

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

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

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.	Docket Nos. ER14-1405-001
Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.	ER14-1406-000 ER14-1406-001
Southwest Power Pool, Inc.	ER14-1407-000 ER14-1407-001

ORDER ON REVISIONS TO JOINT OPERATING AGREEMENTS

(Issued July 25, 2014)

1. In this order, the Commission accepts proposed revisions to Attachment 2 and Article XX of the Joint Operating Agreement between Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) (MISO-PJM JOA) and Attachment 1 and Article XIX of the JOA between MISO and Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (SPP) (MISO-SPP JOA), effective on August 8, 2014, and conditionally accepts proposed revisions to Attachment 2 of the MISO-SPP JOA, subject to the outcome of the proceeding in Docket No. ER13-1864-000.¹ The accepted revisions are to the Congestion Management Process and Change Management Process sections in both JOAs.

¹ See Southwest Power Pool, Inc., Docket No. ER13-1864-000 (proposed Market-to-Market Protocols as Attachment 2 (Interregional Coordination Process) to the MISO-SPP JOA, requesting March 1, 2015 effective date).

I. Background

2. On March 3, 2014, PJM, MISO and SPP (the RTOs) proposed revisions to the JOAs to require each RTO to apply one methodology consistently in calculating²: (1) Market Flow; (2) Firm Flow Entitlement/Firm Flow Limit; and (3) tagged transaction impact calculations within the Interchange Distribution Calculator. MISO and SPP state that the proposed revisions resolve a dispute between them regarding calculations involved in the Market-to-Market protocols. Since the proposed changes affect key components of the Market-to-Market protocols, MISO and PJM propose making the same revisions to the MISO-PJM JOA. The RTOs state that the RTOs are not required to use the same calculation methodology; instead, each RTO must apply its chosen methodology consistently.

3. More specifically, the RTOs propose revisions to section 4.1 of the Congestion Management Process of the JOAs.³ For the aforementioned calculations, the revisions state that each RTO may choose one of the following three methodologies: (1) Point of Receipt/Point of Delivery (POR/POD); (2) Marginal Zone; or (3) Slice of System.⁴ MISO and PJM state that they have chosen the Marginal Zone methodology, while SPP states that it will continue to use the POR/POD methodology. The proposed revisions also require each RTO to post and maintain a document on its public website that describes the calculations and assumptions used in its calculations, as they relate to the treatment of import and export tagged transactions. MISO and SPP also propose to revise the MISO-SPP JOA to reflect revisions to section 4.1 of the Congestion

² Appendix A to this order lists the tariff sections filed by the RTOs.

³ See MISO-SPP JOA, Attachment 1, Congestion Management Process, Executive Summary and sections 4.1, 4.1.1; see also MISO-PJM JOA, Attachment 2, Congestion Management Process, Executive Summary and sections 4.1, 4.1.1.

⁴ The purpose of the Congestion Management Process is to determine the impact of a market transaction (e.g., Market Flow, imports and exports) on two RTOs' transmission systems. The three calculation methodologies accomplish this in the following manners: (1) POR/POD uses hypothetical generation resources and loads to assign market transactions to specific units; (2) Marginal Zone methodology divides the entire system into zones, determines the most economical generators in each zone based on marginal cost (*i.e.*, marginal generators), and allocates the market transaction across those marginal generators; and (3) Slice of System methodology also takes a system-wide approach but considers the average of all available generators in determining the transmission capacity needed for the market transaction.

Management Process in the MISO-PJM JOA, regarding the treatment of jointly-owned generators and pseudo-tie generators, which the Commission accepted in 2013.⁵

4. The RTOs state that, to properly account for tagged transactions, an RTO that uses the Marginal Zone methodology will need to provide participation factors representing the facilities contributing to the transaction, specifically for the sources of tagged export transactions and for the sinks of the tagged import transactions. Accordingly, the RTOs propose to revise Appendix B of the Congestion Management Process in both JOAs to clarify and reflect the process for calculating a common distribution factor and the requirements for data reported to the Interchange Distribution Calculator. Further, MISO states that it will now transition from calculating marginal zone participation factors on a monthly basis to no less than once every 15 minutes.

5. Additionally, the RTOs propose revisions to the JOAs to provide that any change made to an individual RTO's methodology for the three calculations should be governed by the Change Management Process in the Market-to-Market protocols of each JOA.⁶ However, because SPP's and MISO's Market-to-Market protocols are pending in Docket No. ER13-1864-000 and will not be effective until March 1, 2015, the specific language of the proposed amendments varies between the MISO-SPP JOA and the MISO-PJM JOA.⁷

⁵ MISO Transmittal Letter at 4 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 143 FERC ¶ 61,097 (2013); *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Docket No. ER13-1052-001 (June 6, 2013) (delegated letter order)). These changes address load adjustment for imports and the treatment of tagged transactions associated with jointly owned units, which are not pseudo-tied, in the Market Flow calculations.

⁶ Specifically, MISO and SPP propose to add the following sections to the Change Management Process sections of the MISO-SPP JOA: 19.1 (Notice); 19.2 (Response to Notice); 19.3 (Implementation of Change); and 19.4 (Summary of Proposed Changes). MISO and PJM propose to revise section 20.1 (Notice) of the Change Management Process section of the MISO-PJM JOA.

⁷ The MISO-SPP JOA states that changes to the calculation methodologies are governed by the Change Management Process, whereas the MISO-PJM JOA, by virtue of such items falling under fully implemented Market-to-Market protocols, does not. MISO and SPP state that the proposed amendments to the Change Management Process of the MISO-SPP JOA (Article XIX) are intended to bridge the next nine months and, upon SPP's and MISO's implementation of their Market-to-Market protocols, MISO and SPP

(continued...)

II. Notice of Filings and Responsive Pleadings

6. Notice of PJM's filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 79 Fed. Reg. 14,026 (2014), with interventions and protests due on or before March 24, 2014. Timely motions to intervene were filed by American Electric Power Service Corporation (AEP), Exelon Corporation (Exelon), Wisconsin Electric Power Company, SPP and MISO. Timely motions to intervene and comments were filed by MidAmerican Energy Company (MidAmerican) and Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO). On April 8, 2014, the RTOs filed a joint motion for leave to file an answer and answer to the comments.

7. Notice of MISO's filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 79 Fed. Reg. 14,026 (2014), with interventions and protests due on or before March 24, 2014. Missouri Public Service Commission (Missouri Commission) filed a notice of intervention. Timely motions to intervene were filed by Cleco Power LLC, Exelon, AEP, Wisconsin Electric Power Company, SPP, Ameren Services Company, Consumers Energy Company and Western Area Power Administration. Timely motions to intervene and comments were filed by Kansas City Power & Light Company, KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company, and Nebraska Public Power District (collectively, KCP&L), MidAmerican and NIPSCO. On April 8, 2014, the RTOs filed a joint motion for leave to file an answer and answer to the comments

8. Notice of SPP's filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 79 Fed. Reg. 14,026 (2014), with interventions and protests due on or before March 24, 2014. The Missouri Commission filed a notice of intervention. Timely motions to intervene were filed by AEP, Exelon, Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Western Area Power Administration, Nebraska Public Power District, Sunflower Electric Power Corporation and MISO. Timely motions to intervene and comments were filed by MidAmerican, KCP&L and NIPSCO. On April 8, 2014, the RTOs filed a joint motion for leave to file an answer and answer to the comments.

A. Comments

9. KCP&L states that significant, unaccounted-for flows at the MISO/SPP seam are a long-standing issue. KCP&L maintains that having each RTO use a single methodology, while an improvement, does not resolve that concern. KCP&L states that MISO and SPP should be required to use the same calculation methodology because different calculation

will file an amendment to the MISO-SPP JOA to reflect the language in the MISO-PJM JOA.

methodologies may cause inequities to SPP transmission owners. According to KCP&L, the POR/POD methodology tracks flows with more granularity and accuracy than the Marginal Zone methodology. KCP&L asserts that, for the same flow, SPP's calculation will show that a given flow has a more significant impact on the reciprocal coordinated flowgate than MISO's calculation, which will cause SPP to re-dispatch its load when MISO would not.

10. KCP&L also states that, in considering the proposed revisions, the Commission should take into account other pending proceedings involving the MISO-SPP JOA. In particular, KCP&L points to the ongoing proceeding between MISO and SPP (the Capacity Sharing Proceedings) over MISO's use of SPP's transmission system to flow power between MISO Midwest and MISO South (the Entergy system) without, what KCP&L considers, appropriate compensation to SPP.⁸

11. KCP&L further states that the proposed definition of "Market Flow" in section 4.1 of the MISO-SPP JOA Congestion Management Process, while largely taken from section 2.1, defines Market Flow as internal generation serving internal load. KCP&L states that this definition does not take into account that a flow which originates in one MISO region may use a third party transmission system to reach another region of MISO and does not consider any such flows to be an import or export regardless of whether the RTO making the market flow has sufficient capacity to accommodate the flow. KCP&L asserts that the Commission should either: (1) find that such a flow should be considered an export out of and back into another MISO region instead of a MISO Market Flow; or (2) state that the definition of Market Flow in proposed section 4.1 is not determinative to the issue of whether MISO should compensate SPP for MISO's use of SPP's transmission system.

12. NIPSCO, a transmission owner in MISO, filed comments expressing support for MISO's and PJM's proposal to each apply one of the three calculation methodologies. However, NIPSCO states that it is concerned by the potential inconsistency in calculation methodologies between the RTOs. According to NIPSCO, the use of different

⁸ See *Southwest Power Pool, Inc. Complaint*, Docket No. EL14-21-000 (filed Jan. 28, 2014); *Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., Complaint*, Docket No. EL14-30-000 (filed Feb. 18, 2014); *Sw. Power Pool, Inc. v. FERC*, 736 F.3d 994 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (vacating and remanding orders of the Commission in Docket Nos. EL11-34-000 and EL11-34-001); and *Southwest Power Pool, Inc., Unexecuted Non-Conforming Service Agreement*, Docket No. ER14-1174-000 (filed Jan. 28, 2014). On March 28, 2014, the Commission set these matters for hearing and settlement judge procedures. *Southwest Power Pool, Inc.*, 146 FERC ¶ 61,231 (2014).

methodologies, and the resulting potential for differences in calculations by the RTOs, could result in operational decisions that lead to actual flows exceeding facility and operating limits and could lead to different results in calculating the impact of market-to-market events.⁹ NIPSCO points to a MISO presentation¹⁰ illustrating that different calculation methodologies could produce significantly different results, including one example in which the different methodologies produced Firm Flow Entitlements that differed by 127 MW.¹¹ NIPSCO also states that it is concerned by the lack of stakeholder involvement in the process for developing changes to the JOA and Congestion Management Process. NIPSCO highlights that a change to the market-to-market implementation process only requires that the RTOs notify each other and on a quarterly basis post a summary of the changes to the process on each RTO's respective website. NIPSCO asserts that changes in methodology have a potential for financial and operational impact, and that stakeholders should have an opportunity to obtain information and ask questions about proposed changes. NIPSCO also claims that the RTOs have not provided any information that either explains or demonstrates the impact, if any, of a change in methodology to the Financial Transmission Rights/Auction Revenue Rights allocation and auction process or the day-ahead market. Accordingly, NIPSCO requests that the Commission accept the proposals on an interim basis and require the RTOs to work through an open and transparent process, including a more robust stakeholder process, to resolve differences in calculation methodology within one year.

13. MidAmerican states that the revisions to section 4.1 (Market Flow Determination) of both JOAs, while intended to clarify the calculation of Market Flows, appear to conflict with its existing language. MidAmerican asserts that, as revised, section 4.1 appears to provide that "Market Flows represent the impacts of internal generation ... [and] Market Flows need not be based on internal generation." MidAmerican

⁹ NIPSCO Comment at 5.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 4 (citing Seams Management Working Group Presentation, "Market Flow Methodology Proposal," Jan. 6, 2014 at 7-9).

¹¹ NIPSCO states that, for example, for December 10, 2013, the MISO flowgate, BentnHrbr_Palisades345_Cook_Palisades345 (NERC ID 2336), had an average Firm Flow Entitlement calculation of 241 MW under the POR/POD methodology (current) but would have had an average Firm Flow Entitlement calculation of 185 MW if MISO was using the Marginal Zone methodology. Similarly, the average Market Flow calculation under the Slice-of-System methodology was -363 MW, but under the Marginal Zone methodology the average Market Flow increased to -319 MW. *Id.* at 4-5.

recommends deleting the language from section 4.1 stating that “Units assigned to serve a market area’s load do not need to reside within the market area’s footprint to be considered in the Market Flow calculation.” MidAmerican also identifies a minor typographical error in section 19.1 of the MISO-SPP JOA.

B. Answer

14. The RTOs argue that they do not need to use the same calculation methodology to capture transaction impacts. The RTOs state that they have fully vetted the proposal and, while acknowledging there are differences between methodologies, argue that each RTO’s chosen methodology is most appropriate for its market design. Additionally, the RTOs assert, differences in calculation methodologies do not result in equity issues since the firm rights (Firm Flow Entitlement/Firm Flow Limit) and actual usage calculations will model tagged transactions consistently.¹²

15. In response to KCP&L’s assertion that the RTOs’ proposed revisions to the JOA should not be approved without consideration of the potential impacts on the entire JOA, the RTOs state that they fully considered the potential impact of the proposed revised JOA and are comfortable that the proposed revisions do not affect any pending matters. The RTOs state that these matters were also raised, discussed and thoroughly vetted by each RTO’s stakeholder community before the filings were submitted.¹³

16. In response to NIPSCO’s concerns regarding the stakeholder process in developing changes to the JOAs, the RTOs argue that the stakeholder process is sufficient. The RTOs state that they discussed the changes made in this filing in a variety of forums and are unclear what further involvement NIPSCO is requesting. The RTOs state that NIPSCO’s assertion that they failed to meet the requirements of section 205 of the Federal Power Act¹⁴ is unfounded, noting that the JOA expressly authorizes RTOs to file mutually agreed upon revisions. Furthermore, the RTOs state, section 18.12 of PJM-MISO JOA, which describes the procedures to amend the JOA, provides that the JOA cannot be amended unless agreed to by the RTOs party to the agreement and accepted by

¹² RTOs Answer at 4-5.

¹³ *Id.* at 5-6.

¹⁴ 16 U.S.C. § 824d (2012).

the Commission. As a result, the RTOs contend, interested parties present concerns when revisions are filed with the Commission.¹⁵

17. In regard to MidAmerican's comments, the RTOs argue that clarification of section 4.1 of the JOAs is not necessary. The RTOs maintain that the sentence in question is consistent with the proposed amendments and necessary to clarify pseudo-tied load is included in Market Flow. Responding to MidAmerican's correction of a typographical error in section 19.1 of the MISO-SPP JOA, the RTOs agree and state they will make MidAmerican's suggested correction.¹⁶

III. Deficiency Letters and Responses

18. On April 24, 2014, deficiency letters were issued to the RTOs requesting additional information on the application of each calculation methodology both in general and in a day two market dispatched using security-constrained economic dispatch; on whether the RTOs use of different methodologies would result in inefficiencies; and on why each RTO believes that its chosen methodology best reflects its system's design and operation.

19. Notice of PJM's deficiency letter response (PJM Response) was published in the *Federal Register*, 79 Fed. Reg. 32,269 (2014), with interventions and protests due on or before June 17, 2014. None was filed.

20. Notice of MISO's deficiency letter response (MISO Response) was published in the *Federal Register*, 79 Fed. Reg. 32,269 (2014), with interventions and protests due on or before June 17, 2014. None was filed.

21. Notice of SPP's deficiency letter response (SPP Response) was published in the *Federal Register*, 79 Fed. Reg. 32,269 (2014), with interventions and protests due on or before June 18, 2014.¹⁷ None was filed.

¹⁵ RTOs Answer at 6-7.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁷ On May 28, 2014, SPP filed a motion requesting that the Commission accept the SPP Response for filing one day out-of-time.

22. Each RTO agrees that, regardless of the methodology used, the total impact of the RTOs' flows (Market Flow and Interchange Distribution Calculator impact) will be the same.¹⁸ The RTOs state that, while the POR/POD and Marginal Zone methodologies result in different values for Market Flow and interchange, they produce the same net total flow MW amount, and no flows are unaccounted-for between RTOs.¹⁹ PJM and MISO explain that, since total flows on the system are accounted for, no equity issues arise, nor will they be required to make any adjustments to allow SPP to use a different method so long as each RTO consistently applies its methodology to calculate the tagged transaction impacts.²⁰

23. PJM and MISO each states that it chose Marginal Zone for its respective system because Marginal Zone best reflects its system and because this methodology honors unit flexibility and ramp capabilities, and allows for greater granularity for identifying each generator's output and impact when accounting for tagged transactions.²¹ SPP maintains that the POR/POD methodology fits SPP's market design and operation because the processes in SPP's tariff for evaluating transmission service also use the POR/POD methodology.²² SPP states that, when the customer schedules the service in real time, that schedule is reflected in the Interchange Distribution Calculator with similar impacts on flowgates as was shown during the tariff evaluation when granting the service, such that when the Interchange Distribution Calculator assigns relief obligations to the tag (if over five percent impact on the constraint) and to the SPP Market Flow, the curtailment results in a reduction of the bilateral transaction consistent with the granting of the reservation for the transaction.²³

24. SPP also maintains that using the other two methodologies for the three real-time calculations could result in curtailments based on impacts to flowgates for which the

¹⁸ PJM Response at 3, 15-16; MISO Response, Attachment A, at 7, 14; SPP Response, Attachment A, at 7, 13-14.

¹⁹ PJM Response at 15-16; MISO Response, Attachment A, at 14; SPP Response, Attachment A, at 13-14.

²⁰ PJM Response at 16; MISO Response, Attachment A, at 9.

²¹ PJM Response at 16; MISO Response, Attachment A, at 8.

²² SPP Response, Attachment A, at 8.

²³ *Id.* at 8-10.

transaction was never evaluated, resulting in a shift of relief obligation between tags or between tags and Market Flow.²⁴ In addition, SPP states that switching to the Marginal Zone methodology for the three real-time calculations would require SPP to remodel all its systems to account for transaction impacts, an extensive stakeholder process, and extensive work with vendors to make new systems.²⁵

25. The RTOs originally requested an effective date of June 1, 2014 for the revisions of their JOAs. However, since significant software modifications are necessary to effectuate the proposed revisions, the RTOs amended their request, in their Responses, and requested an effective date of two weeks after the Commission issues an order accepting the RTOs proposed revisions.²⁶

IV. Discussion

A. Procedural Matters

26. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2013), the notice of intervention and timely, unopposed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to the proceedings in which they were filed.

27. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2013), prohibits an answer to a protest unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We will accept the RTOs' answer because it has assisted us in our decision-making process. We will also grant SPP's motion to accept filing of the SPP response one day out-of-time.

B. Substantive Matters

28. We will accept the RTOs' proposed revisions to the Congestion Management Process in the JOAs. Currently, there is no required internal consistency within these RTOs for the Congestion Management Process calculations. Accordingly, the proposed revisions are an improvement in that they require each RTO to choose one of the three calculation methodologies and to use it consistently in the calculation of Market Flow, Firm Flow Entitlements/Firm Flow Limit and Interchange Distribution Calculator impact

²⁴ *Id.* at 10.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ PJM Response at 2; MISO Response at 2; SPP Response at 2.

calculations. This consistency will account for total flows on the transmission system and prevent system overloading by using existing real-time applications to monitor flowgates external to an RTO's footprint.

29. KCP&L and NIPSCO argue that the lack of a consistent methodology across all the RTOs, and the resulting potential for differences in calculations by the RTOs, could result in operational decisions that lead to actual flows exceeding facility and operating limits. We find that, regardless of the chosen methodology, as long as that methodology is applied consistently to all of the calculations, the total flow captured will be the same. In addition, we find that each of the methodologies is just and reasonable; they calculate flows consistently between each of the RTOs, have previously been accepted by the Commission, and KCP&L and NIPSCO have not demonstrated that any of these methodologies are unjust and unreasonable. Imposing a uniform treatment across RTOs is beyond the scope of these filings. Moreover, we are not convinced that a single methodology is needed. As demonstrated by the examples in the RTOs' deficiency letter responses, the total flow resulting from an RTO's Market Flows and import and export transactions are captured through consistent use of a chosen calculation methodology (i.e., the total flow captured will be the same regardless of the chosen methodology, as long as that methodology is applied consistently within all of the RTO's calculations).

30. With respect to KCP&L's concern that the proposed definition of "Market Flow" in section 4.1 of the Congestion Management Process does not capture flows that originate and end in one RTO but that use another RTO's system (which is an issue in the Capacity Sharing Proceedings), the proposed definition of "Market Flow" is already in the accepted tariff language associated with the Congestion Management Process, in section 2.1 and in section 4.1, and is unchanged in the instant proposal. Therefore, we will accept the proposed definition of Market Flow. While we will accept the revisions to the Congestion Management Process, including those in section 4.1, our acceptance does not pre-judge the outcome of the Capacity Sharing Proceedings. Contrary to MidAmerican's arguments, the existing language is consistent with the revisions and is necessary to clarify that pseudo-tied load is included in Market Flow.

31. We also will accept the proposed revisions to the Change Management Process in the MISO-PJM JOA and conditionally accept the proposed revisions to the Change Management Process in the MISO-SPP JOA,²⁷ subject to the outcome of the proceeding

²⁷ The correction to the typographical error in section 19.1 of the MISO-SPP JOA, which MISO and SPP agree to make, may be incorporated into the JOA when MISO and SPP next file revisions.

in Docket No. ER13-1864-000.²⁸ NIPSCO's concern regarding the lack of stakeholder involvement in decisions by RTOs to change calculation methodologies does not bear upon the justness and reasonableness of the proposal to require each RTO to apply one methodology of the three calculation methodologies consistently within all of the RTO's calculations, and is therefore outside the scope of this proceeding. The Change Management Process revisions provide for notice once an RTO has decided to change calculation methodologies; neither the existing Congestion Management Process, nor the proposed revised Congestion Management Process, including the Change Management Process revisions, address how the RTO reaches a decision to change calculation methodologies.

32. We disagree with KCP&L that POR/POD is a superior methodology and provides greater granularity. The record here has not provided sufficient support for adopting any of the methodologies exclusively. However, the Marginal Zone methodology may, in theory, produce superior outcomes to the POR/POD methodology, because the POR/POD methodology is based on hypothetical, rather than actual, generation resources and loads. In an RTO with a day two market, including all RTOs in this filing, the RTO uses security-constrained economic dispatch to dispatch generation. Individual generators are not dispatched on a one-to-one basis to fulfill individual transactions; instead, the entire fleet is dispatched in a least-cost manner while respecting constraints on the system. Because the POR/POD methodology assigns import and export tagged transactions to specific units, it could be less accurate with respect to transaction impacts than the Marginal Zone methodology. The Marginal Zone methodology may better reflect the reality of RTO dispatch by security-constrained economic dispatch because the energy to support an export transaction is coming from multiple generators across the footprint, not one specified generator. Using a methodology that more accurately reflects the realities of security-constrained economic dispatch in a day two market allows better modeling of actual flows and loop flows and their associated impacts. While we conclude that there is insufficient record here to choose methodologies, we encourage the RTOs to continue efforts to better model transaction impacts and to evaluate the merits of adopting a single calculation methodology.

The Commission orders:

(A) PJM's and MISO's proposed revisions to Attachment 2 and Article XX of the MISO-PJM JOA are hereby accepted, effective on August 8, 2014, as discussed in the body of this order.

²⁸ As noted above, the Change Management Process provisions in the MISO-SPP JOA are pending in Docket No. ER13-1864-000.

(B) MISO's and SPP's proposed revisions to Attachment 1 and Article XIX of the MISO-SPP JOA are hereby accepted, effective on August 8, 2014, as discussed in the body of this order.

(C) MISO and SPP's proposed revisions to Attachment 2 of the MISO-SPP JOA are hereby conditionally accepted, subject to the outcome of the proceeding in Docket No. ER13-1864-000, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.

Appendix A

Tariff Sections Filed by the RTOs

Docket No. ER14-1405-001

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Interregional Agreements, [ARTICLE XX, MISO-JOA ARTICLE XX - CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS, 1.1.0](#); [Att 2 Executive Summary, MISO-JOA Att 2 Executive Summary, 1.1.0](#); [Att 2 Section 4.1, MISO-JOA Att 2 Section 4.1 Market Flow Determination, 4.1.0](#); and [Att 2 Appendix B, MISO-JOA Att 2 Appendix B - Determination of Marginal Zone P, 1.1.0](#) .

Docket Nos. ER14-1406-000 & ER14-1406-001

Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., MISO Rate Schedules, [ARTICLE XX, CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS, 32.0.0](#); [Executive Summary, Executive Summary, 32.0.0](#); [Section 4.1, Market Flow Determination, 32.0.0](#); [Appendix B, Determination of Marginal Zone Participation Factors, 32.0.0](#); [Section 19, CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS, 32.0.0](#); [Section 19.1, Notice, 32.0.0](#); [Section 19.2, Response to Notice, 32.0.0](#); [Section 19.3, Implementation of Change, 32.0.0](#); [Section 19.4, Summary of Proposed Changes, 32.0.0](#); [Executive Summary, -, 32.0.0](#); [4.1, Market Flow Determination, 32.0.0](#); [4.1.1, Methodologies To Account For Tagged Transactions, 32.0.0](#); [6.6, Forward Coordination Processes, 32.0.0](#); and [Appendix B, Determination of Marginal Zone Participation Factors, 32.0.0](#).

Docket Nos. ER14-1407-000 & ER14-1407-001

Southwest Power Pool, Inc., Rate Schedules and Seams Agreements Tariff, [RS 9 Art. XIX, Rate Schedule 9 Article XIX, 1.1.0](#); [RS 9 Sec. 19.1, Rate Schedule 9 Section 19.1, 1.1.0](#); [RS 9 Sec. 19.2, Rate Schedule 9 Section 19.2, 1.1.0](#); [RS 9 Sec. 19.3, Rate Schedule 9 Section 19.3, 1.1.0](#); [RS 9 Sec. 19.4, Rate Schedule 9 Section 19.4, 1.1.0](#); [RS 9 Att. 1 Exec. Summary, Rate Schedule 9 Attachment 1 Executive Summary, 1.1.0](#); [RS 9 Att. 1 Sec. 4.1, Rate Schedule 9 Attachment 1 Section 4.1, 1.1.0](#); [RS 9 Att. 1 Sec. 4.1.1, Rate Schedule 9 Attachment 1 Section 4.1.1, 0.1.0](#); [RS 9 Att. 1 Sec. 6.6, Rate Schedule 9 Attachment 1 Section 6.6, 1.1.0](#); and [RS 9 Att. 1 Sec. 7 App. B, Rate Schedule 9 Attachment 1 Section 7 Appendix B, 1.1.0](#).