

TECHNICAL CONFERENCE

ON

Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in
Transmission Service

October 12, 2006

Steven T. Naumann
Vice President, Wholesale Market Development
Exelon Corporation

1. What are the challenges that NERC/NAESB and the industry face in the effort to enhance the consistency of certain definitions, data, modeling assumptions and components of the ATC calculation?

- *NERC/NAESB need to start with the definitions, data, modeling assumptions and components of the ATC calculation that were developed by NERC, with input from all the NERC Regions. Problems are caused by transmission providers using their own unique definitions for NERC's terminology rather than conforming to NERC's definitions. Thus, for instance, "scheduled reservations" may include certain projections in one transmission provider's calculations but not in another's. NERC's definitions must be used consistently by all transmission providers.*
- *ATC calculators must be prepared to change their calculation methodologies to conform to a unified methodology. The prevailing value must be best practices rather than "my method is the best and I don't want to change."*
- *The industry must be willing to pay for the cost of programming changes and the Commission must allow recovery of these costs.*

Which of these elements are most critical to make consistent?

- *All definitions must be consistent. The industry must speak a common language in order to achieve consistency in the calculation methodologies.*
- *Base case flows, impact of counterflows, TRM/CBM, dispatch assumptions are critical.*
- *No regional differences within an interconnection are justified.*

Is a focus on comparability of ATC calculation and transparency more important than consistency of ATC calculation?

- *Consistent ATC calculations, consistent limits on what data can be used in the methodology, and consistent assumptions in evaluating the need for system expansion to serve native load, should lead to comparability and transparency.*

2. What is a reasonable timeline to achieve the consistency goal?

- *The goal should be to have a standard to the Commission within one year*
- *A deadline is needed*
- *Quarterly updates should be provided to the Commission to determine what progress is being made, what is causing delays, if any, and whether additional time legitimately is required.*

-
3. Are there common standards and modeling assumptions that can be developed to calculate TRM and CBM?
- *CBM and TRM are two very different margins used in ATC calculations that require separate standards. The key in developing both standards is that the CBM and TRM values must be consistent with how the transmission provider plans its own system.*
 - *If the transmission planner does not use CBM and/or TRM to determine when to upgrade its system for its native load, then it cannot use CBM and/or TRM to determine ATC/AFC for purposes of transmission service.*
 - *Conversely, if the transmission provider uses CBM and/or TRM for determining ATC/AFC for purposes of transmission service, it must use the same assumptions in determining whether or not to expand its system to provide service to its native load*
 - *Bounds can be set in the standard as to how CBM and TRM are accounted for (i.e. modeled) in ATC calculations.*
 - *The methods, including all assumptions, need to be documented in a standard format.*

4. What are the most critical data to be exchanged among transmission providers to ensure that all are performing ATC calculations most accurately? How should that data be exchanged, what protocols should be used, and what forum should develop the protocols?

- *Critical data*
 - *Load level*
 - *Generation and transmission outages*
 - *Generation dispatch*
 - *Reservations*
 - *AFC values*
- *Data exchange protocols do not have to be standardized but can be developed between individual ATC calculators.*

-
5. What is the most important data to make transparent? Regarding the Commission's proposal to require a narrative explanation for changes in monthly or yearly ATC, are there modifications that would achieve the Commission's transparency goals without imposing an undue burden on transmission providers? What ATC information posted in narrative form will be most beneficial?
- *Models, AFC, contingency files or flowgate list used should be posted along with source and sink point subsystems used to determine ATC values.*
 - *Specific reasons for major changes in ATC/AFC. These reasons would include changes in topology (change in transmission status – in/out); changes in accepted transmission service, including designated resources; changes in generation (on/off); changes in assumed load; changes in assumptions)*

6. Regarding the proposal to enhance OASIS postings, what are some industry tools/best practices that can be utilized to assist with this effort?

- *Posting of all uses of transmission including designation/undesignation of network resources by transmission provider for serving its own load*
- *Posting of metrics – service number of percentages of requests accepted/denied broken down by affiliate/non-affiliate and long-term firm/short-term firm, designated network service, undesignated network service, various lengths of non-firm service*