

Standard Development Timeline

This section is maintained by the drafting team during the development of the standard and will be removed when the standard becomes effective.

Development Steps Completed

1. ~~SAR [and supporting package](#) posted for comment on (July 11, 2013 – August 27, 2013).~~
2. ~~Draft standard posted for first comment and ballot (July 11, 2013 – August 27, 2013).~~
3. ~~Draft standard posted for additional comment and ballot (November 8, 2013 - November 18, 2013).~~

Description of Current Draft

This draft standard is concluding informal development and will move to formal development when authorized by the Standards Committee.

Anticipated Actions	Anticipated Date
SAR Authorized by the Standards Committee	July
Additional 45-day Formal Day Comment Period with Ballot Opens	November 2013 July
Nomination Period Opens	July
Standard Drafting Team Appointed	July
Initial Ballot is Conducted	August
Final Ballot is Conducted	December 2013 September
Board of Trustees (Board) Adoption	December 2013 November
Filing to Applicable Regulatory Authorities	December 2013

Effective Dates

- ~~1. MOD-001-2 shall become effective the first day of the seventh calendar quarter after the effective date of the order providing applicable regulatory approval.~~
- ~~2. In those jurisdictions where no regulatory approval is required, MOD-001-2 shall become effective the first day of the fifth calendar quarter after Board’s approval, or as otherwise made effective pursuant to the laws applicable to such ERO governmental authorities.~~

Version History

Version	Date	Action	Change Tracking
1	August 26, 2008	Adopted by the NERC Board	
1a	November 5, 2009	NERC Board Adopted Interpretation of R2 and R8	Interpretation (Project 2009-15)
2	TBD	Consolidation of MOD-001-1a, MOD-004-1, MOD-008-1, MOD-028-1, MOD-029-1a, and MOD-030-2	

Definitions of Terms Used in the Standard

This section includes all newly defined or revised terms used in the proposed standard. Terms already defined in the Reliability Standards Glossary of Terms are not repeated here. New or revised definitions listed below become approved when the proposed standard is approved. When the standard becomes effective, these defined terms will be removed from the individual standard and added to the Glossary.

None.

DRAFT

When this standard receives ballot approval, the text boxes will be moved to the “Guidelines and Technical Basis” section of the standard.

A. Introduction

1. **Title:** Available Transmission System Capability

2. **Number:** MOD-001-2

3. Purpose:

To ensure that determinations of available transmission system transfer capability are determined in a manner that supports the reliable operation of the Bulk-Power System (BPS) and that the methodology and data underlying those determinations are disclosed to those registered entities that need such information for reliability purposes. This Reliability Standard ensures (1) that available transmission system capability determinations account for system reliability limits, and (2) that planners and operators of the BPS can request available transmission system capability information from other Transmission Operators or Transmission Services Providers.

~~3. **Purpose:** (1) To ensure the reliable calculation of Total Flowgate Capability (TFC) and Total Transfer Capability (TTC) values when those values are used by a Transmission Service Provider to calculate Available Flowgate Capability (AFC) or Available Transfer Capability (ATC) or used by a Reliability Coordinator; (2) to require disclosure of how TFC, TTC, Capacity Benefit Margin (CBM), and Transmission Reliability Margin (TRM) values are calculated for entities with a reliability need for the information; and (3) to require the sharing of data with other entities with a reliability need for the AFC, ATC, TFC, TTC, CBM, or TRM values.~~

4. **Applicability:**

4.1. **Functional Entity**

4.1.1 Transmission Operator

4.1.2 Transmission Service Provider

4.2. **Exemptions:** The following is exempt from MOD-001-2.

4.2.1 Functional Entities operating within the Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT)~~ERCOT~~

5. Effective Date:

5.1. The standard shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 18 months after the date that the standard is approved by an applicable governmental authority or as otherwise provided for in a jurisdiction where approval by an applicable governmental authority is required for a standard to go into effect. Where approval by an applicable governmental authority is not required, the standard shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter that is 18 months after the date the standard is adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees or as otherwise provided for in that jurisdiction.

DRAFT

B. Requirements and Measures

Rationale for R1: Total Flowgate Capability (TFC) and Total Transfer Capability (TTC) are the starting points for the Available Flowgate Capability (AFC) and Available Transfer Capability (ATC) values. AFC and ATC values influence real-time conditions and have the ability to impact real-time operations. A Transmission Operator (TOP) shall clearly document its methods of determining TFC and TTC so that any TOP or Transmission Service Provider (TSP) that uses the information can clearly understand how the values are determined. The TFC and TTC values shall account for any reliability constraints that limit those values as well as system conditions forecasted for the time period for which those values are determined. The TFC and TTC values shall also incorporate constraints on external systems when appropriate, in addition to constraints on the TOP's own system. **Rationale for R1:** TFC and TTC values are important to the reliability of the bulk power system when they are used to determine AFC and ATC or in the real-time operation of the transmission system. The Transmission Operator should establish a methodology that ensures reliability. Each

R1. Each Transmission Operator that determines Total Flowgate Capability (TFC) or Total Transfer Capability (TTC) shall develop a written, prepare, keep current, and implement a TFC or TTC methodology (or methodologies) for determining calculating its TFC or TTC values. The methodology (or methodologies) shall reflect the Transmission Operator's current practices for determining TFC or TTC values., if: [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]

- Each methodology Used by that Transmission Operator;
- Requested by its Transmission Service Provider(s); or
- Requested by its Reliability Coordinator.

1.1. ~~The methodologies shall include:~~

1.1 A statement that the TTC or TFC shall describe the method used to account for the following limitations in both the pre- and post-contingency state:

1.1.1 Facility incorporate facility ratings;

1.1.2 System, voltage limits;

1.1.1.1.3 Transient, and stability limits pre- and post-contingency;

1.1.4 Voltage stability limits; and

- Other A description of how this is accomplished;

1.1.5 What criteria (if any) is used to select which of the limits, or System Operating Limits (SOLs).

- Each methodology shall describe the method used), are relevant to account for each of the calculation; and

- The rationale for the selection of the TTC or TFC method being used.

1.2 The methodologies shall address, at a minimum, the following elements, provided such elements impact of the determination of TFC or TTC calculation:

- 1.2.1 ~~The~~How simulation of transfers ~~are~~ performed through the adjustment of generation, Load, or both;
- 1.2.2 Transmission topology, including, but not limited to, additions and retirements;
- 1.2.3 ~~Expected~~~~Currently approved and projected~~ transmission uses;
- 1.2.4 Planned outages;
- 1.2.5 Parallel path (loop flow) adjustments;
- 1.2.6 Load forecast; and
- 1.2.7 Generator dispatch, including, but not limited to, additions and retirements.

1.3 ~~Each methodology shall describe the process for including~~~~The methodologies shall include~~ any reliability-related constraints that are requested to be included by another Transmission Operator, provided ~~that (1) the request references this specific requirement, and (2) the requesting Transmission Operator includes those~~ constraints ~~are also used in its~~that ~~Transmission Operator's~~ TFC or TTC ~~determination~~calculation.

1.3.1 Each Transmission Operator that uses the Flowgate Methodology shall include in its methodology an impact test process for including requested constraints. If a generator to Load transfer in a registered entity's area or a transfer to a neighboring registered entity impact the requested constraint by five percent or greater, the requested constraint shall be included in the TFC determination, otherwise the requested constraint is not required to be included.

1.3.2 Each Transmission Operator that uses the Area Interchange or Rated System Path Methodology shall describe the process it uses to account for requested constraints that have a five percent or greater distribution factor for a transfer between areas in the TTC determination; otherwise the requested constraint is not required to be included. When testing transfers involving the requesting Transmission Operators area, the requested constraint may be excluded.

1.3.3 A different method for determining whether requested constraints need to be included in the TFC or TTC determination may be used if agreed to by the Transmission Operators.

~~1.3.1—Each Transmission Operator that determines TFC or TTC shall provide its current methodology (or methodologies) or other~~ ~~The Transmission Operator shall use a distribution factor (Power Transfer Distribution Factor (PTDF) or Outage Transfer Distribution Factor (OTDF)) of five percent or less when determining if these constraints should be monitored.~~

~~1.2.—The methodologies shall address the periodicity for the Transmission Operator to provide updated TFC or TTC values to the Transmission Service Provider.~~

M1. Examples of evidence (such as written documentation) to show that its methodology (or methodologies) contains the following:

- A description of the method used to account for the limits specified in part 1.1. Methods of accounting for these limits may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- TFC or TTC being determined by one or more limits.
- Simulation being used to find the maximum TFC or TTC that remains within the limit.
- The application of a distribution factor in determining if a limit affects the TFC or TTC value.
- Monitoring a subsetA dated effective methodology that is posted on the Transmission Operator's website, or their Transmission Service Provider's website, or on the Open Access Same-Time Information System (OASIS);
- Descriptions within the methodology regarding how constraints identified by another Transmission Operator 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; or
- Language in the TFC or TTC methodology that specifies the periodicity of providing updated TFC or TTC values to the Transmission Service Provider and evidence that the updated values were provided according to the specified timeframes.
- If the Transmission Operator and Transmission Service Provider are the same entity then evidence of limits and providing the values can be established by a statement that those

Rationale for R2:

ATC is a prediction of the remaining amount of power that can be transferred on a path between two systems for defined system conditions. AFC is a prediction of the amount of additional power for defined system conditions that could flow over a particular flowgate, which may involve one or more paths between systems. The ATC or AFC value influences, to varying degrees depending on the locality, the system conditions that the operator inherits in real time, which gives the Transmission Operator and others an interest in understanding how the values are calculated. To ensure that the Transmission Operator and others have this information, the Transmission Service Provider must have an Available Transfer Capability Implementation Document (ATCID) that accurately describes the current process of determining this value.

- limits are expected to produce the most severe results.
- A statement that the monitoring of a select limit(s) results in the TFC or TTC not exceeding another set of limits.
- A statement that one or more of those limits are not applicable to the TFC or TTC determination.
- A description of the method used to account for the elements specified in part 1.2, provided such elements impact the determination of TFC or TTC. Methods of accounting for these elements may include, but they are not limited to, one or more of the following:
 - A statement that the element is not accounted for since it does not affect the determination of TFC or TTC.
 - A description of how the element is used in the determination of TFC or TTC.

- (1.3) A copy of the request and a description of the method used to perform the impact test (1.3.1) or account for the requested constraints (1.3.2).
- The Transmission Operator shall also be using their current method to determine TFC or TTC. Evidence of this could be, but is not limited to, a demonstration that a selection of currently active TFC or TTC values were calculated based on the current methodology.

Rationale for R2: A TSP must clearly document its methods of determining AFC and ATC so that TOPs can clearly understand how the values are determined. The AFC and ATC values shall account for system conditions at the time those values would be used. Each TSP that uses the Flowgate Methodology shall also use the AFC value determined by the TSP responsible for an external system constraint where appropriate.

- R2.** —Each Transmission Service Provider that determines Available Flowgate Capability (AFC) or Available Transfer Capability (ATC) shall develop~~shall prepare, keep current, and implement~~ an Available Transfer Capability Implementation Document (ATCID) that describes the methodology (or methodologies) it uses to determine AFC or ATC values. The methodology (or methodologies) shall reflect the Transmission Service Provider’s current practices for determining AFC or ATC~~used to calculate ATC or AFC~~ values. [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]
- 2.1.** Each methodology shall describe the method used to account for the following elements that impact the determination~~Examples~~ of AFC or ATC:
- 2.1.1.** The simulation of transfers performed through the adjustment of generation, Load, or both;
 - 2.1.2.** Transmission topology, including, but not limited to, additions and retirements;
 - 2.1.3.** Expected transmission uses;
 - 2.1.4.** Planned outages;
 - 2.1.5.** Parallel path (loop flow) adjustments;
 - 2.1.6.** Load forecast; and
 - 2.1.7.** Generator dispatch, including, but not limited to, additions and retirements.
- 2.2.** Each Transmission Service Provider that uses the Flowgate Methodology shall, for reliability constraints identified in part 1.3, use the AFC determined by the Transmission Service Provider for that constraint.
- M2.** Each Transmission Service Provider that determines AFC or ATC shall provide its current ATCID or other evidence (such as written documentation) to show that its ATCID contains the following:
- A description of the method used to account for the elements specified in part 2.1, provided such elements impact the determination of AFC or ATC. Methods of accounting for these elements may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- A description of how the element ~~a dated effective ATCID that~~ is used in the determination of AFC or ATC.
- A statement that the element is not accounted for since it does not affect the determination of AFC or ATC.
- A statement that the element is accounted for in the determination of TFC or TTC ~~by posted on~~ the Transmission Operator, and does not otherwise affect the determination of AFC or ATC.
- Each Transmission Service Provider that uses the Flowgate Methodology shall provide a description of the method in which AFC provided by another Transmission Service Provider was used for the reliability constraints identified in part 1.3.
- The Transmission Service Provider shall also be using their current method to determine AFC or ATC. Evidence of this could be, but is not limited to, ~~Provider's website or OASIS and a~~ demonstration that ~~a selection of select~~ currently active AFC or ATC values ~~of ATC~~ were calculated based on the current methodology. ~~ATCID.~~

Rationale for R3:

Capacity Benefit Margin (CBM) is one of the values that may be a value used in by a Transmission Service Provider when determining ATC. To ensure transparency and reliability, the Transmission Service Provider must have a Capacity Benefit Margin Implementation Document (CBMID) that accurately describes the AFC or ATC value. CBM is current process of determining this value that can be shared with other entities with a reliability need to understand the amount of firm transmission transfer capability preserved by the transmission provider ~~Transmission Service Provider's process~~ for Load-Serving Entities (LSEs), who's Loads are located on that TSPs system, to enable access by creating the CBM value. When a Transmission Service Provider does not use CBM, the LSEs to generation from interconnected systems to meet resource reliability requirements. A clear explanation of how value in the ATC calculation is zero.

The CBM value is developed is an important aspect of could have been included in the TSPs ability to communicate to TOPs how ATCID. However, Transmission Service Providers have other obligations (tariffs, contracts, future NAESB standards) that AFC or ATC value was determined. Therefore anytime CBM is used (non-zero) a CBMID is required to communicate reference the method of determining CBM ~~CBMID; keeping it as its own document seemed to be less burdensome then requiring its inclusion in the ATCID.~~

- R3.** Each Transmission Service Provider that determines Capacity Benefit Margin (CBM) values shall develop prepare, keep current, and implement a Capacity Benefit Margin Implementation Document (CBMID) that describes its method for establishing CBM. The method described in the CBMID shall reflect the Transmission Service Provider's current practices for determining CBM values. [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning] ~~margins to protect system reliability during a declared NERC Energy Emergency Alert 2 or higher.~~

M3. ~~Each Transmission Service Provider Providers that determines do not use Capacity Benefit Margin (CBM) shall provide evidence, including, but not limited to, its current CBMID, current CBM values, or other evidence (such as written documentation, study reports, or supporting information) to demonstrate that it established CBM values consistent with its methodology described state this in the CBMID. If a Transmission Service Provider does not maintain CBM, examples of evidence include, but are not limited to, an affidavit, statement, or other documentation a dated effective CBMID that is posted on the Transmission Service Provider's website or OASIS and a demonstration, such as a study report, that states select currently active values of CBM were determined per the CBMID, if the Transmission Service Provider does not maintain Providers uses CBM.~~

Rationale for R4:

Transmission Reliability Margin (TRM) is ~~one of the values that may be used in additional capacity held by a Transmission Service Provider when determining the AFC or ATC value. TRM accounts for the inherent uncertainty in system conditions and the need for providing additional operating flexibility margin to a Transmission Operator. To ensure reliable system operation as system conditions change. An explanation by the TOP of how the TRM value is developed for use in the TSP's determination of AFC transparency and ATC is an important aspect of the TSP's ability to communicate to TOPs how that AFC or ATC value was determined. Therefore, anytime a TOP provides a non-zero TRM to a TSP, reliability, the Transmission Operator must have a Transmission Reliability Margin Implementation Document (TRMID) is required to communicate the method that accurately describes their current process of determining TRM, this value and can be shared with entities that have a reliability need to understand the Transmission Operator's process for creating the TRM value. When a Transmission Service Provider does not utilize TRM, the value~~

- R4.** ~~Each Transmission Operator that determines Transmission Reliability Margin (TRM) values shall develop prepare, keep current, and implement a Transmission Reliability Margin Implementation Document (TRMID) that describes its method for establishing TRM. The method described in the TRMID shall reflect the Transmission Operator's current practices for determining TRM values. [Violation Risk Factor: Lower][Time Horizon: Operations Planning] margins to protect system reliability.~~
- M4.** ~~Each Transmission Operator Operators that determines TRM shall provide evidence including, but do not limited to, its current TRMID, current TRM values, or other evidence (such as written documentation, study reports, or supporting information) to demonstrate that it established TRM values consistent with its methodology described use Transmission Reliability Margin (TRM) shall state this in the TRMID. If a Transmission Operator does not maintain TRM, examples of evidence include, but are not limited to, an affidavit, statement, or other documentation that states a dated effective TRMID that is posted on the Transmission Operator does not maintain TRM. Operator's website or OASIS and a demonstration, such as a study report, that select currently active values of TRM were determined per the TRMID, if the Transmission Operator uses TRM.~~

Rationale for R5: Clear communication of the methods of determining AFC, ATC, CBM, TFC, TRM, and TTC are necessary to the reliable operation of the Bulk-Power System (BPS). A TOP and TSP are obligated to make available their methodologies for determining AFC, ATC, CBM, TFC, TRM, and TTC to those with a reliability need. The TOP and TSP are further obligated to respond to any requests for clarification on those methodologies, provided that responding to such requests would not be contrary to the registered entities confidentiality, regulatory, or security concerns. The purpose of this requirement is not to monitor every communication that occurs regarding these values, but to ensure that those with reliability need have access to the information. Therefore, the requirement is very specific on when it is invoked so that it does not create an administrative burden on regular communications between registered entities.

- R5.** Within ~~4530~~ calendar days of receiving a written request that references this specific requirement from a Planning Coordinator, Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, Transmission Planner, Transmission Service Provider, or any other registered entity that demonstrates a reliability need, each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider ~~and Transmission Operator (subject to confidentiality, regulatory, or security requirements)~~ shall provide: *[Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning]*
- 5.1.** A written response to any request for clarification of its TFCATC or TTCAFC methodology, ATCID, CBMID, or TRMID. If the request for clarification is contrary to the Transmission Operator’s or Transmission Service Provider’s confidentiality, regulatory, or security requirements then a written response shall be provided explaining the clarifications not provided, on what basis and whether there are any options for resolving any of the confidentiality, regulatory, or security concerns.
 - 5.2.** If not publicly posted on OASIS or its company website, the Transmission Operator’s effective:
 - 5.2.1** TRMIDCBMID; and
 - 5.2.2** TFC or TTC methodology.
 - 5.3.** If not publicly posted on OASIS or its company website, the Transmission Service Provider’s effective:
 - 5.3.1** ATCID; and
 - 5.3.2** TRMIDCBMID.
- M5.** Examples of evidence include, but are not limited to, dated records of the request from a Planning Coordinator, Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, Transmission Planner, Transmission Service Provider, or another registered entity who demonstrates a reliability need; the Transmission Service Provider’s response to the request; and a statement by the Transmission Service Provider that they have received no requests.

Rationale for R6: This requirement provides a mechanism for each TOP or TSP to access the best available data for use in its calculation of AFC, ATC, CBM, TFC, TRM, and TTC values. Requirement R6 requires that a TOP and TSP share their data, with the caveat that the TOP and TSP is not required to modify that data from the form that they use or maintain it in. For data requests that involve providing data on a regular interval, the TOP and TSP is not obligated to provide the data more frequently than either (1) once an hour, or (2) as often as they update the data. The data provider is also not obligated to provide data that would violate any of its confidentiality, regulatory, or security obligations. The purpose of this requirement is not to monitor every data exchange that occurs regarding these values, but to ensure that those with reliability need have access to the information. Therefore, the requirement is very specific on when it is invoked so that it does not create an administrative burden on regular communications between registered entities.

- R6.** Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider that receives a written request from another Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider for data related to AFC, ATC, TFC, or TTC determinations that (1) references ~~under this specific~~ requirement, and (2) specifies that the requested data is for use in the requesting party's AFC, ATC, TFC, or TTC determination shall take one of the actions below. [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning].
- ~~• Dated records of the registered entity's request;~~
 - ~~• at intervals; or~~
 - ~~• A statement from the requestor that the request is being met.~~
- 6.1.** In ~~responding to the case of a~~ ~~written data~~ request ~~for that involves the providing of~~ data on an ongoing basis, regular intervals, examples of evidence include, but are not limited to: ~~Examples of~~ the Transmission Service Provider or Transmission Operator shall make available its data on an ongoing basis no later than 45 days from receipt of the written request. Unless otherwise agreed upon, the Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider is not required to:
- 6.1.1** Alter the format in which it maintains or uses the data; or
- 6.1.2** Make available the requested data on a more frequent basis than it produces the data and in no event shall it be required to provide the data more frequently than once an hour.
- 6.2** In responding to all other data requests, each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider shall make available the requested data within 45 days of receipt of the written request. Unless otherwise agreed upon, the Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider is not required to alter the format in which it maintains or uses the data.
- 6.3** If making available any requested data under parts 6.1 or 6.2 of this requirement is contrary to the Transmission Operator's or Transmission Service Provider's confidentiality, regulatory, or security requirements, the Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider shall not be required to make available that data; provided that, within 45 days of the written request, it responds to the requesting registered entity specifying the data that is not being

provided, on what basis and whether there are any options for resolving any of the confidentiality, regulatory or security concerns.

M6. Examples of evidence for a data request that involves providing data at regular intervals on an ongoing basis (6.1), include, but are not limited to:

- Dated records of a registered entity's request, and examples of the response being met;
- Dated records of a registered entity's request, a statement from the requestor that the request was met (demonstration that the response was met is not required if the requestor confirms it is being provided); or
- A statement by the Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider that they have received no requests under this requirement.

Examples of evidence for all other data requests (6.2) include, but are not limited to:

- Dated records of a registered entity's request, and the response to the request;
- Dated records of a registered entity's request, a statement from the requestor that the request was met; or
- A statement by the Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider that they have received no requests under this requirement.

An example of evidence of a response by the Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider that providing the data would be contrary to the registered entity's confidentiality, regulatory, or security requirements (6.3) includes a response to the requestor specifying the data that is not being provided, on what basis and whether there are any options for resolving any of the confidentiality, regulatory, or security concerns.

C. Compliance

1. Compliance Monitoring Process:

1.1. Compliance Enforcement Authority:

As defined in the NERC Rules of Procedure, “Compliance Enforcement Authority” refers to NERC or the Regional Entity in their respective roles of monitoring and enforcing compliance with the NERC Reliability Standards.

1.2. Evidence Retention:

The following evidence retention periods identify the period of time ~~a registered~~ entity is required to retain specific evidence to demonstrate compliance. For instances in which the evidence retention period specified below is shorter than the time since the last audit, the Compliance Enforcement Authority may ask the registered entity to provide other evidence to show that it was compliant for the full time period since the last audit.

- Implementation and methodology documents shall be retained for five years.
- Components of the calculationsCalculations and the results of such calculations for all values contained in the~~other components of~~ implementation and methodology documents. ~~shall be retained to show compliance in calculating:~~
 - Hourly values for the most recent 14 days;
 - Daily values for the most recent 30 days; and
 - Monthly values for the most recent 60 days.
- If a Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider ~~responsible entity~~ is found non-compliant, it shall keep information related to the non-compliance until mitigation is complete and approved.
- The Compliance Enforcement Authority shall keep the last audit records and all requested and submitted subsequent audit records.

1.3. Compliance Monitoring and Assessment Processes:

- As defined in the NERC Rules of Procedure, “Compliance Monitoring and Assessment Processes” refers to the identification of the processes that will be used to evaluate data or information for the purpose of assessing performance or outcomes with the associated reliability standard.

1.4. Additional Compliance Information:

- None

D. Regional Variances

None.

E. Interpretations

None.

F. Associated Documents

None.

Table of Compliance Elements

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R1	Operations Planning	Lower	<p>EachThe Transmission Operator <u>that determines TFC or TTC has not described its method for accounting for one of the limitations listed in part 1.1 in its written prepared, kept current, and implemented a methodology. (1.1)</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p>Each that is used by its Transmission Operator <u>that determines TFC or</u></p>	<p>EachThe Transmission Operator <u>that determines TFC or TTC has not described its method for accounting for two of the limitations listed in part 1.1 in its written prepared, kept current, and implemented a methodology. (1.1)</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p>Each that is used by its Transmission Operator <u>that determines TFC or</u></p>	<p>EachThe Transmission Operator <u>that determines TFC or TTC has not described its method for accounting for any of the limitations listed in part 1.1 in its written prepared, kept current, and implemented a methodology. (1.1)</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p>Each that is used by its Transmission Operator <u>that determines TFC or</u></p>	<p>EachThe Transmission Operator <u>that determines TFC or TTC did not develop prepare, keep current, or implement a written methodology for describing its current practices for determining TFC or TTC values.</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p>Each Transmission Operator <u>that uses TFC or TTC developed a written methodology</u></p>

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
			<p><u>TTC has not described its method for accounting for one of the element listed in part 1.2 in its written methodology, provided that element impacts its TFC or TTC determination. (1.2)</u></p> <p>Service Provider, but does not address one of the requirement parts.</p>	<p><u>TTC has not described its method for accounting for two, three, or four elements listed in part 1.2 in its written methodology, provided those elements impacts its TFC or TTC determination.</u></p> <p><u>(1.2) Service Provider, but does not address two of the requirement parts.</u></p>	<p><u>TTC has not described its method for accounting for five, six, or seven elements of listed in part 1.2 in its written methodology, provided those elements impacts its TFC or TTC determination. (1.2)</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>Each Transmission Operator that determines TFC or TTC has not described the process for including any reliability-related constraints that have been requested by another Transmission Operator, provided the constraints are also used in the requesting Transmission Operator’s TFC or TTC calculation and the request referenced</u></p>	<p><u>for determining TFC or TTC but the methodology did not reflect its current practices for determining TFC or TTC values.</u></p>

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
					<p><u>part 1.3. (1.3)</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>Each Transmission Operator that determines TFC or TTC has not used (i) an impact test process for including requested constraints, (ii) a process to account for requested constraints that have a five percent or greater distribution factor for a transfer between areas in the TTC determination, or (iii) a mutually agreed upon method for determining whether requested constraints need to be included in the TFC or TTC determination. (1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.3.3)Service Provider, but does not address three of the</u></p>	

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
					requirement parts.	
R2	Operations Planning	Lower	<p><u>Each Transmission Service Provider that determines AFC or ATC has not described its method for accounting for one of the elements listed in part 2.1 in its written methodology, provided that element impacts its AFC or ATC determination. (2.1)</u></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><u>Each Transmission Service Provider that determines AFC or ATC has not described its method for accounting for two, three, or four elements listed in part 2.1 in its written methodology, provided the elements impact its AFC or ATC determination. (2.1)</u></p> <p>None.</p>	<p><u>Each Transmission Service Provider that determines AFC or ATC has not described its method for accounting for five, six, or seven elements listed in part 2.1 in its written methodology, provided the elements impact its AFC or ATC determination. (2.1)</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>Each Transmission Service Provider that uses the Flowgate Methodology did not use the AFC determined by the Transmission Service Provider for reliability constraints identified</u></p>	<p><u>Each The Transmission Service Provider that determines AFC or ATC did not develop prepared an ATCID describing its AFC or ATC methodology.</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>Each The Transmission Service Provider that determines AFC or ATC did not reflect its kept current practices for determining AFC or ATC values in its an ATCID.</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>The Transmission Service Provider has not implemented an ATCID.</u></p>

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R3	Operations Planning	Lower	None.	None.	None. in part 1.3. (2.2)	<p>EachThe Transmission Service Provider <u>that uses CBM values did</u> has not <u>develop</u> prepared a CBMID <u>describing its method for determining CBM values.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>EachThe Transmission Service Provider <u>that uses CBM values did</u> has not <u>reflect its</u> kept current <u>practices for determining CBM values in its</u> a CBMID.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Transmission Service Provider has not <u>implemented a</u> CBMID.</p>

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R4	Operations Planning	Lower	None.	None.	None.	<p><u>Each</u>The Transmission Operator <u>that uses TRM values did</u>has not <u>develop</u>prepare a TRMID <u>describing its method for determining TRM values.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p><u>Each</u>The Transmission Operator <u>that uses TRM values did</u>has not <u>reflect its</u>keep current <u>practices for determining TRM values in its</u>a TRMID.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Transmission Operator has not implemented a TRMID.</p>
R5	Operations Planning	Lower	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider did not respond</u> The responsible entity responds to a	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider did not respond</u> The responsible entity responds to a	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider did not respond</u> The responsible entity responds to a	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider failed</u> The responsible entity fails to respond to a written

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
			written request by one or more of the <u>registered</u> entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R5 within 45 in 31 or more calendar days from the date of the <u>request</u> , but <u>did not respond within 75</u> not more than 60 calendar days after the request .	written request by one or more of the <u>registered</u> entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R5 within 76 in 61 or more calendar days from the date of the <u>request</u> , but <u>did not respond within 105</u> not more than 90 calendar days after the request .	written request by one or more of the <u>registered</u> entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R5 within 106 in 91 or more calendar days from the date of the <u>request</u> , but <u>did not respond within 135</u> not more than 120 calendar days after the request .	request by one or more of the entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R5.
R6	Operations Planning	Lower	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider did not respond</u> The responsible entity responds to a written request <u>for data</u> by one or more of the <u>registered</u> entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R6 <u>by making the requested</u> to share data <u>available within</u> used in 45 their TTC or ATC calculation in 31 or more calendar days <u>from the</u>	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider did not respond</u> The responsible entity responds to a written request <u>for data</u> by one or more of the <u>registered</u> entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R6 <u>by making data available within 76</u> to share data used in their TTC or ATC calculation in 61 or more calendar days <u>from the date of the</u>	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider did not respond</u> The responsible entity responds to a written request by one or more of the <u>registered</u> entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R6 <u>by making</u> to share data <u>available within 106</u> used in their TTC or ATC calculation in 91 or more calendar days <u>from the date of the</u>	<u>Each Transmission Operator or Transmission Service Provider failed</u> The responsible entity fails to respond to a written request <u>for data by making data available to</u> by one or more of the entities specified in <u>Requirement</u> requirement R6.

R #	Time Horizon	VRF	Violation Severity Levels (VSLs)			
			Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
			<p><u>date of the request,</u> but <u>did respond within</u> <u>75</u>not more than 60 calendar days after the request.</p>	<p><u>request, but did</u> <u>respond within 105</u>not more than 90 calendar days after the request.</p>	<p><u>request, but did</u> <u>respond within 135</u>not more than 120 calendar days after the request.</p>	

DRAFT

D. Regional Variances

None.

E. Interpretations

None.

F. Associated Documents

None.

DRAFT

Guidelines and Technical Basis

Please see the MOD A White Paper for further information regarding the technical basis for each requirement.