Talking points/high level factors for CISS on Automated Checkout if members wants to continue working on this issue and wants CISS to provide guidance to industry on Automated Checkout.

1. Data exchange shall include NSI megawatt for agreed upon time interval, direction of power flow and three part communication recording method.

* These would be the things that you must need to be able to successfully checkout with your neighboring BA

1. Data exchanges may be additionally expanded for before-the-fact & after-the-fact daily checkouts in addition to Real-Time Checkouts.

- These would be the things that you may add to exchange additional data related to NSI

1. Two parties may need to establish new failure procedures and internal alarms when automating NSI.

- These would be the things that participating neighbors might want to consider in their failure scenarios.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Language – Based on above talking points & 7/28/2020 CISS discussions, below is pass at standard language proposal.**

This appendix describes the minimum requirements to any Balancing Authority (BA) who wants to automate NSI checkout with an adjacent BA using a data exchange service with their counterpart.

BA should adhere to INT-009-2.1 R1, 1.1, 1.2 regarding time intervals, magnitude of interchange and direction of flow.

Each BA should ensure their automated checkout partner BA has received accurate, up-to-date NSI data from them, and they should use the numbers only if they match exactly. All electronic data points sent and received for NSI comparison should be recorded with timestamps for audit. BAs should adhere to evidence requirements in INT-009-2.1 M1.

BA may additionally share eTags that contributes to NSI with its adjacent BA as a part of NSI automation for the purposes of discrepancy troubleshooting and verification.

BAs may additionally use same NSI data exchange to share daily NSI totals before-the-fact (BTF) or after-the-fact (ATF).

Any discrepancies in magnitude of interchange shall be resolved via mutual agreement between the two BA.

Both BAs should agree upon and document failure procedures and alarm mechanisms that would trigger manual NSI checkouts (over the phone). BAs should design these procedures in accordance with the evidence requirements in INT-009-2.1 M1.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**NERC reference language to help in discussions during CISS**

**NERC INT-009-2.1 Requirement and Measure**

**R1.** Each Balancing Authority shall agree with each of its Adjacent Balancing Authorities that its Composite Confirmed Interchange with that Adjacent Balancing Authority, at mutually agreed upon time intervals, excluding Dynamic Schedules and Pseudo-Ties and including any Interchange per INT-010-2 not yet captured in the Composite Confirmed Interchange, is:

**1.1.** Identical in magnitude to that of the Adjacent Balancing Authority, and

**1.2.** Opposite in sign or direction to that of the Adjacent Balancing Authority.

**M1.** The Balancing Authority shall have evidence (such as dated logs, voice recordings, electronic records, or other evidence) that its Composite Confirmed Interchange, excluding Dynamic Schedules and Pseudo-Ties and including any Interchange as directed per INT-010-2 not yet captured in the Composite Confirmed Interchange, was agreed to by each Adjacent Balancing Authority, identical in magnitude to those of each Adjacent Balancing Authority, and opposite in sign to that of each Adjacent Balancing Authority. (R1)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------