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# OVERVIEW

The Aggregate Transmission Service Study (ATSS) provides results pursuant to Attachment Z1 of the SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) for long-term transmission service requests. The principal objective of the ATSS is to identify system problems and potential modifications necessary to facilitate these transfers while maintaining or improving system reliability, as well as summarizing the operating limits and determination of the financial characteristics associated with facility upgrades. Facility upgrade costs are allocated on a prorated basis to all requests positively impacting any individual overloaded facility.

All requests for long-term transmission service with a Completed Application received before the closing of the open season will be included in this ATSS. See below for annual open season windows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STUDY ID** | **OPEN SEASON** |
| {Year}-AG1 | December 1 – May 31 |
| {Year}-AG2 | June 1 – November 30 |

Transmission Customers (Customer) requesting service in this study specified five parameters under which they agreed to confirm service. The five parameters are:

1. Directly Assigned Upgrade Cost (E&C and Credit Payment Obligation)
2. Third-Party Upgrade Cost
3. Latest Deferred Start Date
4. Interim Re-dispatch Acceptance
5. Letter of Credit Amount

These parameters are studied for each request and are posted in at least two separate Aggregate Facility Studies (AFS) iterations.

# AFS-1

AFS-1 is posted midway through the 165-day study window, and SPP will tender an AFS – Appendix 1 – Update form to the Customers with a request(s) that have one or more study parameters that were not met. This will open a 5-Business Day window for Customer response. To remain in the ATSS, SPP must receive from the Customer, the AFS – Appendix 1 – Update form with the adjusted parameters that were not met. The AFS Appendix 1 – Update will indicate the parameters that were not met and need to be adjusted by the Customer. If the Customer does not increase the exceeded parameters or does not respond within five Business Days, the request will be removed from study and the request(s) will be “REFUSED” in OASIS. There is no action required on OASIS by the Customer. Following the end of the response period, SPP will conclude the study using the revised parameters. Any requests that cannot be provided under the parameters specified will be removed from study and the Customer may re-submit the request during the next open season.

# Final AFS iteration

SPP will post a final study report within 165 days of the close of the open season which will detail the results for all requests, including those that are removed from study. This final study report provides details and indicates for each request whether any of the five parameters were exceeded. The specific parameters defined by the Customer are confidential and will not be included in this report. At the conclusion of the ATSS, SPP will “ACCEPT” the requests in which the specified study parameters were met and will tender a Service Agreement for each request for service identifying the terms and conditions of the confirmed service.

All allocated revenue requirements for facility upgrades are assigned to the Customer in the AFS data tables. Potential base plan funding allowable is contingent upon validation of designated resources meeting Attachment J, Section III B criteria.

For those upgrades requiring the issuance of a Notification to Construct, within 30 days of the confirmation of the Customer’s OASIS request, the Customer must provide financial security in an amount equal to the full amount of the upgrade cost allocated to the Customer for recovery “Security”. The amount of the Security may increase or decrease each year thereafter based upon the total amount of financial obligation, plus an estimate of the increase or decrease in financial obligations that will be incurred in the next 12 months.

This ATSS process results in studies posted to SPP.org and distributed to Customers included in the study. For specific study results, visit <https://opsportal.spp.org/Studies/Trans> (or use this path: SPP.org > Engineering > Tariff Studies >Transmission Service Studies).



A notification of the ATSS posting is sent to the SPP Aggregate Studies Exploder email. Instructions on how to register are located at: <https://www.spp.org/stakeholder-center/exploder-lists/>

If you have questions regarding the ATSS process or a specific ATSS report, please contact the Transmission Services team via TS@spp.org or submit an SPP Request Management System (RMS) ticket (<https://spprms.issuetrak.com/login.asp>). Information about setting up an RMS account is available on SPP.org. (<http://www.spp.org/stakeholder-center/customer-relations/request-management-system/>).

# SPP ATSS RESULTS

The results of the AFS are detailed in Tables 1 through 7. Detailed results depict individual upgrade costs by study and potential base plan allowances determined by Attachments J and Z1 of the SPP OATT.

To understand the extent to which Base Plan Upgrades may be applied to both Point-to-Point (PTP) and Network Integration Transmission Services (NITS), it is necessary to highlight the definition of Designated Resource. Per Section 1 of the SPP OATT, a Designated Resource is:

“Any designated generation resource owned, purchased or leased by a Transmission Customer to serve load in the SPP Region. Designated Resources do not include any resource, or any portion thereof, that is committed for sale to third parties or otherwise cannot be called upon to meet the Transmission Customer's load on a non-interruptible basis.”

Both NITS and PTP service have potential for base plan funding if the conditions for classifying upgrades associated with designated resources as Base Plan Upgrades as defined in Section III.B of Attachment J are met.

Pursuant to Attachment J, Section III.B of the SPP OATT, the Customer must provide SPP information necessary to verify that the new or changed Designated Resource meets the following conditions:

1. Customer’s commitment to the requested new or changed Designated Resource must have duration of at least five years.
2. During the first year the Designated Resource is planned to be used by the Customer, the accredited capacity of the Customer’s existing Designated Resources plus the lesser of:
3. The planned maximum net dependable capacity applicable to the Customer or
4. The requested capacity; shall not exceed 125% of the Customer’s projected system peak responsibility determined pursuant to SPP Criteria 2.

According to Attachment Z1 Section V.A, PTP Customers pay the higher of the monthly transmission access charge (base rate) or the monthly revenue requirement associated with the directly assigned portion of the Service Upgrade, if any.

NITS Customers pay the total monthly transmission access charges and the monthly revenue requirement associated with the directly assigned portion of the Service Upgrade, if any.

In accordance with Attachment Z2, Customers paying Directly Assigned Upgrade Costs for a Network Upgrade may receive either Incremental Long-Term Congestion Rights (ILTCRs) or credits for new transmission service using the facility, provided that there is an agreement authorizing construction of the upgrade with an execution date, or effective date granted by the Commission if filed unexecuted, on or before July 1, 2020. If the date is after July 1, 2020, the Upgrade Sponsor is not eligible to receive revenue credits, but may receive ILTCRs.

Facilities identified as limiting the requested Transmission Service are reviewed to determine the required in-service date of each Network Upgrade. Both previously assigned facilities and the facilities assigned to this request for Transmission Service are evaluated.

In some instances, due to lead times for engineering and construction, Network Upgrades may not be available when required to accommodate a request for Transmission Service. When this occurs, the ATC with available Network Upgrades will be less than the capacity requested during either a portion of or all of the requested reservation period. The ATC may be limited by expansion plan projects or Customer assigned upgrades.

Some constraints identified in the AFS are not assigned to the Customer because SPP determined that upgrades are not required due to various reasons or the Transmission Owner has construction plans pending for these upgrades. These facilities are listed by reservation in Table 3. Table 7 lists the costs allocated per request for each Service Upgrade assigned in this AFS.

By taking the transmission service subject to interim redispatch, the Customer agrees to any limitations to Auction Revenue Rights that may result. In the absence of implementation of interim redispatch as requested by SPP for Customer transactions resulting in overloads on limiting facilities, SPP may curtail the Customer’s schedule.

## SPP ATSS RESULTS WORKBOOK TABS

The workbook contains worksheets providing the necessary data to analyze Transmission Service Requests presented within the specific parameters as defined by the Customer.

Tables 1 through 7 contain the AFS steady-state analysis results:

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A summary of total MW amount, models used, and closing date for the study.

### REVISION HISTORY

Contains description of each report revision.

### TABLE 1

Table 1 identifies the participating long-term Transmission Service Requests included in the AFS. This table lists deferred start and stop dates both with and without redispatch (based on Customer selection of redispatch if available) and indicates which requests, if any, had parameters that were exceeded.

### TABLE 2

Table 2 identifies total E&C cost allocated to each Customer, letter of credit requirements, third party E&C cost assignments, potential base plan E&C funding (lower of allocated E&C or Attachment J Section III B criteria), PTP base rate charge, total revenue requirements for assigned upgrades with consideration of potential base plan funding, final total cost allocation to the Customer, and directly assigned upgrade cost to the Customer. In addition, Table 2 identifies any SWPA upgrade costs that require prepayment in addition to other allocated costs.

### TABLE 3

Table 3 provides additional details for each request including all assigned facility upgrades required, allocated E&C costs, allocated revenue requirements for upgrades, upgrades not assigned to the Customer but required for service to be confirmed, any required third party upgrades, and credit payment obligations for previously assigned Service Upgrades, Generation Interconnection Network Upgrades, and Sponsored Upgrades.

### TABLE 4

Table 4 lists all upgrade requirements with associated solutions needed to provide Transmission Service for the AFS, earliest date upgrade is required (DUN), estimated date the upgrade will be completed and in service (EOC), and estimated E&C cost.

### TABLE 5

Table 5 lists identified third-party constrained facilities.

### TABLE 6

Reserved

### TABLE 7

Table 7 lists costs allocated per request for Service Upgrades assigned in this AFS.

# DEFINITIONS

Date Upgrade Needed (DUN) – The earliest date the upgrade is required to alleviate a constraint considering all requests.

End of Construction (EOC) – The estimated date the upgrade will be completed and in service.

Total Engineering and Construction Cost (E&C) – The upgrade solution cost as determined by the Transmission Owner. Based on the request having an impact of at least 3% on the limiting element, and having a positive impact on the upgraded facility.

# ATSS METHODOLOGY

The facility study analysis is conducted to determine the steady-state impact of the requested service on the SPP and first tier non-SPP control area systems. The steady-state analysis is performed consistent with current SPP Criteria and NERC Reliability Standards requirements. SPP conforms to NERC Reliability Standards, which provide strict requirements related to voltage violations and thermal overloads during normal conditions and during a contingency. NERC Standards require all facilities to be within normal operating ratings for normal system conditions and within emergency ratings after a contingency.

Normal operating ratings and emergency operating ratings monitored are Rate A and B in the SPP Model Development Working Group (MDWG) models, respectively. The upper bound and lower bound of the normal voltage range monitored is 105% and 95%. The upper bound and lower bound of the emergency voltage range monitored is 105% and 90%. Transmission Owner voltage monitoring criteria is used if more restrictive.

The contingency set includes all SPP control area branches and ties 69 kV and above; first tier non-SPP control area branches and ties 115 kV and above; any defined contingencies for these control areas; and generation unit outages for the control areas with SPP reserve share program redispatch. The monitored elements include all SPP control area branches, ties, and buses 69 kV and above, and all first tier non-SPP control area branches and ties 115 kV and above. Voltage monitoring is performed for SPP control area buses 69 kV and above.

A 3% transfer distribution factor (TDF) cutoff is applied to all SPP control area facilities. For first tier non-SPP control area facilities, a 3% TDF cutoff is applied to AECI, AMRN (Ameren), and ENTR (Entergy) control areas. For voltage monitoring, a 0.02 per unit change in voltage must occur due to the transfer or modeling upgrades to be considered a valid limit to the transfer.

## POWER FLOW MODEL SET

The SPP Integrated Transmission Plan (ITP) power flow models serve as the starting point for all Aggregate Studies requiring steady-state power flow analysis. These models typically include:

* (Current Year) Summer and Winter
* (Current Year +2) Light Load, Summer, and Winter
* (Current Year +5) Light Load, Summer, and Winter
* (Current Year +10) Light Load, Summer, and Winter

The Summer Peak models apply to June through September, the Winter Peak models apply to December through March, and the Light Load models apply to April and May.

The chosen base case models are modified to reflect the current modeling information. One group of requests is developed from the aggregate to model the requested service. Base Reliability model scenarios are utilized. Base Reliability includes projected usage of transmission included in the SPP (Current Year) ITP Cases.

### BASE CASE SETTINGS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solutions** | Fixed Slope Decoupled Newton-Rhapson Solution (FDNS) |
| **Tap Adjustment** | Stepping |
| **Var Interchange Control** | Tie lines and loads |
| **Var Limits** | Apply immediately |
| **Solution Options** | Phase shift adjustment |

### ACCC CASE SETTINGS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Solutions** | AC Contingency Checking (ACCC) |
| **MW Mismatch Tolerance** | .5 |
| **System Intact Rating** | Rate A |
| **Contingency Case Rating** | Rate B |
| **Percent of Rating** | 100 |
| **Output Code** | Summary |
| **Min Flow Change in Overload Report** | 3 MW |
| **Exclude Cases w/ No Overloads from Report** | YES |
| **Exclude Interfaces from Report** | NO |
| **Perform Voltage Limit Check** | YES |
| **Elements in Available Capacity Table** | 60000 |
| **Cutoff Threshold for Available Capacity Table** | 99999.0 |
| **Min. Contingency Case Voltage Change for Report** | .02 |
| **Sorted Output** | None |
| **Tap Adjustment**  | Stepping |
| **Area Interchange Control** | Tie lines and loads (Disabled for generator outages) |
| **Solution Options** | Phase shift adjustment |

## TRANSMISSION REQUEST MODELING

NITS requests for new Transmission Customers are modeled as Generation to Load transfers because the requested NITS is a request to serve new network load with the new designated network resource. NITS requests for existing Transmission Customers are modeled as Generation to Generation transfers in which the Customer’s existing NITS resources are dispatched down. PTP Transmission Service requests are modeled as Generation to Generation transfers. Generation to Generation transfers are accomplished by developing a post-transfer case for comparison by dispatching the requested source and redispatching the requested sink.

## TRANSFER ANALYSIS

Using the selected cases both with and without the requested transfers modeled, the PSS/E Activity ACCC is run on the cases and compared to determine the facility overloads caused or impacted by the transfer. TDF cutoffs (SPP and 1st-Tier) and voltage threshold (0.02 change) are applied to determine the impacted facilities. Generation to Generation and Generation to Load configurations are both evaluated for Network requests to determine if either meets the 3% TDF cutoff. The PSS/E options chosen to conduct the analysis can be found in Appendix A.

## CURTAILMENT AND REDISPATCH EVALUATION

During any period in which SPP determines that a transmission constraint exists on and may impair Transmission System reliability, SPP will take whatever actions are reasonably necessary to maintain reliability. If SPP determines Transmission System reliability can be maintained by redispatching resources, it will evaluate the interim redispatch of units to provide service prior to completion of any assigned Network Upgrades. Any redispatch may not unduly discriminate between the Transmission Owners’ use of the Transmission System on behalf of their Native Load Customers and any Customer’s use of the Transmission System to serve its designated load. Redispatch is evaluated to provide only interim service during the time frame prior to completion of any assigned Network Upgrades.

SPP determines potential relief pairs to relieve the incremental MW impact on limiting facilities. Using the selected cases where the limiting facilities are identified, potential incremental and decremental units are identified by determining the generation amount available for increasing and decreasing from the units’ generation amount, maximum generation amount, and minimum generation amount. If the incremental or decremental amount is greater than 1 MW, the unit is considered as a potential incremental or decremental unit.

Generation shift factors are calculated for the potential incremental and decremental units using the Siemens power flow analysis tool, Managing and Utilizing System Transmission (MUST). Relief pairs from the generation shift factors for the incremental and decremental units with a TDF greater than 3% on the limiting constraint are determined from the incremental units with the lowest generation shift factors and decremental units with highest generation shift factors. If the aggregate redispatch amount for the potential relief pair is determined to be three times greater than the lower of the increment or decrement, then the pair is determined not to be feasible and is not included. The potential relief pairs are not evaluated to determine impacts on limiting facilities in the SPP and first tier systems.

The AFS analyzes the most probable contingencies and does not account for every situation that may be encountered in real-time operation. Because of this, it is possible that the Customer may be curtailed under certain system conditions to allow system operators to maintain the reliability of the transmission network.

# FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The AFS utilizes the allocated Customer’s E&C cost in a present worth analysis to determine the monthly levelized revenue requirement of each facility upgrade over the term of the reservation. In some cases, Network Upgrades cannot be completed within the requested reservation period, thus deferred reservation periods will be utilized in the present worth analysis. If the Customer chose Option 5, Use of Interim Redispatch, in Appendix 1 of the Aggregate Facilities Study Agreement, the present worth analysis of revenue requirements will be based on the deferred term with redispatch in the subsequent AFS. The upgrade levelized revenue requirement includes interest, depreciation, and carrying costs.

Each request for Transmission Service is evaluated independently as the cost associated with each Network Upgrade is assigned to a request. When facilities are upgraded throughout the reservation period, the Customer will pay the total E&C costs and other annual operating costs associated with the new facilities.

In the event that the engineering and construction of a previously assigned Network Upgrade may be accelerated with no additional upgrades to accommodate a new request for Transmission Service, the levelized present worth of only the incremental expenses through the reservation period of the new request, excluding depreciation, shall be assigned to the new request. These incremental expenses, excluding depreciation, include:

1. The levelized difference in present worth of the engineering and construction expenses given the change in date to complete construction to account for additional interest expense and reduced engineering and construction expense due to inflation,
2. The levelized present worth of all expediting fees, and
3. The levelized present worth of the incremental annual carrying charges, excluding depreciation and interest, during the new reservation period taking into account both:
4. The reservation in which the project was originally assigned, and
5. A reservation, if any, in which the project was previously accelerated.

In the case of a Base Plan Upgrade being deferred or displaced by an earlier in service date for a requested upgrade, the methodology for achievable base plan avoided revenue requirements shall be determined per Attachment J, Section VII.A or Section VII.B, respectively. A deferred Base Plan Upgrade is defined as a different requested Network Upgrade needed at an earlier date that negates the need for the initial Base Plan Upgrade within the planning horizon. A displaced Base Plan Upgrade is defined as the same Network Upgrade being displaced by a requested upgrade needed at an earlier date.

A 40-year service life assumption is utilized for Base Plan funded projects, unless another assumption is provided by the Transmission Owner. A present worth analysis of revenue requirements on a common year basis between the Base Plan and Requested Upgrades is performed to determine avoided Base Plan revenue requirements due to the displacement or deferral of the Base Plan Upgrade by the Requested Upgrade. The difference in present worth between the Base Plan and Requested Upgrades is assigned to the transmission requests impacting this upgrade based on the displacement or deferral.

# MAKE-WHOLE PAYMENT

Make-whole payment (MWP) is a potential cost that may be allocated to a Request in a completed AFS meeting the Study Completion Conditions but with unresolved third party impacts. For a Request with identified third party impact(s) where the Customer has not notified SPP of a successful conclusion to the third-party negotiation by the deadline described in Section III.D.2 of Attachment Z1 in the OATT, SPP will deem the Request to be terminated and withdrawn and the Customer may be subject to a MWP in accordance with Section III.D.4 of Attachment Z1 in the OATT. The calculation of the Customer’s MWP shall include any impacts to subsequent completed AFS(s).

The MWP assigned to a withdrawn Request will be any reallocated upgrade costs that are in excess of the sum of (i) the DAUC and (ii) the amounts included in rates, for any remaining confirmed Request(s).

If there is more than one withdrawn Request then the MWP, if any, shall be assigned to the withdrawn Customers based upon the impact of the withdrawal of each withdrawn Customer’s request on those upgrades for which the DAUC increased for the confirmed requests, thereby resulting in the MWP. Upgrade costs for facilities only required by the withdrawn Customer’s request(s) shall not be included as part of the calculation of the MWP. A Customer required to pay a MWP will enter into a Sponsored Upgrade Agreement with SPP in accordance with Attachment J of the OATT and will be eligible for ILTCRs in accordance with Attachment Z2 of the OATT.

# THIRD PARTY FACILITIES

For third-party facilities listed in Table 3 and Table 5, the Customer is responsible for funding the necessary upgrades of these facilities per Section 21.1 of SPP’s OATT.

All modeled facilities within the SPP system are monitored during the development of this study, as well as certain facilities in first-tier neighboring systems. Third-party facilities must be upgraded when it is determined that they are overloaded while accommodating the requested Transmission Service. An agreement between the Customer and third party owner detailing the mitigation of the third party impact must be provided to SPP prior to tendering of a Transmission Service Agreement. These facilities also include those owned by members of SPP who have not placed their facilities under SPP’s OATT. Upgrades on the Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA) network requires prepayment of the upgrade cost prior to construction of the upgrade.

Third-party facilities are evaluated for only those requests whose load sinks within the SPP footprint. The Customer must arrange with the applicable Transmission Providers for study of third party facilities for service that sinks outside the SPP footprint.

# BASE PLAN UPGRADES

The potential base plan funding allowable is contingent on meeting each of the conditions for classifying upgrades associated with designated resources as Base Plan Upgrades as defined in Section III.B of Attachment J.

If the additional capacity of the new or changed Designated Resource exceeds the 125% resource to load forecast for the year of start of service, the requested resource is not eligible for base plan funding of required Network Upgrades and the full cost of the upgrades is assignable to the Customer.

If the request is for wind generation, the total requested capacity of wind generation plus existing wind generation capacity shall not exceed 20% of the customer’s projected system peak responsibility in the first year the Designated Resource is planned to be used by the customer. If the five-year term and 125% resource to load criteria are met, (as well as the 20% wind resource to load criteria for wind generation requests) the requested capacity is multiplied by $180,000 to determine the potential base plan funding allowable. The maximum potential base plan funding allowable may be less than the potential base plan funding allowable, due to the E&C cost allocated to the customer being lower than the potential amount allowable to the Customer. The Customer is responsible for any assigned upgrade costs in excess of potential base plan E&C funding allowable. Network Upgrades required for wind generation requests located in a zone other than the Customer’s Point of Delivery (POD) shall be allocated as 67% base plan region-wide charge and 33% directly assigned to the Customer.

## NETWORK REQUESTS

When completing the NITS Application, the customer is provided with formulas in the spreadsheet intended to assist the customer in making a preliminary estimate of Base Plan funding eligibility for upgrade costs. Any pending changes to existing Designated Resources must be formally submitted prior to the close of the open season to allow those modifications to be taken into account for the official Base Plan funding calculations.

Once the open season is closed, and the study begins, SPP will perform the official calculations for Base Plan funding thresholds, accounting for all existing and requested Designated Resources. All Designated Resources with stop dates greater than 12 months out from the study start date will be assumed to be exercising rollover rights for the purposes of calculating Base Plan funding eligibility, unless the customer elects to include a note in their NITS Agreement stating that they are waiving rollover rights. This NITS Agreement update must be executed before the study start date in order to be incorporated into the Base Plan Funding eligibility calculations.

If a Customer has multiple NITS Agreements, SPP will combine the resources and loads from the associated NITS Agreements or NITS Applications when performing these Base Plan Funding calculations.

Additionally, if a customer submits multiple requests into study and one (but not all) request(s) are withdrawn following a study iteration, SPP will recalculate the Base Plan funding eligibility for that customer by removing the withdrawn request(s) from the calculations.

## POINT-TO-POINT REQUESTS

Regarding application of base plan funding for PTP requests, if PTP base rate exceeds upgrade revenue requirements without taking into effect the reduction of revenue requirements by potential base plan funding, then the base rate revenue pays back the Transmission Owner for upgrades and no base plan funding is applicable as the access charge must be paid as it is the higher of “OR” pricing.

However, if initially the upgrade revenue requirements exceed the PTP base rate, then potential base plan funding would be applicable. The test of the higher of “OR” pricing would then be made against the remaining assignable revenue requirements versus PTP base rate. Examples are as follows:

#### Example A:

E&C allocated for upgrades is $74 million with revenue requirements of $140 million and PTP base rate of $101 million. Potential base plan funding is $47 million, with the difference of $27 million E&C assignable to the Customer. If the revenue requirements for the assignable portion is $54 million and the PTP base rate is $101 million, the Customer will pay the higher amount (so-called “or pricing”) of $101 million base rate of which $54 million revenue requirements will be paid back to the Transmission Owners for the upgrades, and the remaining revenue requirements of $86 million ($140 million less $54 million) will be paid by base plan funding.

#### Example B:

E&C allocated for upgrades is $74 million with revenue requirements of $140 million and PTP base rate of $101 million. Potential base plan funding is $10 million with the difference of $64 million E&C assignable to the Customer. If the revenue requirements for this assignable portion is $128 million and the PTP base rate is $101 million, the Customer will pay the higher amount of $128 million revenue requirements to be paid back to the Transmission Owners, and the remaining revenue requirements of $12 million ($140 million less $128 million) will be paid by base plan funding.

#### Example C:

E&C allocated for upgrades is $25 million with revenue requirements of $50 million and PTP base rate of $101 million. Potential base plan funding is $10 million. Base plan funding is not applicable as the higher amount of PTP base rate of $101 million must be paid and the $50 million revenue requirements will be paid from this.

# Next Steps

SPP will accept the requests in which the specified study parameters are met in the final iteration and will tender a Service Agreement for each of these requests identifying the terms and conditions of the confirmed service. SPP will refuse all requests in which the parameters are exceeded.

# GLOSSARY OF TERMS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Term | Definition |
| ACCC | Alternating Current Contingency Check |
| AFS  | Aggregate Facility Study |
| ATC | Available Transfer Capability |
| ATSS | Aggregate Transmission Service Study |
| CEII | Critical Energy Infrastructure Information  |
| DAUC | Directly Assigned Upgrade Cost |
| DUN | Date Upgrade Needed |
| E&C | Engineering and Construction |
| EOC | End of Construction |
| ITP | Integrated Transmission Plan |
| MDWG | Model Development Working Group |
| MUST | Managing and Utilizing System Transmission |
| MWP | Make Whole Payment |
| NITS | Network Integrated Transmission Service |
| OATT | Open Access Transmission Tariff  |
| POD | Point of Delivery |
| PTP | Point to Point |
| RMS | Request Management System |
| SPP | Southwest Power Pool |
| SWPA | Southwestern Power Administration |
| TC | Transmission Customer |
| TDF | Transfer Distribution Factor |
| TO | Transmission Owner  |
| TP | Transmission Provider |

# REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

The following reference materials are available at: [www.spp.org](http://www.spp.org)

[SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff](https://spp.etariff.biz:8443/viewer/viewer.aspx)

Aggregate Transmission Service Study Procedures and Cost Allocation and Recovery for Service Upgrades (Attachment Z1)

[SPP Business Practices](https://www.spp.org/documents/64300/spp%20oatt%20business%20practices.pdf)

7500 Aggregate Study Procedures

[SPP Planning Criteria](https://www.spp.org/documents/69546/spp%20planning%20criteria%20v4.1.pdf)

[SEAMS Agreements](https://www.spp.org/spp-documents-filings/?id=18378)

AECI

ERCOT

MISO

Peak

Saskatchewan Power

SWPA

TVA

[SPP Disturbance Performance Requirements](https://www.spp.org/documents/28859/spp%20disturbance%20performance%20requirements%20%28twg%20approved%29.pdf)