**Main issues**

* **Allocation Group definitions:** Add descriptions of each group, including the severe Group 3 limitations.
* **Balance-Sheet Financing affidavits:** Add explanation of which projects can retain and/or elect new BSF affidavits, and the implications of that. Applicability of GIDAP Section 8.2.2 seems to be an item of dispute in particular, based on recent Cluster 10 Results Meetings.
* **Other transitional issues:** Add explanation of issues like: (1) Cluster 8-9 projects coming out of parking; (2) Cluster 10 Group 3 parking elections (see above); (3) projects that accepted partial deliverability awards but parked the other project capacity, and thus may be awarded deliverability under both current and revised rules (especially if the latter is a Group 3 allocation).
* **“Housekeeping” issues:**
* **Clarify issues related to PCDS projects**, e.g., affidavit submittals; current language reflects only FCDS and “Energy Only” projects.
* **Clean up terminology**, e.g., Awkward use of “Interconnection Customers” and “projects” (e.g., ICs make elections and submittals for their projects but do not have queue positions).
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**GIDAP BPM**

# Summary of Available Study Tracks and Application Deadlines

## Deliverability Assessment Options

An eligible Generating Facility, including Energy Only projects, will have an opportunity to obtain deliverability following the TP Deliverability Allocation process described in GIDAP Section 8.9.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.[[1]](#footnote-2)

### Participating TO Tariff Option for Full Capacity Deliverability Status

To the extent that a Participating TO’s tariff provides the option for customers taking interconnection service under the Participating TO’s tariff to obtain Full Capacity Deliverability Status or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status, the CAISO will, in coordination with the applicable Participating TO, perform the necessary Deliverability Assessment to determine the Deliverability of customers electing such option. The CAISO shall execute any necessary agreements for reimbursement of study costs it incurs and to assure cost attribution for any Network Upgrades relating to any Deliverability status conferred to such customers under the Participating TO’s tariff.

### Deliverability from Non-Participating TOs

This process applies to Generating Facilities that interconnect to the transmission facilities of a Non-Participating TO located within the CAISO Balancing Authority Area that wish to obtain Full Capacity Deliverability Status or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status under the CAISO Tariff. Such Generating Facilities will be eligible to be studied by the CAISO for Full or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status pursuant to the provisions in GIDAP BPM Section 6.6..

# Study Tracks and Details

|  |
| --- |
| **PLEASE NOTE** |
| Within this Section 6, references to sections of the GIDAP reflect the sections as they appear in the CAISO proposed tariff revisions submitted and pending before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in Docket No. ER18-2498-000 effective Nov. 27, 2018, available at http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Sep27-2018-TariffAmendment-IPE2018-ER18-2498.pdf. |

## Queue Cluster Study Process[[2]](#footnote-3)

The Queue Cluster Study Process track is the default process for processing Interconnection Requests (see GIDAP BPM Attachments 1 and 2). Unless it is demonstrated that an Interconnection Request qualifies for the Independent Study Process track (GIDAP Section 4), the Fast Track Process track (GIDAP Section 5), or the 10 kW Inverter Process (GIDAP Appendix 7), the Interconnection Request will be studied under the Queue Cluster Study Process track (GIDAP Sections 6 and 7).

For Interconnection Requests in a Queue Cluster, the Interconnection Studies consist of a Phase I Interconnection Study, a Phase II Interconnection Study, a TP Deliverability allocation and reassessment study, and an update to the Phase II Interconnection Study report to reflect the results of TP Deliverability allocation and reassessment for the Queue Cluster.

### Activities in Preparation for Phase II Studies[[3]](#footnote-4)

* + - 1. **Phase II Data Form**

Within ten (10) Business Days following the Phase I Interconnection Study Results Meeting, the Interconnection Customer shall submit to the CAISO the completed form of Appendix B to the “*Generator Interconnection Study Process Agreement for Queue Clusters*”– set forth in GIDAP Appendix 3 (GIDAP Appendix B). The title of GIDAP Appendix B is ”*Data Form to Be Provided by the Interconnection Customer Prior to Commencement of the Phase II Interconnection Study*,” In this form, the Interconnection Customer provides critical information regarding the customer’s proposed Generating Facility for the purpose of scoping the Phase II Interconnection Study Work.

* + - * 1. **Confirm Deliverability Status and Provide Other Data[[4]](#footnote-5)**

GIDAP Appendix B requires the Interconnection Customer to make certain important choices and/or affirmations about the nature of its proposed Generating Facility, so that the facility can be appropriately incorporated into the Phase II Interconnection Study effort. One of the most important things that the Interconnection Customer must do is make its election to either:

1. confirm the desired Deliverability Status that the Interconnection Customer had previously designated in the completed form of Appendix A to the Generator Interconnection Study Process Agreement (Assumptions Used in Conducting the Phase I Interconnection Study); or
2. change the desired Deliverability Status in one of the following ways:
   1. from Full Capacity Deliverability Status to Energy-Only Deliverability Status;
   2. from Full Capacity Deliverability Status to Partial Capacity Deliverability Status with a specified fraction of Full Capacity Deliverability Status;
   3. from Partial Capacity Deliverability Status to Energy-Only Deliverability Status; or
   4. reduce Partial Capacity Deliverability Status to a lower fraction of Full Capacity Deliverability Status.

Importantly, there is no opportunity for the Interconnection Customer to “upgrade” its delivery status from Energy-Only Deliverability Status to Full or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status.

Another significant point that the Interconnection Customer must bear in mind in deciding either to confirm a Full or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status or to “downgrade” (for example, from Full to Partial Capacity or to Energy-Only Deliverability Status) is that, once the choice is made, there is no later, further opportunity for the Interconnection Customer to “upgrade” the deliverability status of the Generating Facility, say from Partial Capacity or Energy-Only Deliverability Status to Full Capacity Delivery Status. The purpose of an Interconnection Request and Interconnection Study is to interconnect the facility to the CAISO Controlled Grid. A new facility (or increase increment of an increased facility) is only interconnected to the grid once, and so the Interconnection Request mechanism is not available thereafter to change delivery status.

* + - * 1. Once the Interconnection Customer has chosen Partial Capacity or Energy-Only Deliverability Status at the onset of the Phase II Interconnection Study, the only opportunity left for any “upgrade” of deliverability status is when a Generating Facility meets the criteria for Energy Only projects to obtain TP Deliverability as defined under GIDAP Section 8.9.2. **Confirm MW Capacity**

GIDAP Appendix B requires the Interconnection Customer to confirm the requested MW capacity of the generator.

* + - * 1. **Confirm Need for Ratepayer-Funded/Self Fund Deliverability (Option A or B)[[5]](#footnote-6)**

This GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.6.1(iii) applies to Interconnection Requests for which the Generating Facility Deliverability Status is either Full Capacity or Partial Capacity.

Within GIDAP Appendix B, the Interconnection Customer must select one of two options with respect to Deliverability for the Generating Facility:

**Option (A)**, which means that the Generating Facility requests TP Deliverability only. If the facility does not receive an allocation of TP Deliverability it will either withdraw or convert to EO to be able to continue to Commercial Operation. If the Interconnection Customer selects Option (A), then the Interconnection Customer shall be required to make an initial posting of Interconnection Financial Security under GIDAP Section 11.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 8.3 for the cost responsibility assigned to it in the Phase I Interconnection Study for Interconnection Facilities, RNUs and LDNUs; or,

**Option (B)**, which means that the Interconnection Customer requests Full Capacity Deliverability Status or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status and will assume cost responsibility for all Delivery Network Upgrades (both ADNUs and LDNUs, to the extent applicable) without cash repayment under GIDAP Section 14.3.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 12 to the extent that sufficient TP Deliverability is not allocated to the Generating Facility to provide its requested Deliverability Status. If the Interconnection Customer selects Option (B), then the Interconnection Customer shall be required to make an initial posting of Interconnection Financial Security under GIDAP Section 11.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 8.3 for the cost responsibility assigned to it in the Phase I Interconnection Study for Interconnection Facilities, RNUs, LDNUs and ADNUs. To qualify to receive any allocation of TP Deliverability, Interconnection Customers selecting Option (B) must still meet the criteria identified in GIDAP Section 8.9.2.

* + - 1. **Reassessment of Study Assumptions for the Phase II Studies[[6]](#footnote-7)**

The CAISO, in coordination with the Participating TOs, will perform a reassessment of the Network Upgrades needed for Interconnection Requests queued before the current cluster prior to the beginning of the GIDAP Phase II Interconnection Studies for the current cluster. The reassessment will evaluate the impacts on those Network Upgrades identified in previous interconnection studies and assumed in the Phase I Interconnection Study of:

1. Interconnection Request withdrawals occurring after the completion of the Phase II Interconnection Studies for the immediately preceding Queue Cluster;
2. Generator Downsizing Requests submitted in the most recent Generator Downsizing Request Window that meet the requirements set forth in GIDAP Section 7.5, and Generating Facilities that are to have their generating capacities reduced pursuant to GIDAP Sections 8.9.4, 8.9.5, and 8.9.6
3. the performance of earlier queued Interconnection Customers with executed GIAs with respect to required milestones and other obligations,

1. the amount of TP Deliverability available for allocation;
2. the results of the TP Deliverability allocation from the prior Interconnection Study cycle; and,
3. transmission additions and upgrades approved in the most recent Transmission Planning Process cycle.

The scope of the reassessment generally includes On-Peak Deliverability Assessment, off-peak power flow study, stability analysis and short circuit duty analysis, as necessary. The reassessment will determine if a previously required Network Upgrade is still needed and could be modified or eliminated. This information will be used to develop the base case for the Phase II Interconnection Study.

The results of the reassessment may also indicate that a particular Network Upgrade is no longer required prior to the interconnection of an Interconnection Customer’s facility, or for an Interconnection Customer’s facility to achieve its requested deliverability status, based on its position in the queue. In such instances the financial responsibility to fund the Network Upgrade as assigned in its governing interconnection study report remains unchanged.

Where, as a consequence of the reassessment, the CAISO determines that the Network Upgrade requirement for an Interconnection Request has changed from its most recent governing interconnection study report, the CAISO will issue a reassessment report to the Interconnection Customer. The GIA for the Interconnection Request will be modified or amended accordingly. Such changes to plans of service in Queue Clusters earlier than the current Interconnection Study Cycle will also serve as the basis for potential adjustments to the maximum cost responsibility for Network Upgrades for Interconnection Customers in such earlier Queue Clusters, as follows:

1. An Interconnection Customer shall be eligible for an adjustment to its maximum cost responsibility for Network Upgrades if a reassessment undertaken pursuant to this Section 7.4 reduces its estimated cost responsibility for Network Upgrades by at least twenty (20) percent and $1 million, as compared to its current maximum cost responsibility for Network Upgrades based on its Interconnection Studies or a previous reassessment.

The maximum cost responsibility for an Interconnection Customer who meets this eligibility criterion will be the lesser of (a) its current maximum

cost responsibility and (b) 100 percent of the costs of all remaining

Network Upgrades included in the Interconnection Customer’s plan of

service.

1. If an Interconnection Customer’s maximum cost responsibility for Network Upgrades is adjusted downward pursuant to (a) above, and a subsequent reassessment identifies a change on the CAISO’s system that occurs after the completion of the Interconnection Customer’s Interconnection Studies and requires additional or expanded Network Upgrades, resulting in an increase in the Interconnection Customer’s estimated cost responsibility for Network Upgrades above the maximum cost responsibility as adjusted based on the results of a prior reassessment, then the Interconnection Customer’s maximum cost responsibility for Network Upgrades will be the estimated cost responsibility determined in the subsequent reassessment, so long as this amount does not exceed the maximum cost responsibility originally established by the Interconnection Customer’s Interconnection Studies. In such cases, where the estimated cost responsibility determined in the subsequent reassessment exceeds the maximum cost responsibility as adjusted based on the results of a prior reassessment, the Interconnection Customer’s maximum cost responsibility for Network Upgrades shall be the maximum cost responsibility established by its Interconnection Studies. The Interconnection Customer’s maximum cost responsibility may never exceed the maximum cost responsibility determined by the lower of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Interconnection Studies.

The reassessment is performed in conjunction with TP Deliverability allocation as described in GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4.

Example 1:

*Project ABC*

Phase 1 Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $20,000,000

Phase 2 Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $10,000,000

**Original Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $10,000,000**

Reassessment #1: $8,000,000 Network Upgrades estimated cost responsibility

Pursuant to (a) above, the Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility has been reduced by at least 20 percent and $1 million.

Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $8,000,000

Reassessment #2: $11,000,000 Network Upgrades estimated cost responsibility Pursuant to (b) above, the Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility is the original Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility established by the Phase 2 Interconnection Study.

Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $10,000,000

Example 2:

*Project XYZ*

Phase 1 Network Upgrades Maximum Cost Responsibility: $50,000,000

Phase 2 Network Upgrades Maximum Cost Responsibility: $30,000,000

**Original Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $30,000,000**

Reassessment #1: $40,000,000 Network Upgrades estimated cost responsibility

Pursuant to (b) above, the Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility is the original Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility established by the Phase 2 Interconnection Study.

Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $30,000,000

Phase 2 Revised Report #1 Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $20,000,000

Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility is established as the lower of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Interconnection Study.

**Original Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility is adjusted: $20,000,000**

Reassessment #2: $19,000,000 Network Upgrades estimated cost responsibility

Pursuant to (a) above, the Network Upgrades estimated cost responsibility has *not been* reduced by at least 20 percent and $1 million.

Network Upgrades maximum cost responsibility: $20,000,000

The posted Interconnection Financial Security required of the Interconnection Customer for Network Upgrades shall be adjusted to correspond to any increase in the Interconnection Customer’s estimated cost responsibility any time after but no later than sixty (60) calendar days after issuance of a reassessment report. The CAISO will notify an Interconnection Customer that receives a downward adjustment to its current maximum cost responsibility pursuant to this Section, and the Interconnection Customer may choose to adjust its posted Interconnection Financial Security within sixty (60) calendar days of the issuance of the reassessment report.

### Allocation Process for TP Deliverability[[7]](#footnote-8)

After the Phase II Interconnection Study reports are issued, the CAISO will perform the allocation of the TP Deliverability to eligible Generating Facilities according to, and in the order of, the allocation groups in GIDAP Section 8.9.2[[8]](#footnote-9) and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4. The TP Deliverability available for allocation will be determined from the most recent Transmission Plan. Once a Generating Facility is allocated TP Deliverability, the facility will be required to comply with retention criteria specific in GIDAP Section 8.9.3 and BPM Section 6.2.9.5 in order to retain the allocation. A Generating Facility’s compliance with the retention criteria shall be verified annually until the facility achieves Commercial Operation, at which time the allocation of TP Deliverability will be reflected in the facility’s Deliverability Status as an attribute of the facility that is no longer subject to the retention criteria.

Allocation of TP Deliverability shall not provide any Interconnection Customer or Generating Facility with any right to a specific MW of capacity on the CAISO Controlled Grid or any other rights (such as title, ownership, rights to lease, transfer or encumber). Rather, an allocation of TP Deliverability will be reflected in the Generating Facility’s Deliverability Status for purposes of determining its Net Qualifying Capacity on an annual basis in accordance with CAISO Tariff Section 40.4.6.1 and Section 5.1 of the BPM for Reliability Requirements.

* + - 1. **Market Notice of Timeline, Submission of Affidavits and Commencement of Allocation Activities[[9]](#footnote-10)**

The CAISO will issue a Market Notice to inform interested parties as to the timeline for commencement of allocation activities. The market notice will specify the due date for Interconnection Customer submittal of affidavits attesting to each proposed Generating Facility’s eligibility status and retention information, the due date for the study deposit for Energy Only projects seeking TP Deliverability, and the anticipated release date for allocation results to Interconnection Customers. There are two major components of the allocation process, which are described in detail in GIDAP BPM Sections 6.2.9.3 and 6.2.9.4, respectively.

The remainder of this GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.1 describes the affidavits that Interconnection Customers submit in support of the process for allocating TP Deliverability. Three different affidavits are needed prior to the allocation process, and are listed below.

1. Affidavit for Queue Cluster 4 and earlier queued projects.
2. Affidavit to retain TP Deliverability allocations for Interconnection Customers that currently have a TP Deliverability allocation from a previous allocation cycle.
3. Affidavit for projects seeking allocation of TP Deliverability, including projects that have exercised the parking option, and eligible Energy Only projects.

All affidavits shall be notarized. All affidavits will be reviewed by the CAISO to ensure completeness and accuracy based on information available to the CAISO. If the CAISO determines that an affidavit is not acceptable, it will be returned to the submitter for correction and resubmittal for further review. The CAISO and the Interconnection Customer shall work together to resolve any issue on a best efforts basis.

* + - * 1. **Affidavit for Cluster 4 and Earlier Queued Projects**

The first component of the GIDAP allocation procedures, as described in GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.3(a), requires that the CAISO identify MW quantities of TP Deliverability to be reserved for proposed Generating Facilities in Queue Cluster 4 and earlier that are expected to achieve Commercial Operation.

Specifically, GIDAP Section 8.9.1(a) requires the CAISO to identify commitments that will utilize MW quantities of TP Deliverability for proposed Generating Facilities in Queue Cluster 4 or earlier that have executed power purchase agreements (PPAs) with Load-Serving Entities and have GIAs that are in good standing.

For this purpose, each year following the completion of the current Queue Cluster’s Phase II Interconnection Study, the CAISO will require all Interconnection Customers that meet the criteria just stated to provide an affidavit that attests to information associated with their PPAs and GIAs, as well as other information to assist in the evaluation of these Generating Facilities’ progress toward Commercial Operation.

However, the content of these affidavits, if submitted, will not be used to determine the retention of TP Deliverability for any Cluster 4 and earlier-queued projects, i.e., they would receive the level of deliverability requested once they reach Commercial Operation and the required Network Upgrades are completed even if they do not meet the criteria of reserving TP Deliverability.

The affidavit must include:

* The name and queue number of the Generating Facility being attested to;
* An attestation to the existence of an executed and active PPA, and specify the MW of generating capacity covered under the PPA and the date the PPA was fully executed; and
* The name of the purchasing entity associated with the PPA.
  + - * 1. **Affidavit for Retaining TP Deliverability Allocation**

1. Interconnection Customers with Generating Facilities in Queue Cluster 5 through 9 that have been allocated TP Deliverability or that parked pursuant to GIDAP Section 8.9.4 or 8.9.4.1, must demonstrate by the date set forth in the Market Notice each year, and according to the process described in this GIDAP BPM, that the Generating Facilities meet the criteria to retain their TP Deliverability as described in GIDAP Section 8.9.3.1. Projects receiving their TP Deliverability Allocations based on submittal of a Balance-Sheet Financing affidavit may cite those affidavits to demonstrate compliance with the TP Deliverability retention criteria.
2. Interconnection Customers with Generating Facilities in Queue Cluster 10 or later that have been allocated TP Deliverability under GIDAP Section 8.9.2 on the date set forth in the Market Notice each year, and according to the process described in this GIDAP BPM, that the Generating Facilities meet the criteria to retain its TP Deliverability as described in GIDAP Section 8.9.3.
   * + - 1. **Affidavit for projects seeking allocation of TP Deliverability, including projects that have exercised their parking option(s), eligible projects with Partial Capacity Deliverability Status, and eligible Energy Only projects**

This affidavit is applicable to Generating Facilities that fall into one of three categories. The first category consists of Generating Facilities that have just completed the GIDAP Phase II Interconnection Study process and are seeking an allocation of TP Deliverability for the first time. The second category consists of Generating Facilities that have completed the GIDAP Phase II Interconnection Study process in a previous Interconnection Study Cycle, have exercised the parking option or extended parking option, pursuant to GIDAP Section 8.9.4 or 8.9.4.1 respectively, and are seeking an allocation of TP Deliverability in the current Queue Cluster’s allocation process. The third category consists of Partial Capacity Deliverability Status and Energy-Only Generating Facilities seeking TP Deliverability.

The CAISO shall allocate available TP Deliverability to all or a portion of the full MW capacity of the Generating Facility as specified in the Interconnection Request based on the criteria defined in GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4. Where a criterion is met by a portion of the full MW generating capacity of the Generating Facility, the eligibility score associated with that criterion shall apply to the portion that meets the criterion. Therefore, the affidavit must relate to the same proposed Generating Facility as described in the Interconnection Request and, for each allocation group attested to, must specify the MW quantity of generating capacity that meets the criteria for inclusion in the allocation group. At a minimum, the Generating Facility must meet criteria established in one of the seven allocation groups defined in GIDAP Section 8.9.2.

Interconnection Customers requesting Deliverability for their Energy-Only or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status projects must submit to the CAISO a $60,000 study deposit for each Generating Facility seeking TP Deliverability. The $60,000 study deposit is due on the same due date of the Seeking TP Deliverability affidavit as established and provided in the annual Market Notice published in accordance with GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.1. A market notice is provided 30 calendar days in advance of the TP Deliverability Affidavit due date. Refer to GIDAP Section 8.9.2 for further details.

The affidavit must include the following current information:

1. TP Deliverability allocation group as identified above
2. PPA status (applicable to allocation Groups 1 and 4 only)
3. Shortlist status (applicable to allocation Groups 2 and 5 only)
4. Permitting status (applicable to allocation Groups 1 through 7)
5. Land acquisition status (applicable to allocation Groups 1 through 7)
   * + 1. **Reassessment Study and TP Deliverability Allocation Study**

The CAISO will perform a multi-step study, in coordination with the Participating TOs, to allocate TP Deliverability to eligible generators and update Network Upgrade requirements for all generator projects that have completed their Phase II Interconnection Study or Facilities Study. The overall study consists of the first part of the reassessment, TP Deliverability allocation, and the second part of the reassessment.

In the first part of the reassessment, the CAISO will update the generator and transmission study models to reflect changes since the model setup was completed for the current Phase II Interconnection Study for the Queue Cluster. The study scope will include a Deliverability Assessment, a power flow analysis, and a stability analysis if applicable. The study will identify all deliverability constraints and updates RNU and LDNU requirements for Interconnection Requests queued earlier than the Queue Cluster going through the TP Deliverability allocation. Then the CAISO will perform a TP Deliverability allocation study for the Area Deliverability Constraints identified in the first part of the reassessment. The CAISO will adjust generator project models in the Deliverability Assessment to represent deliverability preserved for prior commitments and the scores of the generator projects seeking TP Deliverability allocation. The CAISO will allocate available TP Deliverability, if any, to the eligible generator projects in the descending order of scores pursuant to GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4.

After the CAISO receives the Interconnection Customers’ decisions on accepting TP Deliverability allocation results, the CAISO, in coordination with the Participating TOs, will perform the second part of the reassessment. The generator projects that have withdrawn will be removed from the study model. The CAISO will update the deliverability study model to reflect changes of requested deliverability status. The CAISO, in coordination with the applicable Participating TOs, will perform a Deliverability Assessment, a power flow analysis, a short circuit duty analysis, and a stability analysis if applicable to update RNU, LDNU and ADNU requirements for the projects up to the Queue Cluster going through the TP Deliverability allocation.

* + - 1. **First Component of the Allocation Process: Representing TP Deliverability Used by Prior Commitments[[10]](#footnote-11)**

Before allocating any TP Deliverability to specific Generating Facilities, the CAISO will identify the following commitments that will utilize MW quantities of TP Deliverability and will appropriately represent them during allocation of TP Deliverability in accordance with GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4:

1. The proposed Generating Facilities corresponding to earlier queued Interconnection Requests meeting the criteria set forth below:
   1. proposed Generating Facilities in Queue Cluster 4 or earlier that have executed and active PPAs with Load-Serving Entities and have GIAs that are in good standing; or
   2. proposed Generating Facilities in Queue Cluster 5 and subsequent Queue Clusters that were previously allocated TP Deliverability and have met the retention criteria set forth in GIDAP Section 8.9.3.

As to both criterion (i) and criterion (ii), the CAISO would set aside TP Deliverability in MW amounts that reflect the Deliverability Status requested by the identified Generating Facilities for the expected Qualifying Capacity amounts, which will not necessarily be the same as their installed MW of capacity. For example, a wind or solar photovoltaic resource of 100 MW installed capacity that requested Full Capacity Deliverability Status would typically have a Qualifying Capacity somewhat less than 100 MW. A capacity level lower than 100 MW but higher than the Qualifying Capacity, as specified in the deliverability assessment methodology (link: http://www.caiso.com/Documents/On-PeakDeliverability AssessmentMethdology.pdf), would be reflected in the MW amount of TP Deliverability the CAISO sets aside before issuing new allocations. If the same Generating Facility requested Partial Capacity Deliverability Status, it would have an even smaller impact on the set-aside of TP Deliverability. For another example, a Generating Facility that met criterion (i) but requested Energy-Only Deliverability Status would not require any set aside of TP Deliverability.

1. any Maximum Import Capability included as a planning objective in the Transmission Plan; and
2. any other commitments having a basis in the Transmission Plan. For example, the CAISO’s annual process for assigning deliverability status to distributed generating resources, which was approved by FERC in November 2012, could result in a commitment of TP Deliverability that would need to be reflected in this component of the process.

This first allocation component is performed for the purpose of determining the amount of TP Deliverability available for allocation to the current Queue Cluster and any eligible parked Generating Facilities from the previous two Queue Clusters in accordance with GIDAP Section 8.9.4 and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4.

The results of this first allocation component shall not affect the rights and obligations of proposed Generating Facilities in Queue Cluster 4 or earlier with respect to the construction and funding of Network Upgrades identified for such Generating Facilities, or their requested Deliverability Status. Such rights and obligations will continue to be determined pursuant to the GIP and the Generating Facility’s GIA.

* + - 1. **Second Component of the Allocation Process: Allocating TP Deliverability to the Current Queue Cluster and Parked Projects[[11]](#footnote-12)**

If the CAISO determines, under GIDAP Section 8.9.1 and after completing the steps described in GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.3, that no TP Deliverability exists for allocation to Generating Facilities not previously allocated their requested amounts of TP Deliverability (which would include both the current Queue Cluster as well as parked projects from the prior two Queue Clusters), then no allocation of TP Deliverability shall be made to these Generating Facilities, which will not impact the retention of prior partial TP Allocations as long as the project meets the allocation retention requirements. If TP Deliverability is available for allocation, then the CAISO will allocate such capacity to eligible Generating Facilities in the current Interconnection Study Cycle and eligible parked Generating Facilities from the previous two Interconnection Study Cycles.

The CAISO will allocate available TP Deliverability to Generating Facilities (1) in order of the seven allocation groups described in GIDAP Section 8.9.2 and (2) within each allocation group, based on the Generating Facility’s total points as established in items (1) through (4) below, based on the Interconnection Customers’ demonstration, via the submitted affidavits, and in accordance with the criteria set forth in GIDAP Section 8.9.2.1. Where a criterion is met by a portion of the full MW generating capacity of the Generating Facility, within each allocation group, the eligibility score associated with that criterion shall apply to the portion that meets the criterion. The demonstration must relate to the same proposed Generating Facility as described in Appendix A to the Interconnection Request.

If the amount of projects meeting the threshold eligibility criteria can be deliverable within the available TP deliverability, the CAISO will allocate TP Deliverability to all of them. In this case the Option (A) or (B) projects that receive TP Deliverability may execute GIAs that reflect their allocations. If, however, not all projects in the allocation group that meet the threshold criteria can be fully accommodated, the CAISO will allocate the available TP Deliverability based on numerical scores reflecting each project’s status with respect to the allocation groups set forth in GIDAP Section 8.9.2 and the criteria below, which are set forth in GIDAP Section 8.9.2.1 with the projects having the highest scores receiving TP Deliverability up to their full request before allocations to lower-ranked projects.

1. **The Project’s PPA Status** (applicable to Allocation Groups 1 and 4 Only)
2. (10 points) The Interconnection Customer represents to the CAISO that it has a regulator-approved PPA with a Load-Serving Entity to serve end users in its service area requiring the project to have Deliverability, or an executed PPA that does not require regulatory approval.
3. (7 points) The Interconnection Customer has an executed PPA with a Load-Serving Entity to serve end users in its service area requiring the Project to have Deliverability, but such agreement has not yet received regulatory approval.
4. **The Project’s Shortlist Status** (applicable to Allocation Groups 2 and 5 Only)

Interconnection Customer must provide proof/documentation of the project being selected/shortlisted and details of such request for offer/request for proposal or solicitation.

1. (Minimum criteria, no points) The Interconnection Customer does not have an executed PPA, but the project is currently included on an active short list or other commercially recognized method of preferential ranking of power providers by a prospective Load Serving Entity purchaser in the CAISO balancing authority area requiring the project to have Deliverability.
2. **The Project’s Permitting Status (All allocation Groups 1 – 7)**
3. (10 points) The Interconnection Customer has received its final governmental permit or authorization allowing the Generating Facility to commence construction.
4. (5 points) The Interconnection Customer has received a draft environmental report (or equivalent environmental permitting document) indicating likely approval of the requested permit and/or which indicates that the permitting authority has not found an environmental impact which would likely prevent the approval. For purposes of this requirement, a draft environmental report can take the form of a draft environmental impact report, draft environmental impact statement, environmental assessment, mitigated negative declaration, or CEC preliminary staff assessment. Findings that would qualify as those which would indicate likely approval include no environmental impacts found that cannot be mitigated to insignificance, or in the case of a National Environmental Policy Act document, the project has been identified as the preferred alternative. If Federal or State Endangered Species Act permits are required, draft environmental reports for such permits have been received and similarly either indicate likely approval or do not find an impact that would likely prevent approval.
5. (3 points) The Interconnection Customer has applied for the necessary governmental permits or authorizations and the authority has deemed such documentation as data adequate for the authority to initiate its review process.
6. (1 point) The Interconnection Customer has applied for the necessary governmental permit or authorization for the construction.
7. **The Project’s Land Acquisition Status (All allocation Groups 1 – 7)**
8. (3 points) The Interconnection Customer can demonstrate a present legal right to begin construction of the Generating Facility on one hundred percent (100%) of the real property footprint necessary for the entire Generating facility.
9. (2 points) The Interconnection Customer can demonstrate Site Exclusivity.
10. (0 points) The Interconnection Customer has a Site Exclusivity deposit.

The tables below summarize the allocation ranking groups and scoring methodology described above for TP Deliverability allocation.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Allocation Group** | **Capacity Status** | **Commercial Status** | **Can Build DNUs for Allocation?** | **Allocation Rank** |
| **1** | Study/Parking Process | Executed or regulator-approved PPA requiring FCDS or interconnection customer is a LSE serving its own load | Yes | Allocated 1st |
| **2** | Study/Parking Process | Shortlisted in a RFO/RFP | Yes | Allocated 2nd |
| **3** | Study Process  (Following Ph. II Only, except for projects that submitted Balance-Sheet Financing affidavits…) | Proceeding without a PPA | Yes | Allocated 3rd |
| **4** | Converted to Energy Only, or Energy Only projects that achieved commercial operation | Executed or regulator-approved PPA requiring FCDS | No | Allocated 4th |
| **5** | Converted to Energy Only, or Energy Only projects that achieved commercial operation | Shortlisted in a RFO/RFP | No | Allocated 5th |
| **6** | Converted to Energy Only | Commercial operation achieved | No | Allocated 6th |
| **7** | Energy Only | Commercial operation achieved | No | Allocated 7th |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Points** | **Permitting** | **PPA Status** | **Shortlist Status** | **Land Acquisition** |
| 10 | Has Final government permit to construct | Has regulator-approved PPA or is LSE |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  | Has executed PPA w/o regulatory approval |  |  |
| 5 | Draft Environmental Report w/no significant impact that cannot be mitigated |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Data adequate |  |  | Legal right to construct 100% of project |
| 2 |  |  |  | Site Exclusivity |
| 1 | Applied |  |  |  |
| 0  (Min. Req.) |  |  | No PPA, included in shortlist or actively negotiating |  |

Where the available amount of TP Deliverability can accommodate only one out of two or more Generating Facilities requesting TP Deliverability and such Generating Facilities are in the same allocation group and score equally under the criteria above, the CAISO will allocate the TP Deliverability under GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4 to such equally scoring Generating Facilities according to lowest LDNU cost estimates.

* + - 1. **Criteria for Retaining TP Deliverability Allocation[[12]](#footnote-13)**

For Interconnection Customers in Queue Cluster 10 or later, once a Generating Facility is allocated TP Deliverability under GIDAP Section 8.9.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4, the Interconnection Customer must annually demonstrate, on the date set forth in the Market Notice and according to the process described in this GIDAP BPM, that the Generating Facility meets the criteria set forth in GIDAP Section 8.9.3 to retain its TP Deliverability. For Interconnection Customers in Queue Clusters 5 through 9, once a Generating Facility is allocated TP Deliverability under GIDAP Section 8.9.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4, the Interconnection Customer must annually demonstrate, on the date set forth in the Market Notice and according to the process described in this GIDAP BPM, that the Generating Facility meets the criteria set forth in GIDAP Section 8.9.3.1 to retain its TP Deliverability.

Refer to GIDAP Section 8.9.3.2 for issues related to an Interconnection Customer’s loss of a PPA or short list status.

-

* + - 1. **Parking for Option (A) Generating Facilities[[13]](#footnote-14)**

For an Option (A) Generating Facility in the current Interconnection Study Cycle which either was allocated less TP Deliverability than requested or does not desire to accept the amount allocated the Interconnection Customer shall select one of the following options:

* + 1. Withdraw its Interconnection Request; or
    2. Decline any allocated TP Deliverability amount and enter into a GIA for Energy-Only Deliverability Status for the entire Generating Facility. In such circumstances, upon execution of the GIA, any Interconnection Financial Security shall be adjusted to remove the obligation for Interconnection Financial Security pertaining to LDNUs; or
    3. Park the Interconnection Request; in which case the Interconnection Request may remain in the Interconnection queue until the next allocation of TP Deliverability in which it may participate in accordance with the requirements of GIDAP Section 8.9.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4. Under this option, the Interconnection Customer may decline any allocated TP Deliverability amount and park the entire amount of the Interconnection Request, or may accept all or a portion of the allocated amount and park to seek the balance of the TP Deliverability needed to fulfill its Interconnection Request in accordance with GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.7(iii). Parking an Interconnection Request does not confer a preference relative to any other Interconnection Request with respect to allocation of TP Deliverability; or
    4. Elect one of the other options available under GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.7.
       1. **Partial Allocations of Transmission Based Deliverability to Option (A) and Option (B) Generating Facilities[[14]](#footnote-15)**

If a Generating Facility is allocated TP Deliverability in the current Interconnection Study Cycle in an amount less than the amount of Deliverability requested, then the Interconnection Customer must choose one of the following options:

1. Accept the allocated amount of TP Deliverability and reduce the MW generating capacity of the proposed Generating Facility such that the allocated amount of TP Deliverability will provide Full Capacity Deliverability Status to the reduced generating capacity; or

1. Accept the allocated amount of TP Deliverability and adjust the Deliverability status of the proposed Generating Facility to achieve Partial Capacity Deliverability corresponding to the allocated TP Deliverability;
2. For an Option (A) Generating Facility, accept the allocated amount of TP Deliverability and seek additional TP Deliverability for the remainder of the requested Deliverability of the Interconnection Request in the next allocation cycle. In such instance, the Interconnection Customer shall execute a GIA for the entire Generating Facility having Partial Capacity Deliverability corresponding to the allocated amount of TP Deliverability. Following the next cycle of TP Deliverability allocation, the GIA shall be amended as needed to adjust its Deliverability status to reflect any additional allocation of TP Deliverability. At the same time the Interconnection Customer may also adopt options (i) or (ii) above based on the final amount of TP Deliverability allocated to the Generating Facility. There will be no further opportunity for this Generating Facility to participate in any subsequent cycle of TP Deliverability allocation; or
3. Decline the allocated amount of TP Deliverability and either withdraw the Interconnection Request or convert to Energy-Only Deliverability Status. In accordance with GIDAP BPM Section 6.9.2.6(3), an Interconnection Customer having an Option (A) Generating Facility that has not previously parked may decline the allocation of TP Deliverability and park until the next cycle of TP Deliverability allocation in the next Interconnection Study Cycle.

An Interconnection Customer that selects option (iii) or (iv) above may, at the time it

selects the option, elect to reduce the generating capacity of its Generating Facility.

Interconnection Customers accepting a partial allocation of TP Deliverability may pursue additional deliverability through the Annual Full Capacity Deliverability Option under GIDAP Section 9.2.

* + - 1. **Declining TP Deliverability Allocation[[15]](#footnote-16)**

An Interconnection Customer having an Option (A) Generating Facility that has not previously parked and is allocated the entire amount of requested TP Deliverability may decline all or a portion of the TP Deliverability allocation and park the Generating Facility Request as described in GIDAP Section 8.9.4(3) and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.6(iii). An Interconnection Customer that selects this option may, at the time it selects the option, elect to reduce the generating capacity of its Generating Facility.

* + - 1. **Required Customer Response to TP Deliverability Allocation[[16]](#footnote-17)**

Upon completion of the allocation of TP Deliverability in accordance with GIDAP Section 8.9.2 and GIDAP BPM Section 6.2.9.4, the CAISO will provide the allocation results to the Interconnection Customers for eligible Generating Facilities in the current Queue Cluster and eligible parked Generating Facilities in the prior two Queue Clusters. Each of these Interconnection Customers will then have seven (7) calendar days to inform the CAISO of its decisions in accordance with GIDAP Sections 8.9.4, 8.9.5, and 8.9.6 and GIDAP BPM Sections 6.2.9.6, 6.2.9.7, and 6.2.9.8. No response will result in any allocation being deemed not accepted by the IC.

## Deliverability for Generators Interconnection to Non-Participating TO Facilities inside the CAISO Balancing Authority Area Additional Deliverability Assessment Options [[17]](#footnote-18)

This process applies to Generating Facilities that interconnect to the transmission facilities of a Non-Participating TO located within the CAISO Balancing Authority Area that wish to obtain Full Capacity Deliverability Status or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status under the CAISO Tariff. Such Generating Facilities will be eligible to be studied by the CAISO for Full or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status pursuant to the following provisions:

* + 1. The Generating Facility seeking Full or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status under the CAISO Tariff must submit a request to the CAISO to study it for such Status. Such study request will be in the form of the CAISO’s pro forma Interconnection Request, must include the Generating Facility’s intended Point of Delivery to the CAISO Controlled Grid, and must be submitted during a Cluster Application Window. The Generating Facility will be required to satisfy the same study deposit and Interconnection Financial Security posting requirements as an Interconnection Customer.
    2. The Non-Participating TO that serves as the interconnection provider to the Generating Facility must treat the CAISO as an Affected System in the interconnection study process for the Generating Facility.
    3. As part of the Non-Participating TO’s interconnection study process, the CAISO, in its sole discretion and on a case-by-case basis, will determine the adequacy of transmission on the Non-Participating TO’s system for the Generating Facility to be deemed fully deliverable to the elected Point of Delivery to the CAISO Controlled Grid. Only those proposed Generating Facilities (or proposed increases in Generating Facility capacity) for which the CAISO has determined there is adequate transmission capacity on the Non-Participating TO system to provide full Deliverability to the applicable Point of Delivery will be eligible to be assessed for Full or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status under the CAISO Tariff.
    4. If the Generating Facility is eligible for study for Full or Partial Capacity Deliverability Status, the CAISO will include the Generating Facility in the Interconnection Study process for the Queue Cluster associated with the Cluster Application Window in which the Generating Facility has submitted its study request. The Point of Delivery with the CAISO will be treated as the Point of Interconnection for purposes of including the Generating Facility in a Group Study with any applicable CAISO Interconnection Customers in the relevant Queue Cluster. Pursuant to the Queue Cluster Interconnection Study process the Generating Facility will be allocated its cost responsibility share of any applicable LDNUs or ADNUs.
    5. The Generating Facility shall be permitted to select an Option (A) or Option (B) Deliverability option under GIDAP Section 7.2 (and will be treated as an Option (B) Generating Facility if a selection is not provided to the CAISO) and permitted to participate in TP Deliverability allocation under GIDAP Section 8.
    6. The CAISO, Participating TO, and Interconnection Customer will execute any necessary agreements for reimbursement of study costs incurred it to assure cost attribution for any Network Upgrades relating to any Deliverability status conferred to each such interconnection customer under the Non-Participating TO’s tariff.

The Non-Participating TO’s interconnection customer will receive repayment of funds expended for the construction of the LDNUs, and, as applicable, ADNUs, on the CAISO Controlled Grid in the same manner as CAISO Interconnection Customers, as specified in GIDAP Section 14.3.2.

1. These revisions presume that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) will approve the CAISO’s relevant requested tariff revisions in Docket No. ER18-2498-000 effective Nov. 27, 2018. The tariff revisions are set forth <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Sep27-2018-TariffAmendment-IPE2018-ER18-2498.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. GIDAP Sections 2.4.3 and 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. GIDAP Section 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. GIDAP Section 7.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. GIDAP Section 7.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. GIDAP Section 7.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. GIDAP Section 8.9. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. As of the publishing date of GIDAP BPM-Version 16.0, GIDAP Section 8.9.2(3) incorrectly references Section 8.9.3.2, and not Section 8.9.2.3. The CAISO will correct this error in a future tariff amendment filing. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. GIDAP Section 8.9. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. GIDAP Section 8.9.1. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. GIDAP Section 8.9.2. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. GIDAP Section 8.9.3. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. GIDAP Section 8.9.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. GIDAP Section 8.9.5. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. GIDAP Section 8.9.6. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. GIDAP Section 8.9.8. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. GIDAP Section 9.4 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)