

Reconsider NAESB Motion 47

Customer Workshop

April 24-25, 2013



Motion 47

When a Challenger cannot be accommodated because AFC is not available on one or more flowgates, the Transmission Provider must identify potential Defenders. A potential Defender must provide relief on all of the flowgates where AFC is not available for the Challenger. The capacity taken away from the Defender shall not be more than 105% (rounded to the nearest MW) of the capacity made available to the Challenger.

When a Challenger cannot be accommodated because ATC is not available on one or more interfaces, the Transmission Provider must identify potential Defenders. A potential Defender must provide relief on all of the interfaces where ATC is not available for the Challenger. The capacity taken away from the Defender shall not be more than 105% (rounded to the nearest MW) of the capacity made available to the Challenger.

Motion 47

Two Parts

1. Commercially similar paths (must provide relief on all of the flowgates where AFC is not available for the Challenger)
 - Provide relief on ALL where AFC not available,
 - no mention of significance
 - Reason for this was to protect from hurting multiple defenders if one matched and challenger had no gain. (see picture)
 - Sub reason was to protect a N->S reservation from being a defender to an E->W request.
2. Defender not required to give up “too much more” capacity than needed to relieve the challenger’s deficit (The capacity taken away from the Defender shall not be more than 105% (rounded to the nearest MW) of the capacity made available to the Challenger).
 - Paul’s comment, “literally stops competitions” – Too tight
 - Contrary to FERC intent
 - Very hard to explain (see example)

Motion 47

Simplified Example	Day 1`					Day 2					
	FG 1	FG 2	FG 3	FG 4	FG 5	FG 1	FG 2	FG 3	FG 4	FG 5	
AFC	20	20	20	20	20	50	50	50	50	50	
Challenger (100 MW)		50		50			50		50		
Capacity Needed (60 MW)		30		30			0		0		
TSR 1 (110 MW)	50	10	50								Frees up 10 MW on FG 2, nothing on FG 4, but at the cost of 110 MW.
TSR 2 (20 MW)		10		10							Improves the offer to the challenger. Takes 20 MW to provide 20 MW relief.
TSR 3 (150 MW)	50		50		50						Not a defender since he doesn't impact the needed paths.
TSR 4 (200 MW)		20		20	160						Improves offer to Challenger, but can't extend to day 2 and would give up 200 to provide 40 relief to challenger.
TSR 5 (80 MW)	50	30									Would need to give up 1/3 of it's capacity, but is it feasible if TSR1 matches?
TSR 6 (23 MW)	1	10	1	10	1						Would need to recall 23 MW to provide 20 MW relief. Not valid since $23/20 = 115\%$ which is greater than 105%
TSR 7 (40 MW)	20	5	10	5							Improves the offer to the challenger
TSR 8 (150 MW)		30	60	20	40						Improves the offer to the challenger

Motion 47

Recommendation?

Break Motion 47 into two separate motions.

1. Leave the Commercially Similar Path Criteria Alone

- This is currently restricted to only those paths/flowgates where ATC/AFC is deficient for the Challenger.
- This does not guarantee commercial similarity, only that the defender in and of itself can offer relief to the challenger.

2. Expand the Limit of the Defender Loss/Challenger Gain Ratio

- Look at defining a “floor” and a “Ceiling” for the actual capacity lost by the defender in excess of what the challenger gains.