Motion Review

Motion Review Document for 8/15/2014
NAESB OS Workshops

Posted August 14, 2014

Motion	Date	Motion
Redirects and Resales		
34	10/25/2012	Redirect Request of the defenders should be processed as regular WEQ Business Practice Standards process and will not be prevented from submitting a redirect. WEQ Business Practice Standards should therefore be silent about limiting the redirects.
41	11/28/2012	Limitation on redirecting the resale shall be the same as that applied to redirecting the parent of the resale which is a defender. If Business Practices are silent about redirect of Defender, these will also be silent about redirect of resale.
42	11/28/2012	While submission of redirect requests are permitted in Motions 34 and 41, new WEQ Business Practice standards shall be written to require that 1) the Competing_Request_Flag shall be set to "Y" for all defenders and all resales associated with defenders and 2) the Transmission Provider shall suspend taking action on redirect of request/reservation with the Competing_Request_Flag set to "Y" until completion of the preemption and competition process.
90	3/11/2014	When a TSR is identified as an A-Defender the COMPETING_REQUEST_FLAG shall be set to 'Y'. Customer initiated status changes shall not be permitted from a pending status when the COMPETING_REQUEST_FLAG is set. Once the COMPETING_REQUEST_FLAG is set to 'Y' for all A-Defenders the Transmission Provider may perform a final review prior to initiating Preemption and Competition to ensure all defenders remain valid and of the same type. If all defenders are not valid and of the same type the Transmission Provider may perform a full reevaluation of the challenger. Once the preemption and /or competition has concluded the COMPETING_REQUEST_FLAG shall be set to 'N'. Customer initiated status changes shall be permitted at this point.
ROFR		

30	9/26/2012	When evaluating a given potential defender with ROFR for its ability to exercise ROFR to preserve their reservation priority, that evaluation will be on its own merits and not consider the impacts of any other potential defender's exercising of their ROFR. That is, the set of defenders preempted and extended ROFR will all be granted simultaneous opportunities to exercise their ROFR even though it is not simultaneously feasible to grant all defenders to exercise their ROFR.
58	6/26/2013	In performing the final evaluation of preemption and competition with ROFR, the TP shall wait for either all ROFR defenders to submit their MATCHING requests or the time at which the competition process must be concluded. At this time, the TP shall order the valid MATCHING requests submitted by each customer based on the criteria, in order, of the MATCHING requests' Duration, Price, and Queue (submission) time, and proceed to evaluate the MATCHING request. The TP shall incorporate all preemption actions for all defenders in evaluating the MATCHING requests. If the MATCHING request may be granted in full, the impact of the MATCHING request shall replace all other impacts of that defender and be included in evaluating each subsequent MATCHING request. If the MATCHING request may not be granted in full, the capacity remaining on the defender after preemption shall be further adjusted to reflect any customer requested mitigation of the final capacity held on the defender as submitted with the MATCHING request, if applicable.
88	2/27/2014	Transmission Provider will not be required to reevaluate the matching requests after initiation of the Preemption & Competition Process due to changed system conditions if the matching requests are not changed by the Transmission Customer.
89	3/11/2014	Once the list of Defenders has been established, The TP shall not be required to perform any further evaluations of the challenger based on system conditions.