

**NERC**

NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRIC  
RELIABILITY CORPORATION

# MOD A Webinar

## Informational Update

Ryan Stewart, Standards Developer  
June 19, 2013

**RELIABILITY | ACCOUNTABILITY**



- Introductions
- Mission of the Webinar
- MOD A Informal Development History
- Informal Results
- Current Pro Forma Standard by Requirement
- Standard Authorization Request Package
- Transition Plan and Coordination
- Expected Timeline for Formal Development

- It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition.
- This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or might appear to violate, the antitrust laws.
- Participants are reminded that this webinar is public. Notice of the meeting was widely distributed. The notice included information for dial-in participation. Participants should keep in mind that the audience may include members of the press and representatives of various governmental authorities, in addition to the expected participation by industry stakeholders.

- NERC Standards Developer, Ryan Stewart
- MOD A Informal Development Group Members:
  - Aaron Staley, Orlando Utilities Commission
  - Ross Kovacs, Georgia Transmission Company
  - James Randall, Bonneville Power Administration
  - Marilyn Jayachandran, PJM Interconnection, LLC
- Participation from:
  - CAISO, PJM, Southern, FPL, CSU, BPA, Duke, WECC, Idaho Power, TEP, FERC Staff, GTC, PGE, OUC

- Give overview of what has been conducted during informal development and the value added
- Provide information on the components of the SAR package
- Allow for time to digest the information
  - Then ask questions and engage in a forum like webinar during first week of the 30 day SAR comment period

- Began in February 2013
- Casted a wide net to industry for involvement
  - Identified areas for improvement
- Strived for consensus for users across North America on the language of the pro forma standard
- Paragraph 81 criteria was utilized
- Conducted seven focused meetings
- Engaged regional working groups for monthly updates

- ATC and AFC values do not directly control reliability, but they do influence the BES conditions the TOP (and others) inherit in real time.
- Therefore there is a need to insure:
  - Transparency in calculation
  - Opportunity to Influence calculation
  - Data sharing for calculation of ATC or AFC
- An overall goal was not to create administrative burden if there was not a reliability goal, for example a TOP already sharing data with another TOP isn't captured by the data sharing obligation.

- Therefore, the consolidation of MOD-001, MOD-004, MOD-008, MOD-028, MOD-029, MOD-030:
  - Combines reliability components of all six standards
  - Promotes consistency in implementation
  - Provides flexibility
  - Ensures information sharing
  - Reduces administrative burden of non-reliability requirements



- If utilized by its Transmission Service Provider or requested by its Reliability Coordinator, a Transmission Operator shall prepare, keep current, and implement a Total Flowgate Capability or Total Transfer Capability methodology used for calculating its Total Flowgate Capability or Total Transfer Capability. *[Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]*
  - The methodology(ies) shall address at a minimum, the following elements of the Total Flowgate Capability or Total Transfer Capability calculation: ...
  - The methodology(ies) shall address reliability-related constraints requested to be included per Requirement R1 and identified by another Transmission Operator are used within a component of the TTC/TFC calculation.
  - The methodology(ies) shall address the periodicity for providing updated TTC or TFC values to the Transmission Service Provider.

- Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to, a dated effective methodology that is posted on the Transmission Operator's website, OASIS or their Transmission Service Provider's website or OASIS; descriptions within the methodology regarding how constraints identified by another Transmission are included and how a distribution factor is applied, or a statement that such a request has not been made or the TTC or TFC calculation does not use PTDF or OTDF in the calculation; a demonstration of select forward looking values of TTC calculated per the methodology and demonstration of were those values were forward to the Transmission Service Provider. If the Transmission Operator and Transmission Service Provider are the same entity then evidence of providing the values can be established by the statement that they are the same entity.

- Each Transmission Service Provider shall prepare, keep current, and implement an Available Transfer Capability Implementation Document (ATCID) that describes the methodology utilized to calculate Available Transmission Capability or AFC values. *[Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]*
  - The ATCID shall include when the document was last updated.

- Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to, a dated effective ATCID that is posted on the Transmission Service Provider's website or OASIS and a demonstration that select currently active values of Available Transmission Capability were calculated based on the currently in effect ATCID.

- Each Transmission Service Provider shall prepare, keep current, and implement a Capacity Benefit Margin Implementation Document that describes its method for establishing margins to protect system reliability during a declared NERC Energy Emergency Alert 2 or higher. Transmission Service Providers that do not utilize Capacity Benefit Margin shall state this in the CBMID. *[Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]*

- Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to, a dated effective CBMID that is posted on the Transmission Service Provider's OASIS and a demonstration that a selection of currently in effect CBM value(s) was determined per the CBMID, if the Transmission Operator utilizes CBM.

- Each Transmission Operator shall prepare, keep current, and implement a Transmission Reliability Margin Implementation Document (TRMID) that describes its method for establishing margins to protect system reliability. Transmission Operators that do not utilize TRM shall state this in the TRMID. *[Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]*

- Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to, a dated effective TRMID that is posted on the Transmission Service Provider's OASIS and a demonstration that a selection of currently in effect TRM value(s) was determined per the TRMID, if the Transmission Operator utilizes TRM.



- Within 30 calendar days of receiving a written request that references this Requirement from a Planning Coordinator, Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, Transmission Planner, or Transmission Service Provider, each Transmission Service Provider and Transmission Operator shall provide:  
*[Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]*
  - A written response to any request for clarification of its ATC or to suggest changes to its ATCID, CBMID, or TRMID.
  - If not publicly posted on OASIS or its company website, the Transmission Service Provider or Transmission Operator's effective:
    - ATCID
    - CBMID
    - TRMID

- Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to: dated records of a Planning Coordinator, Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, Transmission Planner, or Transmission Service Provider request and the Transmission Service Provider's response to the request; a statement by the Transmission Service Provider that they have received no requests.

- Within 30 days of a written request that references this Requirement from another Transmission Service Provider or Transmission Operator, a Transmission Service Provider or Transmission Operator shall share data used in their TTC or ATC calculation. *[Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]*
  - To be a valid request the request must specify that the data is for use in the requesting parties TTC, TFC, ATC, or AFC calculation.
  - The Transmission Service Provider and Transmission Operator are not required to modify the data from the format in which they maintain, utilize or currently make available the data.

- Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to; dated records of a registered entity's request, and the TSPs response to the request; a statement from the requestor that the request was met; a statement by the Transmission Service Provider that they have received no requests. In the case of a data request that involves the providing of data on regular intervals, examples of evidence include but are not limited to; dated records of the registered entity's request, examples of the TSPs providing the data at intervals, a statement from the requestor that the request is being met.

- Revised Pro Forma Standard
- Mapping Document
- Technical White Paper
- Proposed Project Timelines for Formal Development
- NERC Compliance Feedback

- Transition plan is vital for success
- Those requirements not mentioned early will not go away, they will be managed outside of NERC
- Other governing bodies may come into play

Anticipated Actions	Anticipated Date
SAR Authorized by the Standards Committee	June
30 Day SAR Comment Period Opens	June
Nomination Period Opens	June
Standard Drafting Team Appointed	July
Initial Comment Period Opens	August
Initial Ballot is Conducted	October
Initial Comment and Initial Ballot Closes	October
Recirculation Ballot Opens	October
Recirculation Ballot Closes	October/November
BOT Adoption	November
Filing to Applicable Regulatory Authorities	December



# MOD A Contact

[Ryan.Stewart@nerc.net](mailto:Ryan.Stewart@nerc.net) - 404-446-2569