



**MICHEHL R. GENT**  
President and CEO

## **NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL**

Princeton Forrestal Village, 116-390 Village Boulevard, Princeton, New Jersey 08540-5731

August 9, 2005

Mr. Roy Thilly  
Chairman  
Transmission Access Policy Study Group  
Wisconsin Public Power Inc.  
1425 Corporate Center Drive  
Sun Prairie, Wisconsin 53590

Dear Roy:

### **Inadvertent Interchange Payback**

This is in response to your July 22, 2005 letter to me and the NAESB Wholesale Electric Quadrant regarding the comparability between inadvertent interchange payback and energy imbalance. I understand that you and Don Benjamin talked about this in San Diego last week.

The inadvertent-energy imbalance comparability issue arose frequently within NERC committees soon after the Commission promulgated its *pro forma* tariff. In fact, this is one of the issues that resulted in NERC developing our reliability functional model.

We have debated the characteristics of inadvertent interchange over many years. Specifically:

1. Inadvertent interchange is between a balancing authority and the Interconnection, not between two individual balancing authorities. In other words, inadvertent interchange is not a bilateral arrangement.
2. Inadvertent interchange has two forms: 1.) Inadvertent caused by imperfect generation control that we call "primary inadvertent," and 2.) Inadvertent caused by Interconnection frequency error that we call "secondary inadvertent" (the result of other balancing authorities' primary inadvertent). How should the values of these different forms of inadvertent interchange be determined?

Therefore, while inadvertent interchange appears to have many of the attributes of energy imbalance, they are not the same, and I question whether they can be dealt with on the comparable basis that you are suggesting.

A New Jersey Nonprofit Corporation

Phone 609-452-8060 ■ Fax 609-452-9550 ■ URL [www.nerc.com](http://www.nerc.com)

Mr. Roy Thilly  
August 9, 2005  
Page Two

It appears to me that NERC and NAESB have both worked hard on inadvertent settlement methods, with NAESB's Inadvertent Interchange Payback Task Force delving into these concepts further than any group we're aware of. Despite the considerable discussions by industry experts, including economists, the IIPTF realized the practical hurdles of calculating Interconnection market prices and values for frequency response couldn't be crossed. Don explained this at the Stakeholders Committee meeting.

NERC is committed to ensure that our standards do not unduly discriminate among the responsible entities to which those standards apply. Standards that apply to balancing authorities must apply comparably to all balancing authorities. However, NERC cannot ensure that standards that apply to balancing authorities will be economically comparable to tariff rules or other protocols that apply to other transmission customers such as generators or load-serving entities, and that NERC has no influence over.

Roy, I believe NERC and NAESB have thoroughly debated inadvertent payback possibilities over many years. We believe NAESB should continue to set the on- and off-peak periods and develop whatever financial payback provisions that industry may agree upon in the future. Both NERC and NAESB have very open standards development processes that will welcome your thoughtful insight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael R. Gaud", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

cc: Allen Mosher, APPA  
Rae McQuade, NAESB