

145 FERC ¶ 61,064  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Jon Wellinghoff, Chairman;  
Philip D. Moeller, John R. Norris,  
Cheryl A. LaFleur, and Tony Clark.

Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.

Docket No. ER13-2233-000

ORDER ACCEPTING IN PART AND REJECTING IN PART PROPOSED  
TARIFF REVISIONS

(Issued October 22, 2013)

1. On August 23, 2013, Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) submitted proposed revisions to its Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff (Tariff) to comply with the requirements of Order Nos. 676-G<sup>1</sup> and 764<sup>2</sup> (August 23 Filing). On August 27, 2013, MISO submitted an errata to its filing (August 27 Errata),<sup>3</sup> and on October 4, 2013, MISO submitted supplemental information (October 4 Supplement). In this order, we accept the Tariff revisions to comply with Order No. 676-G, effective May 6, 2013, and accept in part and reject in part MISO's proposed Tariff revisions to comply with Order No. 764.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities*, Order No. 676-G, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,343 (2013) (cross-referenced at 142 FERC ¶ 61,131 (2013)).

<sup>2</sup> *Integration of Variable Energy Resources*, Order No. 764, 77 FR 41,482 (July 13, 2012), FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,331, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 764-A, 141 FERC ¶ 61,232 (2012), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 764-B, 144 FERC ¶ 61,222 (2013).

<sup>3</sup> The August 27 Errata resubmitted Attachment J to the filing to correct non-substantive formatting issues.

## I. Order No. 764 Compliance

### A. Background

2. On June 22, 2012, the Commission issued Order No. 764, which requires each public utility transmission provider to: (1) offer intra-hourly transmission scheduling at 15-minute intervals; and (2) incorporate provisions into the *pro forma* Large Generator Interconnection Agreement (LGIA) requiring interconnection customers whose generating facilities are variable energy resources (VER)<sup>4</sup> to provide meteorological and forced outage data to the public utility transmission provider for the purpose of power production forecasting. The Commission also provided guidance regarding the development and evaluation of proposals related to recovering the costs of regulation reserves associated with VER integration.<sup>5</sup>

3. The reforms adopted in Order No. 764 were designed to remove barriers to the integration of VERs and to ensure that the rates, terms, and conditions for Commission-jurisdictional services provided by public utility transmission providers are just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential.<sup>6</sup> Upon noting the increasing number of VERs being brought online, the Commission found that reforms were needed to ensure that transmission customers are not exposed to excessive or unduly discriminatory charges, and that public utility transmission providers have the information needed to efficiently manage reserve-related costs.

4. In Order No. 764, the Commission amended the *pro forma* Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) to provide all transmission customers the option of using more frequent transmission scheduling within each operating hour, at 15-minute intervals.<sup>7</sup> The Commission found transmission customers' inability to adjust their transmission schedules within the hour to reflect changes in generation output can cause charges for Schedule 9 generator imbalance service to be unjust and unreasonable or unduly discriminatory. Thus, this reform was designed to allow transmission customers

---

<sup>4</sup> Order No. 764 defined a VER as a device for the production of electricity that is characterized by an energy source that: (1) is renewable; (2) cannot be stored by the facility owner or operator; and (3) has variability that is beyond the control of the facility owner or operator.

<sup>5</sup> Order No. 764, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,331 at P 4.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* P 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* P 91.

the flexibility to adjust their transmission schedules, in advance of real-time, to reflect the variability of output in generation, more accurate power production forecasts, and other changes in load profiles and system conditions.<sup>8</sup> It was also designed to allow public utility transmission providers, over time, to use fewer reserves to maintain overall system balance.<sup>9</sup> Finally, the Commission implemented this reform to ensure that charges for generator imbalance service under Schedule 9 of the *pro forma* OATT and for other ancillary services through which reserve-related costs are recovered are just and reasonable and are not unduly discriminatory.

5. In Order No. 764 in response to concerns regarding the cost of implementing intra-hour scheduling and possibly required changes in settlement procedures, the Commission stated that to the extent a public utility transmission provider believes that aligning the imbalance settlement with the intra-hour scheduling interval or implementing sub-hourly dispatch will result in more efficient operations, provide appropriate price signals to customers, or address other potential issues, it may seek any authorizations necessary from the Commission to do so under section 205 of the FPA. Such proposal could be submitted contemporaneously with the compliance filing in response to Order No. 764.<sup>10</sup> In addition, in response to requests for regional variation in scheduling protocols the Commission acknowledged that future market enhancements in addition to existing 30-minute scheduling practices and other tools might yield equivalent or greater benefits to transmission customers and public utility transmission providers when reducing the scheduling interval from 30 to 15 minutes and thus could be consistent with or superior to the Final Rule's intra-hour scheduling requirements. Thus, the Commission affirmed the ability of a public utility transmission provider to submit alternative proposals that are consistent with or superior to the intra-hour scheduling requirements. Specifically, the Commission required that a public utility transmission provider demonstrate on compliance how its proposal provides equivalent or greater opportunities for transmission customers to mitigate Schedule 9 generator imbalance charges, and for the public utility transmission provider to lower its reserve-related costs, compared to market practices already in place within the region.<sup>11</sup>

6. The Commission amended the *pro forma* LGIA to require new interconnection customers whose generating facilities are VERs to provide meteorological and forced

---

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* P 92.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* P 95.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* P 105.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* PP 106-107.

outage data to the public utility transmission provider with which the customer is interconnected.<sup>12</sup> Such data would only be required where it is necessary for that public utility transmission provider to develop and deploy power production forecasting. This reform was designed to facilitate public utility transmission providers' use of power production forecasts, which the Commission found can provide public utility transmission providers with advanced knowledge of system conditions needed to manage the variability of VER generation through the unit commitment and dispatch process, rather than through the deployment of more costly reserve service, such as regulation reserves. In requiring this change to the *pro forma* LGIA, the Commission specified that reporting requirements for meteorological and forced outage data would be set forth in Appendix C, Interconnection details of an LGIA, as they may change from time to time.<sup>13</sup> The Commission declined to modify existing LGIAs or to require changes to the *pro forma* OATT,<sup>14</sup> upon finding that such changes would, in effect, impose the data reporting requirements on existing interconnection customers, including small generator interconnection customers, retroactively.<sup>15</sup>

7. In Order No. 764, the Commission stated that the flexibility of providing meteorological and forced outage data requirements in business practices or market rules is not a superior alternative in implementing the reforms of the Final Rule.<sup>16</sup> Rather, the Commission addressed public utility transmission providers' need for flexibility by requiring the reporting requirement to be set forth in Appendix C of the LGIA. Appreciating that public utility transmission providers in some regions have already implemented meteorological or forced outage data requirements in their business practices and market rules, the Commission allowed public utility transmission providers to demonstrate on compliance how continued use of such practices is consistent with or superior to the requirements of Order No. 764.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* P 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* P 193.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* P 195.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* P 196.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* P 194.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

8. On December 20, 2012, the Commission issued Order No. 764-A, largely affirming the reforms adopted in Order No. 764. Among other things, Order No. 764-A extended the deadline for compliance with Order No. 764 to November 12, 2013.<sup>18</sup> On September 19, 2013, the Commission issued Order No. 764-B, which granted in part and denied in part the requests for clarification and denied the requests for rehearing of the Commission's determinations in Order No. 764-A.

### **B. Compliance Filing**

9. In its August 23 Filing, MISO proposes Tariff revisions to comply with the Commission's directives in Order No. 764. MISO notes that it discussed the proposed changes in several stakeholder forums and did not receive negative feedback.<sup>19</sup>

10. MISO's existing tariff permits interchange schedules to begin and end every 15 minutes and establishes that notifications of schedule changes may be made up to 30 minutes prior, except that changes to schedules starting at :30 and :45 of the hour must be made no later than the beginning of the hour. On compliance with Order No. 764, MISO proposes to add new language in sections 13.8 and 14.6 of the Tariff that, *inter alia*, explicitly provides for intra-hour scheduling at 15-minute intervals for Firm and Non-Firm Point-to-Point Transmission Service.<sup>20</sup> With regard to section 40.2.12 and Attachment J, MISO proposes to revise its Tariff to specify the four 15-minute intervals used for Interchange Schedule implementation.<sup>21</sup> In section 40.2.12, MISO proposes a revision to allow for the submission of interchange schedules up to 20 minutes, rather than the existing 30 minutes, before the start of the :00 and :15 schedules. As such, Attachment J would retain MISO's existing limitation that the :30 and :45 schedules must be made by the beginning of the hour.

11. MISO proposes to retain this limitation based on previous economic studies conducted in 2007 and 2008 by its Independent Market Monitor (Potomac Economics) examining intra-hour transactions between MISO and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM). MISO states that these studies indicated "that nearly 60 percent of intra-hour

---

<sup>18</sup> Order No. 764-A, 141 FERC ¶ 61,232 at P 8.

<sup>19</sup> August 23 Filing at 4-5.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 6-7. MISO's proposed modifications for sections 13.8 and 14.6 also include minor language adjustments that describe delivery of capacity, adjustment for losses, and interaction with Attachment J.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* at 7-9.

schedules occurred in the final 15 minutes of the hour, likely because entities were able to see the prices at the beginning of the hour, which prices would be included in the hourly settlement for the transactions.”<sup>22</sup> According to MISO, the Independent Market Monitor concluded that this issue contributed to price volatility and inefficient transactions that, although mostly profitable, did not contribute to price convergence between the MISO and PJM markets. MISO states that preventing market participants from seeing prices before scheduling transactions was one of the potential remedial actions recommended by its Independent Market Monitor and that this scheduling limitation was previously accepted by the Commission.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, MISO maintains that retaining this limitation is consistent with the existing scheduling notification requirements of the *pro forma* OATT,<sup>24</sup> which, according to MISO, were not modified in Order No. 764.<sup>25</sup>

12. Additionally, MISO proposes to revise its Attachment X (Generator Interconnection Procedures) and its *pro forma* LGIA to comply with data requirements set forth in Order No. 764. MISO proposes to add the definition of a VER, as adopted by the Commission in Order No. 764,<sup>26</sup> to section 1 of Attachment X and article 1 of the MISO *pro forma* LGIA.<sup>27</sup> MISO also proposes to add section 8.4, “Provision of Data

---

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* at 7-8 (citing Potomac Economics, *2007 State of the Market Report* at 122-123, 127 (Jul. 2008)). The Independent Market Monitor elaborated, stating that paying market participants based on hourly prices can create an incentive, in certain circumstances, to submit economically inefficient schedules for the final 15 minutes of the hour. Because prices from the beginning of the hour are factored into the price upon which settlement is based, beginning of the hour prices, rather than the expected prices in the final 15 minutes, can encourage schedules in the wrong direction and can contribute to price volatility.

<sup>23</sup> August 23 Filing at 8-9 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 128 FERC 61,279 (2009) (*MISO*)).

<sup>24</sup> MISO states that the *pro forma* OATT allows scheduling changes “up to twenty (20) minutes [or a reasonable time that is generally accepted in the region and is consistently adhered to by the Transmission Provider] before the start of the next scheduling interval provided that the Delivering Party and Receiving Party also agree to the schedule modification.” *Id.* at 9.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* (citing Order No. 764, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,331 at P 118).

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at 9 (citing Order No. 764, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,331 at P 210).

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* at 9.

from a [VER],” to the LGIA as provided in Order No. 764, but includes several non-conforming changes from the *pro forma* language provided in Order No. 764.<sup>28</sup>

13. In its October 4 Supplement, MISO filed errata to the transmittal letter providing justification for its proposed deviations from section 8.4 of the *pro forma* LGIA. According to MISO, in assessing its data needs related to VERs, MISO determined it potentially needed, but did not immediately need, the data required in section 8.4. MISO states that substituting “at a minimum” with “will, upon request from the Transmission Provider” provides the flexibility to request site-specific meteorological data without burdening VER entities through an additional requirement.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, MISO states that because it already provides data submission requirements in its Business Practices Manuals, it added a reference to Business Practices Manuals to section 8.4 as a location for meteorological and forced outage data.<sup>30</sup>

## II. Order No. 676-G Compliance

### A. Background

14. On February 21, 2013, the Commission issued Order No. 676-G and revised its regulations at 18 C.F.R. § 38.2(a) (which establish standards for business practices and electronic communications for public utilities)<sup>31</sup> to incorporate by reference<sup>32</sup> updated business practice standards adopted by the Wholesale Electric Quadrant (WEQ) of the North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB) to categorize various products and services for demand response and energy efficiency and to support the measurement and verification of these products and services in organized wholesale electric markets.<sup>33</sup> In

---

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* at 10.

<sup>29</sup> October 4 Supplement at 1. MISO’s proposed section 8.4 of its LGIA deviates from *pro forma* language by stating that Interconnection Customers with either wind- or solar-powered VERs “will, upon request from the Transmission Provider,” rather than “at a minimum,” be required to provide MISO with various data. *See* Ex. No. C.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* at 1-2.

<sup>31</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 38.2(a) (2013).

<sup>32</sup> Incorporation by reference makes compliance with these standards mandatory for public utilities subject to Part 38 of the Commission’s regulations.

<sup>33</sup> Order No. 676-G, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,343 at P1 (cross-referenced at 142 FERC ¶ 61,131).

Order No. 676-G, the Commission stated that if adoption of these standards does not require any changes or revisions to existing OATT provisions, Regional Transmission Organizations (RTOs) and Independent System Operators (ISOs) “may comply with this rule by adding a provision to their OATTs that incorporates the standards adopted in this rule by reference, including the standard number used to identify the standard.”<sup>34</sup> The Commission also stated that it would allow RTOs and ISOs to file these changes as part of an unrelated tariff filing by December 31, 2013.<sup>35</sup>

### **B. Compliance Filing**

15. MISO proposes to revise Attachment Q (North American Electric Reliability Corporation Transmission Loading Relief Procedures Reference) of its Tariff to replace certain references to outdated WEQ measurement and verification standards with the standards adopted in Order No. 676-G. MISO states that because Attachment Q of the Tariff already incorporates by reference all other applicable NAESB standards and additional tariff changes are not required by Order No. 676-G, MISO’s Tariff revisions comply with the directives of Order No. 676-G.<sup>36</sup>

### **III. Notice of Filing and Responsive Pleadings**

16. Notices of MISO’s August 23 Filing and August 27 Errata were published in the *Federal Register*, 78 Fed. Reg. 54,247 and 54,463 (2013), with interventions and protests due on or before September 17, 2013. Timely motions to intervene were filed by PJM; Exelon Corporation; NextEra Energy Resources, LLC; Consumers Energy Company; Wisconsin Electric Power Company; Xcel Energy Services Inc. (Xcel);<sup>37</sup> and Ameren Services Company (Ameren).<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> *Id.* P 56.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* P 55.

<sup>36</sup> Transmittal Letter at 11.

<sup>37</sup> Xcel filed on behalf of Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation, and Northern States Power Company, a Wisconsin corporation.

<sup>38</sup> Ameren filed on behalf of Ameren Energy Generating Company, Ameren Energy Marketing Company, Ameren Illinois Company, AmerenEnergy Resources Generating Company, and Union Electric Company.

#### IV. Discussion

##### A. Procedural Matters

17. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2013), the timely, unopposed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding.

##### B. Commission Determination

###### 1. Order No. 764

18. In Order No. 764, the Commission stated that a public utility transmission provider with provisions in its existing OATT that the Commission has deemed to be consistent with or superior to the *pro forma* OATT being modified by Order No. 764 can seek to demonstrate that those previously approved variations continue to be consistent with or superior to the *pro forma* OATT as modified by Order No. 764.<sup>39</sup> We find that MISO has not made such a demonstration and, therefore, accept in part and reject in part MISO's proposed Tariff revisions relating to its Order No. 764 compliance.

19. In Order No. 764, the Commission discussed a new scheduling policy that contemplated not just the ability to schedule on a 15-minute basis, but also the ability to *change such schedules* sufficiently close to operating time in order to address the intermittent output of VERs and other system variations.<sup>40</sup> The Commission finds that MISO's proposal to retain its existing scheduling limitations for the :30 and :45 schedules does not comply with the scheduling requirements of Order No. 764.

---

<sup>39</sup> Order No. 764, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,331 at P 374.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.* P 22 (“implementation of intra-hour scheduling under the Final Rule will provide VERs and other transmission customers the flexibility to *adjust their transmission schedules*, thus limiting their exposure to imbalance charges” (emphasis added)), P 92 (“In this Final Rule, we take an additional step to allow transmission customers the flexibility to *adjust their transmission schedules in advance of real-time*, to reflect the variability of output in generation, more accurate power production forecasts to predict output, and other changes in load profiles and system conditions” (emphasis added)), and P 93 (“The Commission concludes that [the] *lack of ability to update transmission schedules within the hour* can cause charges for Schedule 9 generation imbalance service to be unjust and unreasonable or unduly discriminatory” (emphasis added)). *See also* Order No. 764-A, 141 FERC ¶ 61,232 at PP 4, 15.

20. Order No. 764 allows transmission providers to attempt to show that existing tariff provisions should be continued or to submit alternative proposals to comply with the Order; any such deviation must be accompanied by a demonstration that the alternative is “consistent with or superior to the intra-hour scheduling requirements of this Final Rule and are otherwise just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential.”<sup>41</sup> In support of its proposal, MISO cites to the statement in Order No. 764 that the *pro forma* language “provides adequate flexibility for transmission providers to adopt alternative deadlines for accepting scheduling changes.”<sup>42</sup> That statement, however, was made in response to a commenter who wanted to give transmission providers discretion to use shorter notification procedures and the ability to make schedule changes after the notice deadline.<sup>43</sup> It does not support MISO’s proposal to require notification periods for the :30 and :45 schedules that are longer and different than required by the *pro forma* OATT.

21. MISO further asserts that its notification practice is “consistent with” the *pro forma* OATT because it is a “reasonable time that is generally accepted in the region and is consistently adhered to by MISO for scheduling changes.”<sup>44</sup> However, this falls short of the required demonstration that its transmission scheduling practices provide the opportunity for a transmission customer to update its transmission schedule closer to operation and thus mitigate Schedule 9 generator imbalance charges.

22. The 2007 Independent Market Monitor report cited in MISO’s compliance filing offers both a short- and long-term recommendation to address intra-hour scheduling. Specifically, the report recognized that in MISO, intra-hour schedules settle at the average price and quantity over the hour in which they occur and that “[t]he divergence between the actual flows and the financial treatment of flows may create inefficient participant incentives.” The Independent Market Monitor’s long-term recommendation is for MISO “to consider the feasibility of settling intra-hour transactions on a 15-minute basis to align the incentives of participants with those of the system,” while recommending that, in the short-run, MISO “require that intra-hour transactions be scheduled by the beginning of the hour (45 minutes in advance).”<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> *Id.* at P 374.

<sup>42</sup> Transmittal Letter at 9, citing Order No. 764 at P 118.

<sup>43</sup> Order No. 764 at P 117.

<sup>44</sup> Transmittal Letter at 9.

<sup>45</sup> Potomac Economics, *2007 State of the Market Report* (Jul. 2008).

23. Further, in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking preceding Order No. 764, MISO submitted comments also citing the 2007 and 2008 Independent Market Monitor reports, arguing that large changes in Scheduled Interchange could result in price volatility and inefficiency.<sup>46</sup> While the Commission did not specifically reference MISO's comments in Order No. 764, the Commission addressed concerns about the alignment between the scheduling interval and the settlement interval by stating that, to the extent a public utility transmission provider believes that aligning the imbalance settlement with the intra-hour scheduling interval or implementing sub-hourly dispatch will result in more efficient operation, provide appropriate price signals to customers, or other potential issues, it may seek authorization to do so under section 205 of the FPA. The Commission offered that such proposals could be submitted contemporaneously with the compliance filing in response to the Final Rule.<sup>47</sup> MISO has not submitted such a filing.

24. Additionally, we find that MISO's proposed Tariff revisions related to data reporting requirements have not been shown to be consistent with or superior to the requirements of Order No. 764. MISO proposes several non-conforming changes, one of which proposes to place meteorological and forced outage data requirements in its Business Practices Manuals and Appendix C of its LGIA without clarifying whether such requirements will be divided between or duplicated in both locations. While MISO indicated that these changes would provide it flexibility to request data when it is needed rather than requiring data before it is necessary, such changes would allow MISO to unilaterally modify data requirements via changes in its Business Practice Manuals. In Order No. 764-A, the Commission expressed concern regarding the ability of public utility transmission providers to impose VER forecast data requirements unilaterally, and that such changes must be supported.<sup>48</sup> We find that MISO has not made such a showing for its Order No. 764 compliance revisions. MISO additionally proposes to substitute "at a minimum" with "will, upon request from the Transmission Provider" in section 8.4 of the *pro forma* LGIA to reduce difficulties for generators while still providing MISO the option to request site-specific meteorological data. We conditionally accept MISO's

---

<sup>46</sup> Order No. 764, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,331 at P 87.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.* P 105.

<sup>48</sup> *See, e.g.*, Order No. 764-A, 141 FERC ¶ 61,232 at P 38 ("It would be unfair to allow public utility transmission providers to unilaterally impose unexpected costs associated with data reporting provisions on existing interconnection customers without being required to make at least some showing that specific data sought by the transmission provider (and the associated costs) are just and reasonable.").

proposed use of “will, upon request from the Transmission Provider” subject to MISO clarifying that it will negotiate with the interconnection customer which of the data elements MISO requires prior to executing the interconnection agreement so that MISO is not unilaterally imposing requirements not memorialized in the *pro forma* LGIA.

25. As we are accepting in part and rejecting in part the instant attempt by MISO to comply with Order No. 764, we expect MISO to submit a compliance filing by the November 12, 2013 deadline established for such filings consistent with the guidance provided in this order.<sup>49</sup>

## 2. Order No. 676-G

26. We find that MISO’s proposed revisions to Attachment Q of its Tariff comply with the directives of Order No. 676-G. Order No. 676-G allows RTOs and ISOs to comply by adding a provision to their OATTs that incorporates by reference the standards adopted in Order No. 676, provided the adoption of these standards does not require any changes or revisions to their existing OATT provisions.<sup>50</sup> Because MISO incorporates by reference the aforementioned standards and its existing Tariff does not require any changes or revisions to adopt these standards, we accept MISO’s proposed Attachment Q revisions. We also clarify that MISO’s Tariff revisions in Attachment Q related to Order No. 676-G compliance are exclusive of any other changes made in this filing. Therefore, the Commission’s acceptance here does not affect MISO’s compliance with Order No. 764 or any future filing.

### The Commission orders:

(A) MISO’s proposed Tariff revisions filed in compliance with Order No. 676-G are hereby accepted, effective May 6, 2013, as discussed in the body of this order.

---

<sup>49</sup> MISO should take care to file its compliance filing in eTariff under code 80, and any proposed Tariff revisions that are outside the scope of compliance under a code appropriate for section 205 Tariff changes.

<sup>50</sup> Order No. 676-G, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,343 at PP 55-56 (cross-referenced at 142 FERC ¶ 61,131).

(B) MISO's proposed Tariff revisions relating to its compliance with Order No. 764 are hereby accepted in part and rejected in part, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

( S E A L )

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.