

Project 2008-12 - Coordinate Interchange Standards

Mapping Document

Project Purpose

The purpose of Project 2008-12 is to revise the set of Coordinate Interchange standards to ensure that each requirement is assigned to an owner, operator or user of the bulk power system, and not to a tool used to coordinate interchange. The drafting team also addressed the Interchange Subcommittee concerns related to the dynamic Transfers and Pseudo-ties and addressed previously identified stakeholder comments and applicable directives from Order 693. These issues and directives include defining communications on reloading interchange transactions due to different operational conditions and to bringing the set of Coordinate Interchange standards into conformance with the latest versions of the Reliability Standards Development Procedure, ERO Sanctions Guidelines and Uniform Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program.

Standard: INT-001-3, Interchange Information

| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| <p>R1. The Load-Serving, Purchasing-Selling Entity shall ensure that Arranged Interchange is submitted to the Interchange Authority for:</p> <p>R1.1. All Dynamic Schedules at the expected average MW profile for each hour.</p> | <p>Revised and Moved into INT-004-3</p> | <p>INT-004-3:</p> <p>R1. Each Purchasing-Selling Entity that secures energy to serve Load via a Dynamic Schedule or Pseudo-Tie shall ensure that a Request for Interchange is submitted as an on-time¹</p> |

¹ Please refer to the timing tables of INT-006-4.

| Standard: INT-001-3, Interchange Information | | |
|---|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retain Requirement.</p> | | <p>Arranged Interchange to the Sink Balancing Authority for that Dynamic Schedule or Pseudo-Tie, unless the information about the Pseudo-Tie is included in congestion management procedure(s) via an alternate method. [<i>Violation Risk Factor: Lower</i>] [<i>Time Horizon: Operations Planning, Same-day Operations</i>]</p> <p>¹ Please refer to the timing tables of INT-006-4.</p> <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: The CISDT concurs.</p> |
| <p>R2. The Sink Balancing Authority shall ensure that Arranged Interchange is submitted to the Interchange Authority:</p> <p>R2.1. If a Purchasing-Selling Entity is not involved in the Interchange, such as delivery from a jointly owned generator.</p> <p>R2.2. For each bilateral Inadvertent</p> | Retired | <p>The CI SDT believes that this requirement is no longer necessary for reliability. Since the proposed INT-009-2 R1 makes it clear that the Net Scheduled Interchange term in the control equation can only include Confirmed Interchange as agreed to between Balancing Authorities, this by definition requires that an Arranged Interchange be created in order to implement the schedules listed in</p> |

Project 2008-12 - Coordinate Interchange Standards

| Standard: INT-001-3, Interchange Information | | |
|--|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>Interchange payback.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | | <p>R2.1 and R2.2. From a reliability perspective, it is unimportant who creates these Arranged interchanges – only that they be created and confirmed prior to being entered into the control equation.</p> <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: The CISDT concurs.</p> |

| Standard: INT-003-3, Interchange Transaction Implementation | | |
|--|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. Each Receiving Balancing Authority shall confirm Interchange Schedules with the Sending Balancing Authority prior to implementation in the Balancing Authority’s ACE equation.</p> <p>R1.1. The Sending Balancing Authority and Receiving Balancing Authority shall agree on Interchange as received from the Interchange Authority, including:</p> | <p>Revised and Moved into INT-009-2</p> | <p>INT-009-2:</p> <p>R1. Each Balancing Authority shall agree with each of its Adjacent Balancing Authorities that its Composite Confirmed Interchange with that Adjacent Balancing Authority, at mutually agreed upon time intervals, excluding Dynamic Schedules and Pseudo-Ties and including any Interchange per INT-010-2 not yet captured</p> |

| Standard: INT-003-3, Interchange Transaction Implementation | | |
|---|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1.1.1. Interchange Schedule start and end time.</p> <p>R1.1.2. Energy profile.</p> <p>R1.2. If a high voltage direct current (HVDC) tie is on the Scheduling Path, then the Sending Balancing Authorities and Receiving Balancing Authorities shall coordinate the Interchange Schedule with the Transmission Operator of the HVDC tie.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retain Requirement.</p> | | <p>in the Composite Confirmed Interchange, is: [Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Real Time Operations]</p> <p>1.1. Identical in magnitude to that of the Adjacent Balancing Authority, and</p> <p>1.2. Opposite in sign or direction to that of the Adjacent Balancing Authority.</p> <p>R2. The Attaining Balancing Authority and the Native Balancing Authority shall use a dynamic value emanating from an agreed upon common source to account for the Pseudo-Tie in the Net Interchange Actual (NIA) term of their respective control ACE (or alternate control process). [Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Real Time Operations]</p> <p>R3. Each Balancing Authority in whose area the HVDC tie is controlled shall coordinate the Confirmed Interchange prior to its implementation with the Transmission Operator of the HVDC tie. [Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Real Time Operations, Operations Planning]</p> |

Project 2008-12 - Coordinate Interchange Standards

| Standard: INT-003-3, Interchange Transaction Implementation | | |
|---|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| | | CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: The CISDT concurs. |

| Standard: INT-004-2, Dynamic Interchange Transaction Modifications | | |
|--|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. At such time as the reliability event allows for the reloading of the transaction, the entity that initiated the curtailment shall release the limit on the Interchange Transaction tag to allow reloading the transaction and shall communicate the release of the limit to the Sink Balancing Authority.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire</p> | Retired | <p>The CI SDT believes that at a minimum, this requirement does not belong in the “Dynamic Schedules” standard. However, for several reasons, the CI SDT further believes that this specific requirement is no longer required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It mandates a practice (releasing of E-Tag limits) that is process related. • The practice is already addressed in related NAESB standards (WEQ-004 Appendix B - E-Tag Actions). |

| Standard: INT-004-2, Dynamic Interchange Transaction Modifications | | |
|---|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of a limit (and the associated release of that limit) is only one particular way to address curtailments. Other ways exist that could be used in lieu of this approach. The reliability standard should not mandate a single approach when others may suffice. <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: The CISDT concurs.</p> |
| <p>R2. The Purchasing-Selling Entity responsible for tagging a Dynamic Interchange Schedule shall ensure the tag is updated for the next available scheduling hour and future hours when any one of the following occurs:</p> <p>R2.1. The average energy profile in an hour is greater than 250 MW and in that hour the actual hourly integrated energy deviates from the hourly average energy profile indicated on the tag by more than +10%.</p> <p>R2.2. The average energy profile in an hour is less than or equal to 250 MW and in that hour the actual hourly integrated energy deviates from the hourly average energy profile indicated</p> | Revised | <p>INT-004-3</p> <p>R2. The Purchasing-Selling Entity that submits a Request for Interchange in accordance with Requirement R1 shall ensure the Confirmed Interchange associated with that Dynamic Schedule or Pseudo-Tie is updated for future hours in order to support congestion management procedures if any one of the following occurs: [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning, Same Day Operations, Real Time Operations]</p> <p>2.1. For Confirmed Interchange greater than 250 MW for the last hour, the actual hourly integrated energy deviates from the Confirmed Interchange by more than 10% for that hour and</p> |

| Standard: INT-004-2, Dynamic Interchange Transaction Modifications | | |
|---|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>on the tag by more than +25 megawatt-hours.</p> <p>R2.3. A Reliability Coordinator or Transmission Operator determines the deviation, regardless of magnitude, to be a reliability concern and notifies the Purchasing-Selling Entity of that determination and the reasons.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | | <p>that deviation is expected to persist.</p> <p>2.2. For Confirmed Interchange less than or equal to 250 MW for the last hour, the actual hourly integrated energy deviates from the Confirmed Interchange by more than 25 MW for that hour and that deviation is expected to persist.</p> <p>2.3. The Purchasing-Selling Entity receives notification from a Reliability Coordinator or Transmission Operator to update the Confirmed Interchange.</p> <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: In the absence of clear industry consensus supporting the Independent Expert Review recommendation to retire this requirement, the CISDT believes that there is a reliability need to have the RFI updated for a Dynamic Schedule or Pseudo-Tie that is significantly different than the original schedule. This will allow the IDC and WITT Tool to have more accurate interchange data for reliability analysis.</p> |

| Standard: INT-005-3, Interchange Authority Distributes Arranged Interchange | | |
|---|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. Prior to the expiration of the time period defined in the timing requirements tables in this standard, Column A, the Interchange Authority shall distribute the Arranged Interchange information for reliability assessment to all reliability entities involved in the Interchange.</p> <p>R1.1. When a Balancing Authority or Reliability Coordinator initiates a Curtailment to Confirmed or Implemented Interchange for reliability, the Interchange Authority shall distribute the Arranged Interchange information for reliability assessment only to the Source Balancing Authority and the Sink Balancing Authority.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | Retired | <p>The CISDT is proposing retirement of this requirement. The entities to receive the transaction are included today in the eTag specification, Section 3.6.1.1.1. The timing requirement for the distribution of tags is removed from this standard, as they are currently included and expected to remain in the NAESB documentation.</p> <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: The CISDT concurs.</p> |

| Standard: INT-006-3, Response to Interchange Authority | | |
|--|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. Prior to the expiration of the reliability assessment period defined in the timing requirements tables in this standard, Column B, the Balancing Authority and Transmission Service Provider shall respond to each On-time Request for Interchange (RFI), and to each Emergency RFI and Reliability Adjustment RFI from an Interchange Authority to transition an Arranged Interchange to a Confirmed Interchange.</p> <p>R1.1. Each involved Balancing Authority shall evaluate the Arranged Interchange with respect to:</p> <p>R1.1.1. Energy profile (ability to support the magnitude of the Interchange).</p> <p>R1.1.2. Ramp (ability of generation maneuverability to accommodate).</p> <p>R1.1.3. Scheduling path (proper connectivity of Adjacent Balancing Authorities).</p> <p>R1.2. Each involved Transmission Service Provider shall confirm that the transmission service arrangements associated with the</p> | <p>Revised</p> | <p>R1. Each Balancing Authority shall approve or deny each on-time Arranged Interchange or emergency Arranged Interchange that it receives and shall do so prior to the expiration of the time period defined in Attachment 1, Column B. [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning, Same-day Operations, Real-time Operations]</p> <p>1.1. Each Source and Sink Balancing Authority shall deny the Arranged Interchange or curtail Confirmed Interchange if it does not expect to be capable of supporting the magnitude of the Interchange, including ramping, throughout the duration of the Arranged Interchange.</p> <p>1.2. Each Balancing Authority shall deny the Arranged Interchange or curtail Confirmed Interchange if the Scheduling Path (proper connectivity of Adjacent Balancing Authorities) between it and its Adjacent Balancing Authorities is invalid.</p> <p>R2. Each Transmission Service Provider shall approve</p> |

| Standard: INT-006-3, Response to Interchange Authority | | |
|--|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>Arranged Interchange have adjacent Transmission Service Provider connectivity, are valid and prevailing transmission system limits will not be violated.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | | <p>or deny each on-time Arranged Interchange or emergency Arranged Interchange that it receives and shall do so prior to the expiration of the time period defined in Attachment 1, Column B. [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning, Same-day Operations, Real-time Operations]</p> <p>2.1. Each Transmission Service Provider shall deny the Arranged Interchange or curtail Confirmed Interchange if the transmission path (proper connectivity of adjacent Transmission Service Providers) between it and its adjacent Transmission Service Providers is invalid.</p> <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: In the absence of clear industry consensus supporting the Independent Expert Review recommendation to retire this requirement, the CISDT believes that this distribution requirement may currently drive how software performs this function. However, if that software were not present, this requirement clearly directs who needs to receive the results of the evaluations that were performed in order for the</p> |

Project 2008-12 - Coordinate Interchange Standards

| Standard: INT-006-3, Response to Interchange Authority | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| | | interchange to occur. |

| Standard: INT-007-1, Interchange Confirmation | | |
|---|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. The Interchange Authority shall verify that Arranged Interchange is balanced and valid prior to transitioning Arranged Interchange to Confirmed Interchange by verifying the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1.1. Source Balancing Authority megawatts equal sink Balancing Authority megawatts (adjusted for losses, if appropriate). R1.2. All reliability entities involved in the Arranged Interchange are currently in the NERC registry. R1.3. The following are defined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> R1.3.1. Generation source and load sink. R1.3.2. Megawatt profile. R1.3.3. Ramp start and stop times. R1.3.4. Interchange duration. R1.4. Each Balancing Authority and Transmission Service Provider that received the Arranged Interchange information from the Interchange Authority for reliability assessment has provided approval. | <p>Retired, Revisions made to defined term used in various INT standards to clarify reliability objective</p> | <p>R1.1, R1.2 and R1.3 ensure the data submitted on the interchange is valid. This activity occurs in software validation and is not appropriate for a reliability standard; these items are included in the Technical Basis and Guidelines section of INT-006. Interchange that does not meet these criteria would not be an Arranged Interchange.</p> <p>R1.4. is addressed in the proposed revision to the definition of Confirmed Interchange: <i>The state where no party has denied and all required parties have approved the Arranged Interchange.</i></p> <p>INT-006-4, Requirement R4 also specifies conditions under which the BA shall not transition to Confirmed Interchange:</p> <p>R4. Each Sink Balancing Authority shall confirm that none of the following conditions exist prior to transitioning an Arranged Interchange to Confirmed Interchange: [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time</p> |

| Standard: INT-007-1, Interchange Confirmation | | |
|--|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | | <p>Horizon: Operations Planning, Same-day Operations, Real-time Operations]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a Reliability Adjustment Arranged Interchange, the time period specified in Attachment 1, Column B has elapsed, and the Source Balancing Authority or the Sink Balancing Authority associated with the Arranged Interchange has not communicated its approval of the transition. • It is not a Reliability Adjustment Arranged Interchange, the time period specified in Attachment 1, Column B, has elapsed, and not all Balancing Authorities and Transmission Service Providers associated with the Arranged Interchange have communicated their approval of the transition. • It is not a Reliability Adjustment Arranged Interchange, the time period specified in Attachment 1, Column B, has elapsed, and any entity associated with the Arranged Interchange has communicated its denial of the transition. |

Project 2008-12 - Coordinate Interchange Standards

| Standard: INT-007-1, Interchange Confirmation | | |
|---|---|---|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| | | CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: The CISDT concurs. |

| Standard: INT-008-3, Interchange Authority Distributes Status | | |
|--|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. Prior to the expiration of the time period defined in the Timing Table, Column C, the Interchange Authority shall distribute to all Balancing Authorities (including Balancing Authorities on both sides of a direct current tie), Transmission Service Providers and Purchasing-Selling Entities involved in the Arranged Interchange whether or not the Arranged Interchange has transitioned to a Confirmed Interchange.</p> <p>R1.1. For Confirmed Interchange, the Interchange Authority shall also communicate:</p> <p>R1.1.1. Start and stop times, ramps, and megawatt profile to Balancing Authorities.</p> <p>R1.1.2. Necessary Interchange information to NERC-identified reliability analysis services.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | <p>Revised and moved into INT-006-4</p> | <p>INT-006-4:</p> <p>R5. Each Sink Balancing Authority shall distribute all notifications of whether an Arranged Interchange was transitioned to Confirmed Interchange to the following entities, and notifications of on-time Confirmed Interchange shall be distributed such that they are delivered in time to be incorporated into scheduling systems prior to ramp start as specified in Attachment 1, Column D: [Violation Risk Factor: Lower] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning, Same-day Operations, Real-time Operations]</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1. The Source Balancing Authority, 5.2. Each Intermediate Balancing Authority, 5.3. Each Reliability Coordinator associated with each Balancing Authority included in the Arranged Interchange, 5.4. Each Transmission Service Provider included in the Arranged Interchange, and 5.5. Each Purchasing Selling Entity included in the Arranged Interchange. |

Project 2008-12 - Coordinate Interchange Standards

| Standard: INT-008-3, Interchange Authority Distributes Status | | |
|---|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| | | CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: In the absence of clear industry consensus supporting the Independent Expert Review recommendation to retire this requirement, the CISDT believes that this distribution requirement may currently drive how software performs this function. However, if that software were not present, this requirement clearly directs who needs to receive the results of the evaluations that were performed in order for the interchange to occur. |

| Standard: INT-009-1, Implementation of Interchange | | |
|---|--|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. The Balancing Authority shall implement Confirmed Interchange as received from the Interchange Authority.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | <p>Combined with INT-003-3, Requirement R1</p> | <p>INT-009-2</p> <p>R1. Each Balancing Authority shall agree with each of its Adjacent Balancing Authorities that its Composite Confirmed Interchange with that Adjacent Balancing Authority, at mutually agreed upon time intervals, excluding Dynamic Schedules and Pseudo-Ties and including any Interchange per INT-010-2 not yet captured in the Composite Confirmed Interchange, is: [Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Real-Time Operations]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Identical in magnitude to that of the Adjacent Balancing Authority, and 1.2. Opposite in sign or direction to that of the Adjacent Balancing Authority. <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: The CISDT concurs that a separate requirement is not necessary. This requirement was combined with INT-003-3, Requirement R1.</p> |

| Standard: INT-010-1, Interchange Coordination Exemptions | | |
|---|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R1. The Balancing Authority that experiences a loss of resources covered by an energy sharing agreement shall ensure that a request for an Arranged Interchange is submitted with a start time no more than 60 minutes beyond the resource loss. If the use of the energy sharing agreement does not exceed 60 minutes from the time of the resource loss, no request for Arranged Interchange is required.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | <p>Revised</p> | <p>INT-010-2:</p> <p>R1. The Balancing Authority that experiences a loss of resources covered by an energy sharing agreement or other reliability needs covered by an energy sharing agreement shall ensure that a Request for Interchange (RFI) is submitted with a start time no more than 60 minutes beyond the resource loss. If the use of the energy sharing agreement does not exceed 60 minutes from the time of the resource loss, no RFI is required. [<i>Violation Risk Factor: Lower</i>] [<i>Time Horizon: Real Time Operations</i>]</p> <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: In the absence of clear industry consensus supporting the Independent Expert Review recommendation to retire this requirement, the CISDT believes that there is a reliability need to have an RFI submitted for this type of Interchange. This will allow the IDC and WITT Tool to have more accurate interchange data for reliability analysis</p> |

| Standard: INT-010-1, Interchange Coordination Exemptions | | |
|---|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>R2. For a modification to an existing Interchange schedule that is directed by a Reliability Coordinator for current or imminent reliability-related reasons, the Reliability Coordinator shall direct a Balancing Authority to submit the modified Arranged Interchange reflecting that modification within 60 minutes of the initiation of the event.</p> <p><i>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</i></p> | Revised | <p>INT-010-2:</p> <p>R2. Each Sink Balancing Authority shall ensure that a Reliability Adjustment Arranged Interchange reflecting a modification is submitted within 60 minutes of the start of the modification if a Reliability Coordinator directs the modification of a Confirmed Interchange or Implemented Interchange for actual or anticipated reliability-related reasons. [<i>Violation Risk Factor: Lower</i>] [<i>Time Horizon: Real Time Operations</i>]</p> <p><i>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: In the absence of clear industry consensus supporting the Independent Expert Review recommendation to retire this requirement, the CISDT believes that there is a reliability need to have an RFI submitted for this type of Interchange. This will allow the IDC and WITT Tool to have more accurate interchange data for reliability analysis</i></p> |
| <p>R3. For a new Interchange schedule that is directed by a Reliability Coordinator for current or imminent</p> | Revised | <p>INT-010-2:</p> |

| Standard: INT-010-1, Interchange Coordination Exemptions | | |
|---|---|--|
| Requirement in Approved Standard | Translation to New Standard or Other Action | Comments |
| <p>reliability-related reasons, the Reliability Coordinator shall direct a Balancing Authority to submit an Arranged Interchange reflecting that Interchange schedule within 60 minutes of the initiation of the event.</p> <p>Independent Expert Review recommendation: Retire per P81 criteria. A guideline exists in the functional specification for electronic tagging.</p> | | <p>R3. Each Sink Balancing Authority shall ensure that a Request for Interchange is submitted reflecting that Interchange Schedule within 60 minutes of the start of the scheduled Interchange if a Reliability Coordinator directs the scheduling of Interchange for actual or anticipated reliability-related reasons. [<i>Violation Risk Factor: Lower</i>] [<i>Time Horizon: Real Time Operations</i>]</p> <p>CISDT Consideration of Independent Expert Review recommendation: In the absence of clear industry consensus supporting the Independent Expert Review recommendation to retire this requirement, the CISDT believes that there is a reliability need to have an RFI submitted for this type of Interchange. This will allow the IDC and WITT Tool to have more accurate interchange data for reliability analysis</p> |