

## ***Common Requirements***

1. There will be a two-tier curtailment approach for TLR Level 5 that provides incentive to have Coordination Agreements that honor external constraints when providing transmission service (PTP and Network and Native). The Coordination Agreement and two tier curtailment requirements are documented below. These NAESB Business Practices are not intended to duplicate the MOD Standards. There may be some items that are listed below that overlap the MOD Standards. A Coordination Agreement (a new or existing agreement) must meet the following requirements; however, it could have additional provisions agreed upon by the parties:
  - Coordination Agreement Requirements
    - Limit the provision of transmission service as it impacts other parties' systems by respecting the constraints as described in the Coordination Agreement.
      - For off-path impacts a Coordination Agreement party will utilize the same system conditions including constraints and facility loadings as used by the other parties to the Coordination Agreement when providing transmission service on its system. This is applicable for both short-term and long-term transmission service.
    - The Coordination Agreement will include mutually negotiated congestion management Provisions, including real-time Procedures, or the TLR process.
      - Congestion management Provisions will address congestion created by scheduling of inter-BA transmission service, intra-BA transmission service, and GTL
    - If all parties are jurisdictional the Coordination Agreement will be filed with FERC
    - Parties, if requested, will establish Coordination Agreements where they share Coordinated Flowgates<sup>1</sup>. (expect NERC to establish the criteria for Coordinated Flowgate (test))
    - A list of Coordination Agreements is not required to be posted on a Transmission Service Provider's OASIS. **However, Transmission Service Providers need current information on the IDC/PFV priority treatment of firm service provided on their system on all impacted parallel systems to allow them to post this information on their OASIS for Transmission Customers, as required, to ensure transparency.**
  - Will address the curtailment priority of grandfathered firm service (pre-OATT).
  - Unilateral agreement
    - In the event the parties cannot agree to a Coordination Agreement a unilateral agreement may be filed with FERC.
    - If a party can demonstrate that they are meeting the minimum requirements for a Coordination Agreement and have been unable to execute a Coordination Agreement, the unilateral agreement containing the minimum requirements would

---

<sup>1</sup> Coordinated Flowgates are those flowgates identified by the Reliability Coordinators for which data is reported to the IDC under the IDC Change Order 283

Entity Name	Coordination Required
NERC IDCWG	<p>A new change order will need to be developed in support of TLR changes. IDC CO 331 – IDC webRegistry interface, CO 326 – PFV Metrics, and CO 322 – PFV Priorities are underway.</p> <p>The new change order will also need to include the following additional requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Development of an interface for TSPs to input the parties with which they have Coordination Agreements (or Reciprocity) that meet the requirements to qualify its transmission service to obtain LTC priority for parallel path flows (where default assumption would be FTC where no input data provided by TSP).</li> <li>2) IDC/PFV software changes to identify the proper firm curtailment priority for all TSPs transmission service on parallel paths accounting for current list/matrix of Coordination Agreements for all TSPs</li> <li>3) Development of an interface (linkable web page) to provide transparent real-time reporting of the FTC/LTC priority matrix showing the TSPs with transmission service that would be treated as FTC on specific parallel path systems. (Note: This information is necessary to allow TSPs to provide transparent information to TCs regarding the priority of service they provide.)</li> </ol>

## Items considered but not included:

The BPS had discussions on the following topics and decided that they would not be included in the Permanent Solution.

1. How to address a second TLR after the firm generation was cut and left the non-firm generation (Would you curtail firm before you cut the non-firm wind?) (Credit for re-dispatch already taken?)
 

**Status:** To do this would require the Transmission Service Provider to identify the generators that were moved to provide the relief obligation and by how much and then reported to the IDC. It would have to be limited to just those units that were moved because of the TLR. Because of the changes in the system you cannot identify which units are moving for which TLR. This issue is not going to be addressed in this proposal. This issue exists today.
2. Impact on internal billing functions.
 

**Status:** Don't know that this causes any new impacts, with the exception that there may be a need for a new class of tags which are to be excluded from billing (e.g., NF dynamic tags for SPP). This is beyond the scope of the BPS.