# Minority Issues—WECC-0149

Before receiving separate 100%-affirmative ballots on WECC-0141 and WECC-0149, the following minority issues were resolved.

Minority Issues can be reviewed in their entirety on the WECC-0149 Project Page, on the Submit and Review Comments accordion, as part of the associated Response to Comments for each posting.

## WECC-0149 Posting 1

The minority voiced concern that:

1. The phrase “Requesting Entity” (RE) should not be used, as it could add confusion to the process. The DT concluded that even though RE is an abbreviation used variously in multiple documents, its use is clearly defined in the four corners of the Table Revision Process (Process)—thereby avoiding confusion.
2. The word “requirements” should not be used in the revision process. The DT disagreed noting that, although the process is not a Standard, the mandated steps are “required” if the petitioning entity wishes to make requested changes. Although the Table Revision Process (Process) is not a Standard, it is nonetheless proposed to be a WECC/NERC/FERC-approved document like the WECC Reliability Standards Development Procedures (Procedures). Neither document is a Standard; but, both documents create mandates and not suggestions.
3. Definitions should be developed for the words *generic*, *specific*, *procedural*, and *substantive.* The DT disagreed noting that the Oxford Dictionary definition would serve the purpose.
4. The WECC Path Rating Catalogue and the WECC-0149 FAC-501-WECC-4, Attachment B listing should be identical. The DT agreed with the conclusion but noted that the two documents have separate purposes; thus, two lists may be an acceptable outcome. Also, changes to the Catalogue are outside of the scope of this project.

Various unsupported non-substantive changes were not adopted.

## WECC-0149 Posting 2 and NERC’s 45-Day Posting for Comment

No Minority Issues were raised.