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| Date of Request for Comment: | October 18, 2016 |
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*Listed below is the summary description of changes for the proposed New “technical feasibility exception” definition. Please place your comments/reasons for position underneath (if any).*

|  |
| --- |
| **Definitions – New** |
| **Existing** | **Proposed** | **Market Participant Comments and/or Alternate Proposal** |
| No definition currently exists in the Alberta Reliability Standards | **“technical feasibility exception”** means a variance from a requirement in the CIP Cyber Security **reliability standards** that achieves a level of **reliability** of the **bulk electric system** that is comparable to or higher than compliance with the requirement. | *Comment # 1: Insert Comments / Reason for Position (if any)* |