OPERATIONS SERIES · EC-WP-304

Operational Planning & Real-Time Reliability

Bridging planning and real-time. Where reliability is shaped before it is tested.

Operational planning turns planning assumptions into the operating limits and next-day Operating Plans the control room runs on. This reference walks through what the standards require at each horizon, where the handoffs break, and what an auditor looks for in between.

Energy Compliance, Inc. Professional Reference

energycomplianceinc.com **OCTOBER 2026**

Disclaimer & Legal Notice

This publication is the work product of Energy Compliance, Inc. and is provided for general information and educational purposes only. It does not constitute legal advice, regulatory guidance, engineering advice, or formal interpretation of any NERC Reliability Standard, FERC order, RTO or ISO protocol, or Regional Entity directive.

This publication may not be used or cited as authority in any audit, enforcement, regulatory, or legal proceeding. Compliance with NERC Reliability Standards depends on facts and circumstances unique to each registered entity, and the reader should consult qualified counsel and subject matter experts when making compliance decisions.

NERC, FERC, and the names of Regional Entities are referenced here for descriptive purposes only. Energy Compliance, Inc. is not affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or any NERC Regional Entity.

Energy Compliance, Inc. assumes no responsibility or liability for errors, omissions, or outcomes resulting from the use of this publication.

Foreword

This professional reference is one of a series Energy Compliance, Inc. publishes for registered entities and the people who run their compliance programs.

I have spent more than thirty years on every side of the bulk electric system. I have operated control centers as a Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, and Power System Operator. I have audited grid facilities and signed off on findings as a senior compliance auditor. I have worked enforcement matters from inside the regulator's process. For the last several years I have advised registered entities directly through the firm I founded.

The entities that do reliability well share a habit. They take the standards seriously without confusing them with reliability itself. A NERC Reliability Standard is a floor, not a ceiling. Compliance is something an auditor evaluates; reliability is something a system either delivers or does not. So these entities prepare for audits by building programs that survive real questions, not binders that look thick.

That is the perspective these references try to share. Each one takes a single topic, whether a standard family, an operational function, a regulatory framework, or an emerging industry problem, and walks through how it actually works.

They are written for the compliance manager who wants to understand the system and not just memorize requirements. For the legal counsel who has to brief a board honestly. For the senior operator who has been told that compliance and reliability are

the same thing and suspects they are not. And for the new compliance hire who was handed a binder and told good luck.

These references are not marketing material dressed up as content. They come from three decades of doing this work and watching it succeed and fail. I write them in the same voice I use in a control room or in front of a Regional Entity audit team: direct, grounded in evidence, and honest about what the standards do and do not require.

Energy Compliance exists because much of the consulting offered to registered entities today is structured for billable hours rather than for outcomes. Every engagement is overseen by a senior practitioner. We do not bring five people to a meeting that needs one. We automate the work that should be automated and apply senior judgment to the work that requires it. If that is what you want in a compliance partner, the back of this reference has our contact information.

If not, the reference still belongs to you. Take what is useful and apply it well. And remember the only test that ultimately matters: when the system needs to perform, does it?

Rob Smith

Founder and Principal, Energy Compliance, Inc.

Executive Summary

Operational planning bridges the gap between long-range studies and real-time operations. It turns planning assumptions into operating limits, next-day Operating Plans, and the models behind the operator's tools. Reliability is shaped there before it is tested in the control room.

The standards treat this as a chain of obligations, not a philosophy. Under TOP-002-5 and IRO-008-3, the Transmission Operator and the Reliability Coordinator each need an Operational Planning Analysis for the next day and an Operating Plan for any SOL or IROL exceedance it finds. TOP-001-6 and IRO-008-3 then require a Real-time Assessment at least once every 30 minutes. Data specifications under TOP-003-7 and IRO-010-5 decide what information feeds both. MOD-033-3 closes the loop by requiring planning models to be checked against actual System behavior at least once every 24 calendar months. Every link in that chain leaves evidence, and every link can fail.

- The next-day Operational Planning Analysis and the Operating Plan that answers it are the core deliverables, and the TOP and BA plans have to reach the RC (TOP-002-5 R6, R7).
- The 30-minute Real-time Assessment catches what the next-day study did not foresee (TOP-001-6 R13; IRO-008-3 R4).
- The data specification decides what the analysis can see. A stale specification produces a stale study (TOP-003-7; IRO-010-5).
- The RC owns outage coordination and applies one SOL methodology to next-day and real-time work (IRO-017-1 R1; IRO-008-3 R7).
- MOD-033-3 is the formal return path: planning models are checked against actual System behavior every 24 calendar months, with RCs and TOPs supplying data within 30 days of a request.

1 The Reliability Framework Linking Planning and Real-Time Operations

1.1 Why the Interface Matters

Real-time reliability depends on the operator knowing the system: its models, its limits, and how it is expected to behave. Most of that knowledge comes from planning work done days, months, or years earlier. The operator uses it to anticipate system performance and to prepare for both expected and unexpected events.

When that planning information is out of date, missing, or wrongly applied, the operator is working blind. Real-time actions can be fast and well within the operator's authority and still be ineffective, because they rest on a picture of the system that is no longer true. That is the core risk this reference addresses.

Operational planning and real-time operations are distinct activities, but they are tightly linked. Planning sets expectations for system performance under defined scenarios. Real-time operations manage performance as those scenarios actually play out, or fail to. Reliability holds when the two are kept in step through shared assumptions, disciplined information flow, and clear operating boundaries.

1.2 Three Horizons, One System

The NERC framework builds this linkage into the standards themselves. Every requirement carries a Time Horizon label, and the labels track the chain this reference follows. Model validation under MOD-033-3 is tagged Long-term Planning. The next-day Operational Planning Analysis under TOP-002-5 is tagged Operations Planning. The 30-minute Real-time Assessment under TOP-001-6 Requirement R13 is tagged Real-time Operations.

The Glossary draws the same lines. A Transmission Planner develops a plan for the reliability of the transmission system that is "generally one year and beyond." A Planning Assessment is a "documented evaluation of future Transmission System performance and Corrective Action Plans to remedy identified deficiencies." An Operational Planning Analysis is "an evaluation of projected system conditions to assess anticipated (pre-Contingency) and potential (post-Contingency) conditions for next-day operations." A Real-time Assessment is the same kind of evaluation performed "using Real-time data."

Operational planning sits in the middle. It takes Planning Assessment results, model data, and expected conditions and turns them into operating limits, expected contingencies, and Operating Plans. Its job is not to predict every outcome. Its job is to cut down the uncertainty the operator faces and give everyone a common frame for decisions in normal and abnormal conditions.

1.3 Why This Is Harder in an Interconnected System

Coordination between planning and operations is harder when actions in one area can have wide-area effects. Reliability Coordinators, Transmission Operators, and Balancing Authorities each need an understanding of system limits and operating characteristics that comes from planning work. Operational planning is where regional and local views of the system are reconciled before real time, not during it.

1.4 What Oversight Looks At

Reliability oversight does not run operations or dictate planning methods. It looks at whether the interfaces between planning and operations support reliable operation, whether planning information is being used correctly in real time, and whether lessons from operations are making it back into planning. It also watches for system-wide issues that emerge as the system changes.

This reference is written for planners, operators, Reliability Coordinator staff, compliance personnel, and anyone else who needs to understand that interface. It takes a reliability perspective. It explains how reliability is carried across time horizons; it is not a procedure manual for any one function.

> **From the Field**
>
> Day-ahead planning and real-time operations are two different jobs with two different mindsets. The handoff is where reliability either holds or breaks. Planning is what you do before. Operations is what you do during. The framework expects a coherent transition between them, not parallel exercises. Programs that staff planning and operations as separate domains miss the transition. In my experience the handoff is where audit findings land, and the requirements that carry it are specific: TOP-002-5 R3, R6 and R7, and IRO-008-3 R2 and R3.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Planning and real-time operations are interdependent functions joined by operational planning. Planning describes how the system is expected to behave; real-time operations correct for how it actually behaves. Operational planning bridges the "what if" and the "as is," reducing uncertainty in operating decisions. The standards encode this chain through their Time Horizons, and the rest of this reference follows it link by link.

2 Operational Planning as the Bridge Between Planning Horizons and Real-Time Conditions

2.1 What the Standards Require of Operational Planning

In practice the horizon runs from the next day out to a season. Load forecasts and resource availability are better known than in long-range planning, and the planned configuration of the system is set, but plenty remains uncertain.

The mandatory core is next-day. TOP-002-5, Operations Planning, effective October 1, 2025, states its purpose plainly: to ensure that Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities "have plans for operating within specified limits." It requires each Transmission Operator to:

- have an Operational Planning Analysis that will allow it to assess whether its planned operations for the next day will exceed any of its System Operating Limits (R1);
- have an Operating Plan for next-day operations to address potential SOL exceedances that analysis identifies (R2);
- notify entities identified in the Operating Plan of their role in it (R3); and
- provide its next-day Operating Plan to its Reliability Coordinator (R6).

Each Balancing Authority must have a next-day Operating Plan that addresses expected generation commitment and dispatch, Interchange scheduling, Demand patterns, and capacity and energy reserve requirements including deliverability (R4), notify the entities in it (R5), and provide it to the Reliability Coordinator (R7).

The Reliability Coordinator does the same at wide-area scale. IRO-008-3 requires it to perform an Operational Planning Analysis for the next day covering SOLs and IROLs within its Wide Area (R1), and to have a coordinated Operating Plan that addresses potential exceedances "while considering the Operating Plans for the next-day provided by its Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities" (R2). That clause is the bridge in regulatory form. The RC's plan has to account for what the TOPs and BAs below it intend to do.

2.2 Narrowing the Set of Possible States

From a reliability point of view, operational planning cuts down the number of possible system states operating personnel have to deal with. Operating limits come from analysis of the system's ability to operate normally and recover from disturbances within established criteria. Operational planning does not set those criteria. It takes the results of planning analysis and confirms that the planned operating actions suit the conditions expected in the near term.

It also sharpens contingency awareness. Planning studies are built around credible contingencies and system sensitivities. Operational planning tailors that knowledge to the configuration and conditions expected for the period. The result is a short list of the risks that matter tomorrow, not a long list of contingencies that are unlikely under tomorrow's conditions.

2.3 A Cycle of Approximation and Correction

Operational planning and real-time operations work in a cycle. Once the plan reaches the control room, the actions taken reflect both the plan and the conditions the plan did not capture. Those experiences then inform the assumptions used in the next planning period.

Misalignment enters when procedures are built on outdated assumptions, incomplete models of system and load components, or wrong information about resource capability. The information in front of operating personnel then does not match how the system actually behaves. An auditor looks at that gap through operating outcomes and observed practice, not a line-by-line review of planning methods.

2.4 Coordination Among Operating Entities

Operational planning also coordinates the functions that share the system. Reliability Coordinators, Transmission Operators, and Balancing Authorities all draw on its outputs to build a common view of system state and to operate within the same parameters. When that coordination is weak, each group can enter real time with a different picture, and problems that one group sees coming go untreated because another group acts on a different assumption.

Operational planning manages uncertainty; it does not eliminate it. The structured near-term picture it provides is still a resource when actual conditions depart from the plan, because it gives operators a known starting point to work from.

> **From the Field**
>
> Operational planning bridges weeks-out studies and minute-by-minute operations. The framework relies on it but does not always make it visible. The operational planner who has not sat the operating desk does not fully understand what the operator will face; desk experience changes planning judgment. Planning that ignores operating constraints produces studies operations cannot use. Those studies become reference documents, not operating tools.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Operational planning translates planning assumptions into next-day conditions, operating limits, and contingency awareness, reducing uncertainty for operating personnel. TOP-002-5 and IRO-008-3 make it mandatory: an Operational Planning Analysis, an Operating Plan for identified exceedances, notice to the entities with a role, and delivery of TOP and BA plans to the RC. Misalignment at this interface introduces real reliability risk, which is why operational planning has to be treated as a control in its own right.

3 Translation of Planning Assumptions into Operating Limits and Tools

3.1 From Assumption to Limit

Real-time reliability depends on how planning assumptions are converted into operating limits and situational awareness tools. Planning studies rest on assumptions about the expected state of the grid: system states, load scenarios, resource capability, and contingencies. Those assumptions are valid in the study. They have to be translated before an operator can use them. This translation is one of the most vulnerable interfaces in the framework.

Operating limits are the clearest expression of planning assumptions in real time. The Glossary now defines a System Operating Limit as "all Facility Ratings, System Voltage Limits, and stability limits, applicable to specified System configurations, used in Bulk Electric System operations for monitoring and assessing pre- and post-Contingency operating states." Under FAC-014-3, effective April 1, 2024, each Transmission Operator establishes SOLs for its portion of the Reliability Coordinator Area in accordance with the RC's SOL methodology (R2), and the RC establishes IROLs (R1).

The planning link runs both ways. The RC must provide each Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner in its area with its SOLs, including the subset that are IROLs, at least once every twelve calendar months (FAC-014-3 R5). Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners in turn must implement a documented process to use Facility Ratings, voltage limits, and stability criteria in their Near-Term Planning Assessments that are equally limiting or more limiting than the RC's methodology, or give each affected TP (or PC), TOP and RC a technical rationale for using less limiting ones (R6). Oversight asks whether limits trace to the analysis behind them and whether they stay current as configuration and parameters change. The focus is that connection, not the number itself.

3.2 Tools Inherit Their Assumptions

Situational awareness tools carry planning assumptions too. Contingency analysis, network models, and monitoring constructs are all built on assumed topology and resource behavior. When those assumptions hold, the tools sharpen the operator's view. When they stop holding, uncertainty grows and the right control action gets harder to find.

The standards address the quality of what those tools produce. TOP-010-1(i), effective April 1, 2018, requires each Transmission Operator to implement an Operating Process or Operating Procedure to address the quality of the Real-time data needed for Real-time monitoring and Real-time Assessments (R1), and another to address the quality of the analysis used in its Real-

time Assessments (R3). Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities must also have an alarm process monitor that notifies System Operators when the Real-time monitoring alarm processor fails (R4). IRO-018-1(i) places parallel obligations on the Reliability Coordinator.

3.3 Assumption Drift

A recurring risk is an assumption that stays in an operating tool longer than it remains valid. Changes in the resource mix, network configuration, or operating procedures can change system behavior that the models and procedures still describe the old way. The auditor will ask whether a mechanism existed to catch that drift and act on it, and will care less about whether any single model or procedure was changed.

3.4 Prioritization and Consistency Across Entities

Translation also means choosing. Planning studies may cover a wide range of sensitivities and contingencies, but operating tools have to focus on what matters under current conditions. Operational planning decides which components, parameters, and scenarios get close tracking. Expect the Regional Entity to check that those priorities follow current system risk and not an old study's.

Consistency among entities matters just as much. When Transmission Operators, Balancing Authorities, and Reliability Coordinators work from different limits or models, they can see different systems during a disturbance. The standards set a tiebreaker for limits: TOP-001-6 Requirement R18 requires each Transmission Operator to "operate to the most limiting parameter in instances where there is a difference in SOLs." That resolves the conflict in the moment. It does not fix the misalignment that produced it.

Translating planned conditions into operating criteria is continuous work, because the system keeps changing. A major disturbance tends to expose any place where the operating picture has drifted from the planned one. Because this interface depends on traceability, I consider it one of the most important reliability control points in the chain.

> **From the 2025 Enforcement Record**
>
> One of the three serious-risk noncompliance filings NERC reported for 2025 was a TOP-001-5 R1 violation. The entity failed to act to maintain the reliability of its Transmission Operator Area because of a known programmatic weakness in its alarm notification system, in two instances, and the second resulted in a loss of load. A known weakness in a tool is not a tool problem. It is an operating risk the program accepted.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Planning assumptions shape real-time reliability through the limits and tools they produce. FAC-014-3 ties operating limits to the RC's methodology and sends them back to planners every year; TOP-010-1(i) and IRO-018-1(i) require processes for data quality, analysis quality, and alarm monitoring. Risk appears when limits and tools no longer fit the current system. Traceability, coordination, and timely adjustment keep planning assumptions valid in the applications operators rely on.

4 Information Flow, Coordination, and Shared Situational Awareness

4.1 Context Has to Be Shared to Be Useful

Real-time reliability depends on correct planning assumptions and on good communication among operating entities. Planning and operational planning create the reliability context: planned system states, operating limits, expected constraints, and sensitivities. That context only helps if it is distributed, understood, and agreed upon. A failure to communicate can undercut even sound planning and operating practice.

Shared situational awareness means every entity draws the same conclusions from the same information. Transmission Operators, Balancing Authorities, and Reliability Coordinators work at different scopes and time horizons, but their actions are tightly interdependent. A common understanding of system state, from generation through delivery and across planning and operations, is a precondition for reliable operation.

4.2 The Data Specification Is the Contract

The standards turn information flow into documented obligations. TOP-003-7, effective October 1, 2026, requires each Transmission Operator to maintain documented specifications for the data and information it needs to perform its Operational Planning Analyses, Real-time monitoring, and Real-time Assessments (R1), and to distribute them to the entities that hold that data (R3). Balancing Authorities have parallel obligations (R2, R4). Each Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority, Generator Owner, Generator Operator, Transmission Owner, and Distribution Provider that receives a specification must satisfy it (R5).

IRO-010-5, effective July 1, 2025, does the same for the Reliability Coordinator: a documented specification for the data needed for its Operational Planning Analyses, Real-time monitoring, and Real-time Assessments (R1), distribution of that specification (R2), and an obligation on recipients to meet it (R3).

In my view the data specification is the most underrated document in the operations planning chain. It is where the planner, the operator, and the plant agree in writing on what the analysis needs. When the specification is stale, the analysis is stale, no matter how good the software is.

4.3 Timing

The timing of information sharing matters too. Without timely planning-derived information, operating personnel may not have what they need for near-term decisions, and the gap gets filled with ad hoc calls. Operational planning is what puts relevant information in operators' hands ahead of execution and keeps it updated. The next-day requirements in TOP-002-5

(notify entities of their role, deliver plans to the RC) and IRO-008-3 (notify impacted entities of their role in the RC's plan) exist for exactly this reason.

Real-time data paths carry obligations as well. TOP-001-6 requires Balancing Authorities and Transmission Operators to notify their Reliability Coordinator and known impacted interconnected entities of all planned outages, and unplanned outages of 30 minutes or more, of telemetering and control equipment, monitoring and assessment capabilities, and associated communication channels (R9).

4.4 Too Much Information Is Also a Risk

Information overload is its own reliability risk. Preparing for operations can produce a great deal of analysis, not all of it relevant to the conditions at hand. Operational planning should put the essential information in front of operators at the right level of detail, at the right time. An auditor reviewing the operator's displays and briefing material will look at whether they keep attention on what matters.

4.5 Communication Discipline and the Return Path

When conditions turn, communication protocols carry the weight. COM-002-4, effective July 1, 2016, requires the issuer of an oral two-party, person-to-person Operating Instruction during an Emergency to confirm the receiver's response if the repeat-back is correct, reissue the instruction if it is incorrect or the receiver asks, or take an alternative action if there is no response or the instruction was not understood (R5). The receiver must repeat the instruction back, not necessarily verbatim, and receive confirmation, or ask that it be reissued (R6).

Information also has to flow the other way. Real-time experience shows where system behavior departs from design assumptions, and that is what corrects the basis for future studies. Chapter 6 takes up that return path. Reliability needs the link to exist and to work, across organizational and geographic boundaries.

> **From the Field**
>
> Planning data flows to operations. Operating data flows back to planning. If the loop is broken, both sides operate on outdated information. Shared situational awareness across planning and operations is a procedural commitment, evidenced by communication discipline. Programs that hold weekly planning meetings without operations participation do not have shared situational awareness. They have parallel meetings.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Timely, relevant information exchange sustains shared situational awareness from planning through operational planning into real time. TOP-003-7 and IRO-010-5 make data needs a documented, distributed, binding specification; TOP-002-5, IRO-008-3, TOP-001-6, and COM-002-4 govern who is told what and when. Outdated, fragmented, or excessive information is a reliability risk in its own right, and the feedback path from operations to planning has to work as reliably as the forward path.

5 Managing Uncertainty Across Planning and Real-Time Horizons

5.1 Where the Uncertainty Comes From

Operating the Bulk Electric System always involves uncertainty. Planning relies on forecasts and modeled scenarios; real-time operations deal with actual conditions, which may differ. Uncertainty cannot be removed, but it can be managed through well-defined interfaces between planning, operational planning, and real-time operations.

Planning uncertainty comes from assumptions about future load, generation availability, system configuration, and operation. Every analysis needs assumptions, and they can strongly affect a study's accuracy. The Glossary's definition of an Operational Planning Analysis lists the inputs that carry this uncertainty into the next day: "load forecasts; generation output levels; Interchange; known Protection System and Remedial Action Scheme status or degradation, functions, and limitations; Transmission outages; generator outages; Facility Ratings; and identified phase angle and equipment limitations." No study gives perfect insight into real-time performance. The question for the auditor is how well planning and operational planning recognize and handle that uncertainty.

5.2 Narrowing, Not Eliminating

Operational planning reduces uncertainty step by step as the operating day approaches. Forecasts get better, system parameters get firmer, and resource data becomes more reliable. The operator's uncertainty falls because the range of possible system states narrows, not because the variability of the system itself goes away.

Some uncertainty is left over by design. Real-time operations deal with unexpected outages, weather, and rapid changes that make complete information impossible. Reliability improves when earlier planning has prepared the operator for credible contingencies and left enough operating flexibility to handle them.

5.3 The Real-Time Backstop

The standards set the real-time backstop explicitly. Each Transmission Operator must ensure a Real-time Assessment is performed at least once every 30 minutes (TOP-001-6 R13), and so must each Reliability Coordinator (IRO-008-3 R4). When Real-time monitoring or a Real-time Assessment identifies an SOL exceedance, the Transmission Operator must initiate its Operating Plan to mitigate it (TOP-001-6 R14) and inform its RC of the actions taken to return the System within limits (R15).

The main source of real-time surprise is the gap between what the plan assumed and what is actually happening. When something unexpected shows up, operations become fast and time-

sensitive. The event review then has to answer whether the gap was a one-off or a sign of broader misalignment between planning and operations.

5.4 Preparation, Margins, and Learning

Reliability is about being ready for the unexpected: margins, reserves, and the ability to adjust. Planning and operational planning help identify the points where an unexpected event would put the system under the most stress, so operators can prepare.

Extreme cold is a good example of the standards forcing that preparation into the operations planning horizon. TOP-002-5 Requirement R8 requires each Balancing Authority to have an extreme cold weather Operating Process that includes a method to identify an extreme cold weather period, a method to determine an adequate reserve margin considering generating unit operating limitations in previous extreme cold weather periods (Part 8.2), and a method to determine a five-day hourly forecast for the identified period.

Feedback handles uncertainty as it unfolds. Operating experience adjusts forecast assumptions and refines the operating plan. Better reliability means turning operational surprises into understanding rather than repeating them.

> **From the Field**
>
> Day-ahead, hour-ahead, real-time. Three horizons, three different jobs. Each needs different tools, different staffing, and different decision authority. Programs that try to handle all three with the same staff and the same process underperform on all three. The standards calibrate expectations to the time horizon. A delay that is tolerable in day-ahead work is unacceptable in real time, which is why the Real-time Assessment carries a 30-minute clock and the Operational Planning Analysis runs on a next-day cycle.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Uncertainty exists in both planning and real time, from forecast assumptions and from changing conditions. Reliability does not depend on eliminating it but on making it manageable. Operational planning narrows it as the operating day approaches; the 30-minute Real-time Assessment and the requirement to initiate Operating Plans handle what remains. Margins, preparation, and feedback tie these horizons together.

6 Operational Experience as Feedback to Planning Assumptions

6.1 What Operations Sees That Studies Do Not

Operating experience is the richest source of information about how the Bulk Electric System actually performs. Planning and operational planning rely on model assumptions and forecasts; operating experience checks whether those assumptions and forecasts were right.

Some operating conditions are hard to derive from typical planning studies. The dynamic performance of resources, and interactions that static studies do not capture, can differ from what was expected. From a reliability point of view, those differences are not necessarily planning failures. They reflect the limits of foresight and point to where more study or better understanding is needed.

6.2 The Formal Loop: Model Validation

The standards make part of this feedback mandatory. MOD-033-3, effective April 1, 2026, requires each Planning Coordinator to implement a documented model validation process for its planning models (R1). The process must include:

- a comparison of the steady-state planning model's power flow performance to actual System behavior, represented by state estimator cases or other Real-time data, at least once every 24 calendar months (Part 1.1);
- a comparison of the dynamic model's simulation of a local event to actual System behavior, represented by Real-time data such as Disturbance data recordings, at least once every 24 calendar months (Part 1.2); and
- guidelines to determine unacceptable differences in performance, including for generating facilities, and guidelines to resolve them (Parts 1.3 and 1.4).

The operations side has a duty in that loop. Each Reliability Coordinator and Transmission Operator must, within 30 calendar days of a written request, provide actual System behavior data, or a written response that it does not have it, to any Planning Coordinator performing model validation (R2). That 30-day clock is a planning requirement imposed on operators. It is the feedback loop written into the rules.

6.3 Disturbances, Near Misses, and Unusual Conditions

Disturbances, near misses, and unusual operating conditions are among the most valuable sources of feedback. They expose sensitivities and weak points that normal operation hides. The evidence an auditor wants is the event analysis itself, and proof that its findings reached the place where operating assumptions and design and operating limits are set.

The goal is a steady process of learning: capturing deviations from expected behavior and using them to update reliability assessments.

6.4 Timeliness and a Shared View

Feedback has to arrive in time to matter. An operating insight delivered long after the fact may no longer apply, because the system has moved on. Operational planning helps close that gap by capturing short-term operating knowledge and carrying it into the next operating cycle.

Feedback also builds a shared view. When planners, operators, and Reliability Coordinator staff see how operations confirm or contradict planning assumptions, they work from the same understanding, and there is less room for misunderstanding. The practical rule is simple: treat real-time performance as an input to planning.

> **From the Field**
>
> Planning identifies the risks that could materialize in operations, and the quality of that risk identification determines how prepared operations are. A planning study that did not consider the contingency that actually occurred is a study that missed something. The miss has to be examined and the lesson codified. Operating events that were not planned for become the basis for the next planning cycle. The cycle works only if the lesson reaches planning.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Operational experience validates planning assumptions and shows where more information is needed. MOD-033-3 makes part of that loop mandatory: planning models compared with actual System behavior every 24 calendar months, with RCs and TOPs supplying the data within 30 days of a request. The rest depends on a disciplined habit of capturing, interpreting, and carrying operating lessons into planning.

7 Reliability Risk Arising from Planning and Operations Misalignment

7.1 How Misalignment Shows Up

A mismatch between planning assumptions and real-time conditions is a persistent reliability risk. Planning and operational planning set the expected baseline; real-time operations face actual conditions that may differ. When the difference becomes material, risk appears even when no single operating action or planning study, viewed alone, is deficient.

Misalignment takes several forms. A Planning Assessment may rest on a configuration or resource snapshot that no longer represents the grid. Operating tools or staff may still use constraints, transfer limits, or sensitivities from an earlier assessment. Or events move so quickly that there is no time for a full planning cycle between them. A Regional Entity looking at this tends to read for patterns over time rather than grade one action.

7.2 Erosion of Predictability

One effect of misalignment is an erosion of predictability. Operators rely on situational awareness built from knowing their system and from expectations grounded in solid planning. Their expectations of how the system responds to normal conditions, unusual situations, and contingencies come directly from that planning. When actual behavior is materially different from expected behavior, that awareness erodes. Responding to dynamic events takes more effort, and otherwise sound operating actions become less effective.

7.3 Margins in the Wrong Place

Misalignment also affects margins. Planning studies set credible limits and operating expectations to give the system adequate margin. If those limits are not checked against current capability, the margin may be wrong in either direction. A margin that is too small leaves the system operating closer to its true limits than anyone intends. A margin that is too large restricts operating flexibility for no reliability benefit and can complicate operations. Both are risks.

7.4 Misalignment Accumulates

Misalignment is rarely the result of one event. It builds from the sum of several things:

- the system changing over time;
- assumptions persisting after they stop being true; and
- delays between a planning decision and its implementation in operations.

So the useful evidence is a record of recurring patterns: unexpected system behavior or persistent gaps between planned and actual operations.

The interconnected system magnifies the consequences. Different assumptions or models in different entities produce different understandings of system conditions. Those differing views raise the chance of uncoordinated responses, or slower restoration, under stressed conditions, even when every entity stays within its own area of responsibility.

Oversight does not treat misalignment as a failure in itself. It treats it as a sign of vulnerability and tries to find where alignment is slipping, so that the entities involved can reassess before an event does it for them.

> **From the Field**
>
> The handoff from operational planner to real-time operator should be procedural. Programs that improvise the handoff produce inconsistent execution. In well-run control rooms, shift turnover overlaps with planning briefings, and the overlap is intentional. It is where the planner's situational awareness becomes the operator's. Programs that cut handoff time as an efficiency measure are optimizing the wrong thing.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Reliability risk rises whenever planning assumptions and real-time conditions diverge, bringing uncertainty, misplaced margins, and coordination problems. Misalignment usually builds slowly as assumptions age. Oversight treats it as an indicator of vulnerability and looks for trends showing alignment is deteriorating.

8 Role of Reliability Coordinators in Bridging Planning and Operations

8.1 Authority and an Integrating View

The Glossary describes the Reliability Coordinator as "the highest level of authority who is responsible for the Reliable Operation of the Bulk Electric System," with "the Wide Area view" and the authority "to prevent or mitigate emergency operating situations in both next-day analysis and real-time operations." The RC's role spans both horizons by definition. IRO-001-4 Requirement R1 requires the RC to act to address the reliability of its Reliability Coordinator Area through direct actions or by issuing Operating Instructions.

So the RC has real authority to direct. What makes it a bridge between planning and operations is that it also integrates: it combines planning-derived expectations with the real-time picture across many Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities. The RC uses planning-derived information to understand system conditions relative to limits, contingencies, and interarea transfer capability. That information shapes how it characterizes wide-area conditions and identifies threats.

8.2 What the RC Receives from Planning

The RC does not perform long-range planning, so its effectiveness depends on the timeliness and consistency of the planning information it receives. The standards make that delivery mandatory. IRO-017-1, effective April 1, 2017, requires each Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner to provide its Planning Assessment to impacted Reliability Coordinators (R3), and to jointly develop solutions with its RC for issues or conflicts with planned outages identified in its Planning Assessment for the Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon (R4).

The same standard makes the RC the owner of outage coordination. Each RC must develop, implement, and maintain an outage coordination process for generation and Transmission outages in its area that identifies roles and reporting responsibilities, sets submission timing, defines how outage impacts are evaluated within its Wide Area, and defines how conflicts are resolved (R1). Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities must perform the functions that process specifies (R2). Outage coordination is where long-range plans, next-day studies, and real-time operations meet most visibly.

8.3 Spotting What Individual Entities Cannot See

In real time, the RC combines its planned expectations with live knowledge of the grid across its footprint. That combination lets it spot anomalies that may not be visible from a single plant or a single Transmission Operator. The RC brings those anomalies to other entities' attention, confirms whether they are real, and then works to understand why they occurred.

The standards set the cadence and the notices. The RC must ensure a Real-time Assessment is performed at least once every 30 minutes (IRO-008-3 R4). When the assessment indicates an actual or expected SOL or IROL exceedance within its Wide Area, the RC must notify impacted Transmission Operators, Balancing Authorities, and other impacted RCs in accordance with its SOL methodology (R5), and notify them again when the exceedance has been prevented or mitigated (R6). The RC must use its SOL methodology when determining SOL exceedances for Real-time Assessments, Real-time monitoring, and Operational Planning Analysis alike (R7). One methodology across both horizons is a structural guard against misalignment.

8.4 One Wide-Area View

Different Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities can use different assumptions or models, which makes agreement on a wide-area picture harder. The RC's job includes making sure there is a way to resolve those differences and arrive at one common view of system state.

Much of that is communication. The RC shares forecasts, operating plans, and real-time information so that actions are coordinated. When an auditor reviews RC communications, the question is often whether they actually produced a common view of events, beyond the content of individual instructions or alerts.

As resource characteristics change and margins for error shrink, the RC's role as a bridge between planning and operations becomes more important. It works as a layer of defense in depth, keeping horizons in step across entities without replacing local control.

> **From the 2025 Enforcement Record**
>
> Another of the three serious-risk filings NERC reported for 2025 involved IRO-001-4 R2. The registered entity failed to comply with the Reliability Coordinator's Operating Instructions after the RC informed it that a lengthier stability study was needed before requested generator unit testing could occur. That is the planning-to-operations handoff failing in plain sight: the RC made the study a condition, and the entity did not follow the RC's instruction.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Reliability Coordinators are the key interface between planning results and real-time system state. With authority across both horizons and a Wide Area view, they catch problems early and coordinate among entities. IRO-017-1 feeds them Planning Assessments and makes them owners of outage coordination; IRO-008-3 sets the 30-minute assessment cadence, the exceedance notices, and a single SOL methodology across planning and real time.

9 Planning Horizons, Operational Timeframes, and Reliability Continuity

9.1 Different Horizons, Different Questions

Reliability has to be maintained across timeframes that differ in reach, scope, certainty, and decision authority. Long-term planning, operational planning, and real-time operations each answer a different question. System reliability is the result of all three holding together. The spaces between horizons are potential weak points, where assumptions, information, or decision authority may not line up.

Long-term planning looks ahead at system adequacy and vulnerability, including future conditions and post-contingency performance. It establishes the working assumptions about the future system: capabilities, transfer limits, and credible contingencies. It does not make short-term operating decisions, but it is the analytical basis for them.

Operational planning focuses on near-term conditions with less uncertainty. It uses updated forecasts, system models, and resource information to revise the assumptions made in long-term planning. Continuity holds when operational planning carries forward the intent of the long-term work while absorbing what was not known when that work was done.

Real-time operations have the shortest timeframe and the least room to wait. The operator controls the actual system state using the tools, constraints, and assumptions that earlier work produced. Continuity holds as long as those tools, constraints, and assumptions represent the present system and its credible contingencies.

9.2 Where Continuity Breaks

Discontinuities between horizons arise for several reasons:

- assumptions stay in use longer than they remain valid;
- a decision made in one horizon is not properly reflected in another; and
- a long-term constraint or outcome is still built into short-term operating parameters after system conditions have changed significantly.

Auditors tend to look at the effect of these breaks on operations and system performance, rather than trying to pinpoint the exact step where each one was allowed in.

9.3 Different Objectives at Different Timescales

Another challenge is that each horizon has a different objective. Long-term planning is about adequacy and sufficiency. Operational planning and real-time operations are about security and

stability now. Operational planning has to turn the long-range view into present-day operating conditions, and the reliability question is whether it did so without breaking continuity.

9.4 Stress That Spans Horizons

Continuity matters most under stress. Events that span several timeframes, such as prolonged extreme weather or extended outages, test whether planning assumptions match actual system capability. TOP-002-5 R8's extreme cold weather Operating Process (Section 5.4) is built for exactly this: a requirement that carries planning judgment across several operating days. Oversight checks whether the planning and operating constructs in place support reliable supply throughout the timeframes that matter to customers.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Bulk Electric System reliability has to be considered continuously across long-term planning, operational planning, and real-time operations. Each horizon asks a different question, and misalignment between them creates vulnerability. Oversight looks for changes or events that break alignment across horizons and asks whether operational planning bridges the gaps that inevitably arise.

10 Oversight Perspective on Planning and Operations Integration

10.1 Outcomes and Interfaces

Reliability oversight looks at planning and operations together, from an outcome-focused, system-wide perspective. Rather than examining a single study or a single operating decision, it looks at the interfaces between functions and at system reliability under a range of assumptions and scenarios. It focuses on interfaces and consistency rather than on process steps alone.

Integration can be tested by comparing planning assumptions, operational planning outputs, and actual system performance against each other. They do not have to match exactly. What matters is that differences are understood, put in context, and carried forward. Unexplained discrepancies are a sign that integration is degrading.

10.2 Roles and Boundaries

Roles and responsibilities in planning and operations need to be clearly defined and bounded. Each Planning Coordinator, Transmission Planner, Reliability Coordinator, and operating organization brings its own expertise. Those contributions integrate best when they are coordinated and when handoffs between roles are understood. Oversight checks that gaps, or overlaps, in responsibility have not created inconsistency or confusion.

The standards help here because they name the function for each obligation. TOP-002-5 assigns the next-day analysis and plan to the TOP and BA. IRO-008-3 assigns the wide-area analysis to the RC. IRO-017-1 assigns Planning Assessment delivery to the PC and TP. MOD-033-3 assigns model validation to the PC and data delivery to the RC and TOP. PER-005-2, effective July 1, 2016, goes further: it requires each RC, BA, and TOP to use a systematic approach to train its Operations Support Personnel on how their job functions affect real-time reliability-related tasks (R5). The Glossary defines those personnel as individuals who "perform current day or next day outage coordination or assessments, or who determine SOLs, IROLs, or operating nomograms" in direct support of Real-time operations. In other words, the standards expect the operational planner to be trained on the operator's world.

10.3 Feedback, Transparency, and the Evidence Trail

Oversight also looks at whether feedback actually works. Planning and operational planning are supposed to evolve with lessons from operations and with changes in the system and its components. An ineffective feedback loop lets out-of-date assumptions stay in place, increasing the chance that planned and actual operations diverge.

Transparency supports all of this. Good documentation and traceable links between planning inputs, operating limits, and real-time results let an outside reviewer follow how decisions were

made without reconstructing every procedural step. TOP-002-5 sets short minimums. Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities keep evidence for a rolling 90 calendar days for analyses, the most recent 90 calendar days for voice recordings, and 12 months for operating logs and email records, unless the Compliance Enforcement Authority (CEA) directs longer retention as part of an investigation. Where those periods are shorter than the time since the last audit, the CEA may ask for other evidence covering the full period. A program that keeps only the minimum should know exactly what it can prove on audit day.

10.4 Non-Prescriptive by Design

Oversight is deliberately non-prescriptive about the means of integration. Beyond the specific obligations the standards set, oversight does not tell entities how to prepare for or conduct operations. It checks whether the controls in place are adequate for the required level of reliability. That flexibility lets integration methods keep pace with the system and with each entity's structure.

Entities that find their own gaps are treated differently from those that do not. NERC's annual report for 2025 found that approximately 85% of reported noncompliance was self-identified by registered entities. Under the NERC Sanction Guidelines, NERC or the Regional Entity considers whether a violation was self-reported promptly and before detection through a compliance monitoring engagement, and may reduce the monetary penalty as warranted. The guidelines add that a Self-Report should typically be submitted within three months of discovery.

As the system modernizes, with tighter reserves and more variable operating conditions, the need for this oversight grows. Observed performance, trends, and patterns are the tools that confirm integration is working or show where closer review is warranted.

> **From the Field**
>
> Operational planning is audited. The standards expect documented analyses, traceable assumptions, and Operating Plans that match what the analysis found. A finding on operational planning often traces to a documentation gap, not an analytical one. Programs that did the work and did not document it still produce findings. Programs that surface their own issues get a different conversation with enforcement than programs that wait to be found.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Oversight assesses whether planning, operational planning, and operations stay aligned and whether procedures, roles, and communications let operating personnel make sound decisions. The standards assign each link to a named function, require training for the people who build operating limits and plans, and set short minimum evidence retention. Oversight is outcome-based and non-prescriptive, and self-identification carries real weight under NERC's Sanction Guidelines.

11 System Evolution and Increasing Dependence on Planning and Operations Alignment

11.1 Faster Assumption Turnover

The growing complexity of the Bulk Electric System makes it more important that planning and real-time operations stay in step. Changes in the resource mix, in how resources operate, and in system dynamics all add pressure at the points where planning and operations meet. Misalignment costs more, and the need to keep horizons synchronized grows.

Variability and frequent changes in operating conditions are now normal. Studies have to cover a broader range of system states, and real-time operations face more uncertainty, more often. Operational planning is how that gets handled, and the Operating Plan is where an auditor will look to see the added complexity reflected.

System change also shortens the useful life of planning assumptions. Assumptions that once held for long periods may now need updating much more often as load and operating patterns change. Planning and operational planning processes need to detect when assumptions are going stale and adjust. The practical test is whether assumptions are revalidated at a pace that matches the pace of system change.

11.2 New Resources, New Models

The models themselves are changing. MOD-033-3 notes that the planning System models it covers include registered inverter-based resources and aggregated distributed energy resources, as well as inverter-based resources that are not DERs and fall below NERC registration criteria, wherever they are present in the existing System. Validation against actual System behavior has to cover resources whose dynamic performance did not exist when many planning frameworks were designed.

The ride-through requirements for those resources are also current and moving. PRC-029-2, Frequency and Voltage Ride-through Requirements for Inverter-Based Resources, became effective October 1, 2026, replacing PRC-029-1, following FERC approval. Operational planning that assumes resource behavior during disturbances needs to track which standard governs that behavior.

11.3 Wider Interactions and Thinner Margins

Interconnection between regions and assets is increasing. Power flows, contingency effects, and sensitivities now reach well beyond the boundaries that planning and operating studies were originally drawn around. That makes it even more important for planners and operating

personnel to share one view of the system, developed jointly by the Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operators, and Balancing Authorities. An auditor will want to see planning and operating tools that support that common view.

Margin analysis is becoming more important too. As margins shrink, model errors and stale assumptions have a larger effect on operations. Oversight does not set margins or procedures. It asks whether planned margins and procedures are sufficient to manage the system reliably through a credible contingency.

11.4 Learning-Oriented Governance

System evolution is a further argument for governance built around learning. No planning framework can anticipate every change in timing, nature, or likelihood. Reliability improves where operating experience is routinely built into planning and where planning processes stay flexible enough to keep up. The evidence that matters is whether that learning happens systematically rather than case by case.

> **From the Field**
>
> Operational planning is being reshaped by inverter-based resources, storage, and demand response. The studies need to model resources that did not exist when the planning frameworks were designed. The standards governing planning and operations data are being revised: TOP-003-8 and IRO-010-6 are already on NERC's books as subject to future enforcement on April 1, 2029, and MOD-032-2 on April 1, 2028. Programs that build for the direction stay positioned.

End-of-Chapter Summary

An evolving system needs tighter integration of operational planning and real-time operations, because current information is needed to avoid decisions made on stale assumptions and conflicting interpretations. Greater variability, complexity, and interdependence drive that need. New resource types, revised ride-through and data standards, and thinner margins make sustained alignment and learning-oriented governance prerequisites for reliability.

12 Synthesis and Reliability Perspective on Planning and Real-Time Operations

12.1 One Chain, Three Horizons

Operational planning and real-time operations are intertwined parts of Bulk Electric System reliability. Planning sets the performance expectations for how the system should behave. Operational planning combines that long-range information with the expected near-term state into a next-day operating picture. Real-time operations deliver the actual performance. For reliability to hold, the three have to work as one integrated whole, not as separate activities.

A theme throughout this reference is consistency between horizons. Planning assumptions have to flow into operating limits, tools, procedures, and the situational awareness operators work with. What operations then learns about actual system behavior has to flow back. No single horizon should dominate the others. All of them have to be connected, and the connections have to be supported and consistent.

12.2 The Bridge and Its Traffic

Operational planning is an increasingly important bridge between forecasting and real-time operation. Good assumptions for current conditions reduce uncertainty and give operators a defined frame to work in. An operational planning process that keeps its assumptions current supports predictability and better real-time decisions. Without it, operational planning becomes the place where reliability risk quietly accumulates, because it no longer matches the state of the system.

Information flow, coordination, and situational awareness recur for the same reason. Reliable operation requires every function to interpret the planning context the same way, inside the organization and across organizational boundaries. Breaks in information flow, or inconsistent assumptions, can undermine operations that look sound element by element. The interfaces deserve more attention than the individual decisions.

12.3 Uncertainty, Learning, and Change

Managing uncertainty is the other recurring theme. The framework does not pretend to eliminate uncertainty. It manages it through margins and monitoring. Preparing for expected variability through planning and operational planning, and handling residual uncertainty in real time, are both part of the approach. Lessons learned in operations have to feed the planning cycle, and knowledge sharing has to be routine rather than exceptional.

The ongoing evolution of the grid intensifies all of these pressures. Thinner margins and greater complexity raise the cost of gaps between forecast and reality. Oversight grounded in actual data, trends, and patterns keeps integration effective without intruding on how each entity does its work.

12.4 Governance, Not a Transaction

Reliable operation depends on alignment, on successfully translating planning assumptions into real-time practice, and on learning across horizons. Seen from the reliability framework, the relationship between planning and real-time operations is ongoing governance, carried out every day, through every Operating Plan, every Real-time Assessment, and every lesson that makes it back to the planners.

> **From the Field**
>
> "Planning is engineering, operations is real-time." Partly true, but it leaves out the handoff between them. "Operational planning is just shorter-term planning." That undersells it. Operational planning is its own discipline. Planning Coordinators and operational planners are not interchangeable, and the standards assign them different obligations for a reason.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Bulk Electric System reliability depends on continuous synchronization among planning, operational planning, and real-time operations. Planning sets the foundation, operational planning sets the conditions expected for the operating day, and real-time operations manage the conditions that actually arrive. Oversight focuses on outcomes and on what is learned across horizons, and treats the planning-to-operations relationship as continuing governance.

Glossary

The definitions below are quoted, in some cases abridged, from the NERC Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards as posted in October 2026. They are reproduced for convenience; the official Glossary controls.

Term	Meaning in this paper
Balancing Authority (BA)	The responsible entity that integrates resource plans ahead of time, maintains Demand and resource balance within a Balancing Authority Area, and supports Interconnection frequency in real time.
Bulk Electric System (BES)	Unless modified by the lists shown below, all Transmission Elements operated at 100 kV or higher and Real Power and Reactive Power resources connected at 100 kV or higher. This does not include facilities used in the local distribution of electric energy. (The full definition includes inclusions I1 through I5 and exclusions E1 through E4; see the Glossary.)
Operating Instruction	A command by operating personnel responsible for the Real-time operation of the interconnected Bulk Electric System to change or preserve the state, status, output, or input of an Element of the Bulk Electric System or Facility of the Bulk Electric System. (A discussion of general information and of potential options or alternatives to resolve Bulk Electric System operating concerns is not a command and is not considered an Operating Instruction.)
Operating Plan	A document that identifies a group of activities that may be used to achieve some goal. An Operating Plan may contain Operating Procedures and Operating Processes.
Operational Planning Analysis (OPA)	An evaluation of projected system conditions to assess anticipated (pre-Contingency) and potential (post-Contingency) conditions for next-day operations. The evaluation shall reflect applicable inputs including, but not limited to: load forecasts; generation output levels; Interchange; known Protection System and Remedial Action Scheme status or degradation, functions, and limitations; Transmission outages; generator outages; Facility Ratings; and identified phase angle and equipment limitations.
Operations Support Personnel	Individuals who perform current day or next day outage coordination or assessments, or who determine SOLs, IROLs, or operating nomograms, in direct support of Real-time operations of the Bulk Electric System.
Planning Assessment	Documented evaluation of future Transmission System performance and Corrective Action Plans to remedy identified deficiencies.
Planning Authority	The responsible entity that coordinates and integrates transmission Facilities and service plans, resource plans, and Protection Systems. (Planning Coordinator: see Planning Authority.)

Term	Meaning in this paper
Real-time Assessment (RTA)	An evaluation of system conditions using Real-time data to assess existing (pre-Contingency) and potential (post-Contingency) operating conditions. The assessment shall reflect applicable inputs including, but not limited to: load; generation output levels; known Protection System and Remedial Action Scheme status or degradation, functions, and limitations; Transmission outages; generator outages; Interchange; Facility Ratings; and identified phase angle and equipment limitations.
Reliability Coordinator (RC)	The entity that is the highest level of authority who is responsible for the Reliable Operation of the Bulk Electric System, has the Wide Area view of the Bulk Electric System, and has the operating tools, processes and procedures, including the authority to prevent or mitigate emergency operating situations in both next-day analysis and real-time operations. The Reliability Coordinator has the purview that is broad enough to enable the calculation of Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits, which may be based on the operating parameters of transmission systems beyond any Transmission Operator's vision.
System Operating Limit (SOL)	All Facility Ratings, System Voltage Limits, and stability limits, applicable to specified System configurations, used in Bulk Electric System operations for monitoring and assessing pre- and post-Contingency operating states.
Transmission Operator (TOP)	The entity responsible for the reliability of its "local" transmission system, and that operates or directs the operations of the transmission Facilities.
Transmission Planner (TP)	The entity that develops a long-term (generally one year and beyond) plan for the reliability (adequacy) of the interconnected bulk electric transmission systems within its portion of the Planning Authority area.
Wide Area	The entire Reliability Coordinator Area as well as the critical flow and status information from adjacent Reliability Coordinator Areas as determined by detailed system studies to allow the calculation of Interconnected Reliability Operating Limits.

How Energy Compliance Can Help

Operational planning is judged on the paper trail between the study, the Operating Plan, and what happened in the control room.

Audit defense and audit preparation

EC provides audit and enforcement support (non-advocacy), audit defense with Notice of Penalty response and settlement posture, and NERC compliance program support, interpretation, and audit preparation. RSAW production and data request strategy for TOP-002, IRO-008, TOP-003, and IRO-010 come from the practitioner who answers the follow-ups.

Program reviews and alignment

A regulator-perspective program review tests whether your Operational Planning Analyses, Operating Plans, data specifications, and notices would survive real audit questions. Reliability governance and program assessments, operational and engineering reliability alignment, compliance program design and improvement, and mitigation planning and Self-Report development follow from the findings.

Senior advisory and training

EC offers NERC reliability and compliance advisory support, senior advisory on complex reliability questions, registration and applicability analysis, training and executive briefings on reliability frameworks, and industry engagement in standards development and working-group participation.

WattOps Compliance

Next-day studies, plans, and logs age out fast under 90-day and 12-month retention. WattOps Compliance is EC's NERC compliance evidence platform (wattopscompliance.com). EC will run one standard at one facility through WattOps at no cost (CIP standards excluded).

RenewOps

For renewable and storage operators, the data your TOP and RC specifications ask for starts at the plant. RenewOps is EC's renewable operations monitoring and analytics platform, with a Data Center module.

If your next-day plan and your control room are not working from the same assumptions, call us before an event shows you where.

Website: energycomplianceinc.com · Email: rsmith@complianceforenergy.com

Phone: 763.438.4427

About the Author

Rob Smith is the Founder and Principal of Energy Compliance, Inc., with more than thirty years in the industry on every side of the system. He began in control-room operations as a Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, and Power System Operator across RTO/ISO and utility control centers. On the regulator side, he was a senior compliance auditor and subject matter expert for NERC Reliability Standards. He audited grid facilities, evaluated mitigation adequacy, participated in risk-based oversight of utility mitigation activities, and supported the development of violation notifications and settlements in FERC-directed enforcement actions. He conducted a regulatory audit in the Sultanate of Oman against the Sultanate's Sector Law and Grid Code.

He founded Energy Compliance, Inc. to deliver senior regulator-side compliance authority without the layered staffing and billable-hour overhead of larger firms.

Education:

- MBA, Energy Management, University of Mary
- MSL, Compliance Law, Fordham Law University
- BAS, Energy Management, Bismarck State College
- BAS, Mechanical Engineering, Metallurgy minor, University of Florida
- BAS, Criminology, St. Petersburg College (State Law Enforcement Certification)
- AAS, Power Plant Technology, Bismarck State College
- AAS, Electrical Transmission System Technology, Bismarck State College

Certifications: NERC Lead Auditor training; previously NERC-certified at the Reliability Coordinator level; 1st Class A Boiler Engineer License, Minnesota.

About Energy Compliance, Inc.

Energy Compliance, Inc. is an independent consulting and advisory firm based in Bloomington, Minnesota, focused exclusively on electric reliability, cybersecurity reliability, and regulatory compliance for organizations connected to the North American Bulk Electric System.

We support Generator Owners and Operators, Transmission Owners and Operators, Reliability Coordinators, Balancing Authorities, and Distribution Providers across NERC Reliability Standards, FERC orders, RTO/ISO market participation rules, Regional Entity oversight, and state regulatory frameworks.

We do this work differently than larger consulting firms. A senior practitioner with regulator-side experience oversees every engagement, and we staff for outcomes, not billable hours. Deliverables are operationally executable and audit-defensible, structured for the auditor's question rather than the consultant's binder. Where automation can replace manual work, we build it. Where senior judgment is required, the senior is in the room.

Our services include, but are not limited to: NERC reliability and compliance advisory support; reliability governance and program assessments; registration and applicability analysis; operational and engineering reliability alignment; compliance program design and improvement; audit and enforcement support (non-advocacy); mitigation planning and Self-Report development; training and executive briefings on reliability frameworks; and regulator-perspective program reviews. Each engagement is scoped to the entity's role, function, and bulk system impact. Learn more at energycomplianceinc.com.

Sources and Authorities

- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards (definitions of Operational Planning Analysis, Real-time Assessment, Operating Plan, Operating Instruction, Operations Support Personnel, Planning Assessment, System Operating Limit, Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority, Planning Authority, Transmission Planner, Wide Area, and Bulk Electric System), accessed October 2026. https://www.nerc.com/glossary-of-terms
- NERC Reliability Standard TOP-002-5, Operations Planning (effective October 1, 2025; FERC order issued February 15, 2024, Docket No. RD24-1-000). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/top/top-002-5.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard TOP-001-6, Transmission Operations (effective April 1, 2024). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/top/top-001-6.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard TOP-003-7, Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority Data and Information Specification and Collection (effective October 1, 2026). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/top/top-003-7.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard TOP-010-1(i), Real-time Reliability Monitoring and Analysis Capabilities (effective April 1, 2018). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/top/top-010-1i.pdf
- NERC, TOP Reliability Standards listing (status and effective dates of TOP-001-6, TOP-002-5, TOP-003-7, TOP-003-8, and TOP-010-1(i)), accessed October 2026. https://www.nerc.com/standards/reliability-standards/top
- NERC Reliability Standard IRO-001-4, Reliability Coordination, Responsibilities (effective April 1, 2017). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-001-4.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard IRO-008-3, Reliability Coordinator Operational Analyses and Real-time Assessments (effective April 1, 2024). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-008-3.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard IRO-010-5, Reliability Coordinator Data and Information Specification and Collection (effective July 1, 2025). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-010-5.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard IRO-017-1, Outage Coordination (effective April 1, 2017). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-017-1.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard IRO-018-1(i), Reliability Coordinator Real-time Reliability Monitoring and Analysis Capabilities (effective April 1, 2018). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-018-1i.pdf

- NERC, IRO Reliability Standards listing (status and effective dates of IRO-001-4, IRO-008-3, IRO-010-5, IRO-010-6, IRO-017-1, and IRO-018-1(i)), accessed October 2026. https://www.nerc.com/standards/reliability-standards/iro
- NERC Reliability Standard FAC-014-3, Establish and Communicate System Operating Limits (effective April 1, 2024). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/fac/fac-014-3.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard MOD-033-3, Steady-State and Dynamic System Model Validation (effective April 1, 2026). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/mod/mod-033-3.pdf
- NERC, MOD Reliability Standards listing (status and effective dates of MOD-032-1, MOD-032-2, and MOD-033-3), accessed October 2026. https://www.nerc.com/standards/reliability-standards/mod
- NERC Reliability Standard PER-005-2, Operations Personnel Training (effective July 1, 2016). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/per/per-005-2.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard COM-002-4, Operating Personnel Communications Protocols (effective July 1, 2016). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/com/com-002-4.pdf
- NERC Reliability Standard PRC-029-2, Frequency and Voltage Ride-through Requirements for Inverter-Based Resources (effective October 1, 2026). https://www.nerc.com/standards/reliability-standards/prc/prc-029-2
- NERC, ORCP and CMEP Annual Report (February 11, 2026), Chapter 5, Year in Review. https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/programs/enforcement/cmep-and-vegetation-reports/2025-orcp-and-cmep-annual-report.pdf
- NERC Rules of Procedure, Appendix 4B, Sanction Guidelines of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (effective January 19, 2021). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/who-we-are/rules-of-procedure/appendix-4b.pdf

© Energy Compliance, Inc. · EC-WP-304 · October 2026