level of stakeholder review is appropriate given the importance of the RSB, see above, and will help ensure there is industry consensus on key governance matters. NERC should therefore develop a revised ROP Appendix with RSB election requirements of comparable depth to those in the current Appendix 3B (and then make any necessary changes to the RSB scope document to ensure alignment).

To the extent that NERC believes flexibility is needed to allow for alternative election or nomination procedures (e.g., nomination and selection vs. sector balloting), the option to use alternative approaches can be expressly identified in the new Appendix. For instance, the existing Appendix 3B includes a section allowing a segment to choose to use an Alternative Procedure. Including a set default process and express authorization for alternative approaches in an ROP Appendix will place NERC and the RSB on firmer procedural ground than an ad hoc and unspecified process.

In addition, as discussed in response to Question 2, above, Public Power Trade Associations strongly support inclusion of the composition of the RSB in ROP § 306 with the revision proposed above.

10. Do you support the proposed revisions in Rules of Procedure Appendix 3D –Development of the Registered Ballot Body to implement the MSPPTF recommendations?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

11. If no, please provide detailed comments and suggestions on revisions to the Rules of Procedure Appendix 3D – Development of the Registered Ballot Body.

Comments:

Public Power Trade Associations do not have any comments on this topic at this time.

12. Please provide any comments on the proposed Reliability and Security Technical Committee (RSTC) charter revisions.

Comments:

Public Power Trade Associations do not have any comments on this topic at this time.

13. Please provide any comments on the proposed Reliability Issues and Steering Committee (RISC) charter revisions.

Comments:

Public Power Trade Associations do not have any comments on this topic at this time.

14. Please provide any comments on the proposed RISC Reliability Standard Development Subcommittee Scope Document.

Comments:

See Public Power Trade Associations' answers to Questions 2 and 9, above, detailing our position on the appropriate placement of information regarding the composition of the RSB and election procedures.

15. Please provide any additional comments or feedback.

Comments:

(1) Clarification of Standard Initiation Request Review and Prioritization Cadence.

Although the semiannual SIR review and prioritization process was a prominent feature of the MSPP Task Force's Board-approved Final Recommendations (*see, e.g.*, Final Recommendations at 13-15), it is not specified in the proposed SPM, NERC's Summary, or NERC's Annotations to the MSPP Task Force's Final Recommendations. Public Power Trade Associations understand from the June 5 industry webinar that NERC's intention is that the SIR review and prioritization process remain flexible, so that more than two intake periods could occur in a busy year, and less than two could occur in an unusually light year. While we appreciate the need for flexibility to schedule additional SIR review and prioritization processes if the RSB determines that two is insufficient given the volume of SIRs, retention of the MSPP Task Force's recommendation of two intake periods per year is an essential floor to ensure timely consideration and prioritization of SIRs. Adhering to the MSPP Task Force's Final Recommendation as the minimum cadence would allow the RSB the flexibility to efficiently manage the SIR load in busy years by adding additional SIR review and prioritization processes, while ensuring

that potentially important SIRs do not languish for an unduly lengthy period of time, even in slower years. The proposal to do otherwise would undermine a key objective of the MSPP reforms. Final Recommendations at 3 (Task Force’s goal was to create “streamlined” standard initiation process “on a predictable cadence”), 12 (identifying that current standard initiation process “often takes significant time”).