

**Project 2008-04 — Revisions to FAC-010, FAC-011, and FAC-014
Standard Development Roadmap**

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:

SAR posted for comment with draft standard for 45-day comment period from January 21–March 5, 2008.

Proposed Action Plan and Description of Current Draft:

Second draft of SAR and proposed changes to standards posted for a 30-day comment period from March 31–April 29, 2008.

Future Development Plan:

Anticipated Actions	Anticipated Date
1. Post for 30-day pre-ballot period.	May 2–31, 2008
2. Conduct initial ballot.	June 2–11, 2008
3. Post response to comments on initial ballot.	June 13, 2008
4. Conduct recirculation ballot.	June 13–22, 2008
5. Board adoption.	June 26, 2008
6. Submit to regulatory authorities for approval.	June 30, 2008

Definitions of Terms Used in 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.

A. Introduction

1. **Title:** Establish and Communicate System Operating Limits
2. **Number:** FAC-014-~~1~~2
3. **Purpose:** To ensure that System Operating Limits (SOLs) used in the reliable planning and operation of the Bulk Electric System (BES) are determined based on an established methodology or methodologies.
4. **Applicability**
 - 4.1. Reliability Coordinator
 - 4.2. Planning Authority
 - 4.3. Transmission Planner
 - 4.4. Transmission Operator
5. **Effective Date:** January 1, ~~2008~~2009

B. Requirements

- R1. The Reliability Coordinator shall ensure that SOLs, including Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits (IROLs), for its Reliability Coordinator Area are established and that the SOLs (including Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits) are consistent with its SOL Methodology.
- R2. The Transmission Operator shall establish SOLs (as directed by its Reliability Coordinator) for its portion of the Reliability Coordinator Area that are consistent with its Reliability Coordinator's SOL Methodology.
- R3. The Planning Authority shall establish SOLs, including IROLs, for its Planning Authority Area that are consistent with its SOL Methodology.
- R4. The Transmission Planner shall establish SOLs, including IROLs, for its Transmission Planning Area that are consistent with its Planning Authority's SOL Methodology.
- R5. The Reliability Coordinator, Planning Authority and Transmission Planner shall each provide its SOLs and IROLs to those entities that have a reliability-related need for those limits and provide a written request that includes a schedule for delivery of those limits as follows:
 - R5.1. The Reliability Coordinator shall provide its SOLs (including the subset of SOLs that are IROLs) to adjacent Reliability Coordinators and Reliability Coordinators who indicate a reliability-related need for those limits, and to the Transmission Operators, Transmission Planners, Transmission Service Providers and Planning Authorities within its Reliability Coordinator Area. For each IROL, the Reliability Coordinator shall provide the following supporting information:
 - R5.1.1. Identification and status of the associated Facility (or group of Facilities) that is (are) critical to the derivation of the IROL.
 - R5.1.2. The value of the IROL and its associated T_v .

The Reliability Coordinator, Planning Authority, Transmission Operator, and Transmission Planner shall each verify compliance through self-certification submitted to its Compliance Monitor annually. The Compliance Monitor may conduct a targeted audit once in each calendar year (January – December) and an investigation upon a complaint to assess performance.

The Performance-Reset Period shall be twelve months from the last finding of non-compliance.

1.3. Data Retention

The Reliability Coordinator, Planning Authority, Transmission Operator, and Transmission Planner shall each keep documentation for 12 months. In addition, entities found non-compliant shall keep information related to non-compliance until found compliant.

The Compliance Monitor shall keep the last audit and all subsequent compliance records.

1.4. Additional Compliance Information

The Reliability Coordinator, Planning Authority, Transmission Operator, and Transmission Planner shall each make the following available for inspection during a targeted audit by the Compliance Monitor or within 15 business days of a request as part of an investigation upon complaint:

1.4.1 SOL Methodology(ies)

1.4.2 SOLs, including the subset of SOLs that are IROLs and the IROLs supporting information

1.4.3 Evidence that SOLs were distributed

1.4.4 Evidence that a list of stability-related multiple contingencies and their associated limits were distributed

1.4.5 Distribution schedules provided by entities that requested SOLs

~~2.Levels of Non-Compliance~~

~~2.1.Level 1:— Not applicable.~~

~~2.2.Level 2:— Not all SOLs were provided in accordance with their respective schedules.~~

~~2.3.Level 3:— SOLs provided were not developed consistent with the SOL Methodology.~~

~~2.4.Level 4:— There shall be a level four non-compliance if either of the following conditions exist:~~

~~2.4.1No SOLs were provided in accordance with their respective schedules.~~

~~No evidence the Planning Authority delivered a set of stability related multiple contingencies and their associated limits to Reliability Coordinators in accordance with R6.~~

2. Violation Severity Levels:

<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Severe</u>
<u>R1</u>	<u>There are SOLs, for the Reliability Coordinator Area, but from 1% up to but less than 25% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R1)</u>	<u>There are SOLs, for the Reliability Coordinator Area, but 25% or more, but less than 50% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R1)</u>	<u>There are SOLs, for the Reliability Coordinator Area, but 50% or more, but less than 75% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R1)</u>	<u>There are SOLs for the Reliability Coordinator Area, but 75% or more of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R1)</u>
<u>R2</u>	<u>The Transmission Operator has established SOLs for its portion of the Reliability Coordinator Area, but from 1% up to but less than 25% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R2)</u>	<u>The Transmission Operator has established SOLs for its portion of the Reliability Coordinator Area, but 25% or more, but less than 50% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R2)</u>	<u>The Transmission Operator has established SOLs for its portion of the Reliability Coordinator Area, but 50% or more, but less than 75% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R2)</u>	<u>The Transmission Operator has established SOLs for its portion of the Reliability Coordinator Area, but 75% or more of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Reliability Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R2)</u>
<u>R3</u>	<u>There are SOLs, for the Planning Coordinator Area, but from 1% up to, but less than, 25% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R3)</u>	<u>There are SOLs, for the Planning Coordinator Area, but 25% or more, but less than 50% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R3)</u>	<u>There are SOLs for the Planning Coordinator Area, but 50% or more, but less than 75% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R3)</u>	<u>There are SOLs, for the Planning Coordinator Area, but 75% or more of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R3)</u>
<u>R4</u>	<u>The Transmission Planner has established SOLs for its portion of the Planning Coordinator Area, but up</u>	<u>The Transmission Planner has established SOLs for its portion of the Planning Coordinator Area, but 25%</u>	<u>The Transmission Planner has established SOLs for its portion of the Reliability Coordinator</u>	<u>The Transmission Planner has established SOLs for its portion of the Planning Coordinator Area, but 75%</u>

Standard FAC-014-1-2— Establish and Communicate System Operating Limits

Requirement	Lower	Moderate	High	Severe
	<u>to 25% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R4)</u>	<u>or more, but less than 50% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R4)</u>	<u>Area, but 50% or more, but less than 75% of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R4)</u>	<u>or more of these SOLs are inconsistent with the Planning Coordinator’s SOL Methodology. (R4)</u>
<u>R5</u>	<u>The responsible entity provided its SOLs to all the requesting entities but missed meeting one or more of the schedules by less than 15 calendar days. (R5)</u>	<u>One of the following:</u> <u>The responsible entity provided its SOLs to all but one of the requesting entities within the schedules provided. (R5)</u> <u>Or</u> <u>The responsible entity provided its SOLs to all the requesting entities but missed meeting one or more of the schedules for 15 or more but less than 30 calendar days. (R5)</u> <u>OR</u> <u>The supporting information provided with the IROLs does not address 5.1.4</u>	<u>One of the following:</u> <u>The responsible entity provided its SOLs to all but two of the requesting entities within the schedules provided. (R5)</u> <u>Or</u> <u>The responsible entity provided its SOLs to all the requesting entities but missed meeting one or more of the schedules for 30 or more but less than 45 calendar days. (R5)</u> <u>OR</u> <u>The supporting information provided with the IROLs does not address 5.1.3</u>	<u>One of the following:</u> <u>The responsible entity failed to provide its SOLs to more than two of the requesting entities within 45 calendar days of the associated schedules. (R5)</u> <u>OR</u> <u>The supporting information provided with the IROLs does not address 5.1.1 and 5.1.2.</u>

Standard FAC-014-1.2 — Establish and Communicate System Operating Limits

<p><u>R6</u></p>	<p><u>The Planning Authority failed to notify the Reliability Coordinator in accordance with R6.2</u></p>	<p><u>Not applicable.</u></p>	<p><u>The Planning Authority identified the subset of multiple contingencies which result in stability limits but did not provide the list of multiple contingencies and associated limits to one Reliability Coordinator that monitors the Facilities associated with these limits. (R6.1)</u></p>	<p><u>The Planning Authority did not identify the subset of multiple contingencies which result in stability limits. (R6)</u></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>The Planning Authority identified the subset of multiple contingencies which result in stability limits but did not provide the list of multiple contingencies and associated limits to more than one Reliability Coordinator that monitors the Facilities associated with these limits. (R6.1)</u></p>
------------------	---	-------------------------------	--	---

E.

E. Regional Differences

None identified.

Version History

Version	Date	Action	Change Tracking
1	November 1, 2006	Adopted by Board of Trustees	New
<u>2</u>		<u>Changed the effective date to January 1, 2009</u> <u>Changed “Cascading Outage” to “Cascading”</u> <u>Replaced Levels of Non-compliance with Violation Severity Levels</u>	<u>Revised</u>