

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

ISO New England Inc.,)	Docket Nos. ER24-2007-000
New England Power Pool)	ER24-2009-000
Participants Committee, and)	
Participating Transmission Owners)	
Administrative Committee)	

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO ANSWER AND ANSWER OF
ISO NEW ENGLAND INC.**

Pursuant to Rules 101(e), 212, and 213 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission” or “FERC”),¹ ISO New England Inc.² (“ISO-NE” or the “ISO”) submits this Motion for Leave to Answer and Answer (“Answer”) to the pleadings³ filed in response to the separate, but concurrent filing submitted by the ISO, joined by the New England Power Pool Participants Committee (“NEPOOL”) and the Participants Committee Administrative Committee on behalf of the Participating Transmission Owners (“PTO AC”) (collectively, the “Filing Parties”), in the above-captioned proceedings, on May 14, 2024. The filings comprise the revisions to Sections I, II and III of the Tariff filed in compliance with the Commission’s *Improvements to Generator Interconnection Procedures and Agreements*, Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A (“Order No. 2023 Revisions”); and the revisions to Section II of the

¹ See 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.101(e), 385.212, 385.213.

² Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined in this filing have the meanings ascribed thereto in Section I.2.2 of the ISO’s Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff (“Tariff”). Section II of the Tariff contains the Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”).

³ Motion to Intervene and Protest of Glenvale LLC (“Glenvale Protest”); Motion to Intervene and Limited Protest of Longroad Energy Holdings, LLC (“Longroad Protest”); Comments of BlueWave Public Benefit Corp. (“BlueWave Protest”); and Comments of RENEW Northeast, Inc. (“RENEW Comments”), Docket Nos. ER24-2007 and ER24-2009 (June 4, 2024) (collectively, “Protests”).

Tariff pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act (“FPA”) (the “Order No. 2023 Related Changes”).⁴

I. INTRODUCTION

The Order No. 2023 Compliance Package propose revisions to Sections I, II, and III of the Tariff that are necessary for the New England region to move from the existing first-come, first-served serial interconnection process to the first-ready, first-served Cluster Study process required in Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A. The Intervenor’s pleadings challenge, and ask that the Commission reject or modify, several aspects of the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package. These aspects relate to: (i) the application of the Cluster Study Process to Small Generating Facilities and Elective Transmission Upgrades (“ETUs”); (ii) the study deposit amounts proposed under Schedules 22, 23, and 25 of the Tariff; (iii) the amount of Commercial Readiness Deposits (“CRDs”) required to be submitted with an Interconnection Request; (iv) the \$50,000 application fee required to be submitted with an Interconnection Request for a Large Generating Facility; (v) the timing associated with the ISO’s ability to accept surety bonds to satisfy Commercial Readiness Deposit requirements; (vi) the proposed 270 Calendar Day Cluster Study timeframe; and (vii) the lack of flexibility for Interconnection Customers to reduce the size of, or change the type of inverter used for, a proposed Generating Facility after studies have concluded. Certain

⁴ ISO New England Inc., *Revisions to the ISO New England Inc. Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff in Compliance with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A*, Docket No. ER24-2009-000 (May 14, 2024); and *Errata to Revisions to the ISO New England Inc. Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff in Compliance with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A*, Docket No. ER24-2009-000 (May 31, 2024); ISO New England Inc., *Revisions to Section II of the ISO New England Inc. Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff Related to Compliance with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A*, Docket No. ER24-2007-000 (May 14, 2024) (collectively the “Order No. 2023 Compliance Package”).

Intervenors also posed questions in their pleadings related to the implementation of the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package.

As addressed in Section III of this Answer, Intervenors' arguments fail on procedural grounds and lack merit. Fundamentally, they fail to demonstrate that any aspect of the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package is unjust and unreasonable or otherwise non-compliant with Order Nos. 2023, 2023-A, or in the case of proposed revision to the ISO-NE SGIP, Order No. 2006.⁵ Many of the arguments seek to re-write the requirements of Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A, or to reform the interconnection process, in a manner that goes beyond the scope of the orders. Accordingly, the Commission should reject Intervenors' pleadings, and accept the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package as filed, without conditions, or modifications.

II. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE ANSWER

This Answer responds to the pleadings submitted in response to the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package. While the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure allow parties to file answers to comments, the Commission's rules prohibit answers to protests.⁶ The Commission, however, has the authority to waive this prohibition.⁷ The Commission has found good cause to permit answers in various circumstances, including where the answer would assure a complete record in the proceeding,⁸ lead to a better understanding of the issues in the proceeding,⁹ permit

⁵ *Standardization of Small Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures*, Order No. 2006, 111 FERC ¶ 61,220, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 2006-A, 113 FERC ¶ 61,195 (2005), *order on clarification*, Order No. 2006-B, 116 FERC ¶ 61,046 (2006).

⁶ *See* 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2). Note that the ISO also responds to the comments filed by RENEW as explicitly allowed under this section.

⁷ *See* 18 C.F.R. § 385.101(e).

⁸ *See, e.g., High Island Offshore Sys., L.L.C.*, 113 FERC ¶ 61,202, at P 8 (2005).

⁹ *See, e.g., CenterPoint Energy–Miss. River Transmission, LLC*, 141 FERC ¶ 61,080, at P 4 (2012).

the issues to be narrowed or clarified,¹⁰ aid in the disposition of the issues raised by the protests,¹¹ or otherwise assist the Commission in its decision-making process.¹² This answer achieves these purposes. It clarifies misconceptions contained in certain of the Protests, assures a complete and accurate record by addressing several proposals that are either beyond the scope of the proceeding, are at odds with the requirements of Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A, or otherwise unworkable, and provides a better understanding of the issues relating to the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package. For these reasons, the ISO respectfully requests that the Commission grant this motion for leave to answer and consider the following answer in ruling on the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package.

III. ANSWER

A. Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A Do Not Preclude the Filing Parties from Proposing Tariff Changes Beyond the Orders Directives Pursuant to Section 205 of the FPA

In its protest, Glenvale states that “the Commission declined to include small generating facilities in the cluster study process, and prescribed no specific study deposit or initial [Commercial Readiness Deposit (“CRD”)] amounts for such projects.”¹³ Glenvale further avers that the “study deposits and initial CRDs amounts (as well as transitional cluster study deposits and withdrawal penalties)” and \$50,000 application fee that the Filing Parties proposed for inclusion in the ISO-NE Small Generator Interconnection Procedure (“ISO-NE SGIP”) are

¹⁰ See, e.g., *TransColorado Gas Transmission Co.*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,208, at P 4 (2005); *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 84 FERC ¶ 61,224, at 62,078 (1998).

¹¹ See, e.g., *Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co.*, 140 FERC ¶ 61,251, at 62,258 n.6 (2012).

¹² See, e.g., *S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 141 FERC ¶ 61,100, at P 5 (2012); *ISO New Eng. Inc. & New Eng. Power Pool*, 140 FERC ¶ 61,177, at P 6 (2012); *E. Shore Nat. Gas Co.*, 181 FERC ¶ 61,233, at P 9 n.17 (2022) (accepting an answer “to the extent [it] . . . is an answer to the protest . . . because it provides information that has assisted us in our decision-making process”); *Tri-State Generation & Transmission Ass’n*, 179 FERC ¶ 61,118, at P 34 (2022) (accepting an answer to a protest because it “provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process”).

¹³ Glenvale Protest at 3.

“burdensome and discriminatory for smaller resources.”¹⁴ Glenvale requests that the Commission direct the ISO “to adopt study deposit and initial CRD amounts in its SGIP that are no greater than the amounts that would apply to similarly-sized projects under the Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (“LGIP”) approach set forth in Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A.”¹⁵

Glenvale’s protest, as the ISO understands it, primarily challenges the study deposit, application fee, and initial Commercial Readiness Deposit framework as applied, primarily, to Small Generating Facilities under the ISO-NE SGIP in Schedule 23 of the OATT, and these challenges are addressed in Sections B, C, and D below. In making these arguments, however, Glenvale notes that the Commission declined to include Small Generating Facilities in the Cluster Study Process, or prescribe specific study deposits or initial CRDs for these facilities. To the extent that Glenvale challenges the inclusion of Small Generating Facilities (and ETUs) in the Cluster Study Process³, the ISO asks that the Commission reject such arguments for the reasons stated in this section.¹⁶ Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A do not revise the Commissions *pro forma* Small Generator Interconnection Procedures (“*pro forma* SGIP”) to include Small Generating Facilities in the Cluster Study Process, but they also do not preclude a filing pursuant to Section 205 of the FPA to modify the ISO-NE SGIP, or the ETU Interconnection Procedures, in Schedules 23 and 25 of the OATT, respectively. As is well-established law, a utility’s right to submit a filing

¹⁴ Glenvale Protest at 3-4.

¹⁵ Glenvale Protest at 4.

¹⁶ Despite its initial arguments to the contrary, Glenvale’s own protest also appears to agree that Small Generating Facilities and ETUs should be included in the Cluster Study process. *See* Glenvale Protest at 18 (stating that “the Filing Parties propose to include Small Generating Facilities in the cluster study process, and “Glenvale does not object to this concept...”). Glenvale’s only protest then is to the rules that will apply with Small Generating Facilities (and ETUs) as part of that process.

pursuant to Section 205 of the FPA is not impugned by a compliance obligation under Section 206.¹⁷

Moreover, Order No. 2023 states clearly that transmission providers may propose *both* independent entity variations from the order’s requirements under Section 206 *and* additional revisions under Section 205, to the extent that they are deemed necessary.¹⁸ Specifically, the Order No. 2023 states: “transmission providers may seek the appropriate variation on compliance provided the reason for the variation is sufficiently justified and may continue to propose solutions to interconnection issues under FPA section 205.”¹⁹

The Filing Parties’ proposed Tariff revisions to include Small Generating Facilities (and ETUs) in the Cluster Study Process are just and reasonable. First, the reforms adopted for the *pro forma* LGIP in Order No. 2023 fix problems that also impact Schedules 23 and 25 of the OATT.²⁰ In Order No. 2023, the Commission found that:

[T]he existing *pro forma* generator interconnection procedures and agreements are insufficient to ensure that interconnection customers are able to interconnect to the transmission system in a reliable, efficient, transparent, and timely manner, thereby ensuring that rates, terms, and conditions for Commission-jurisdictional services are just, reasonable, and not unduly discriminatory or preferential. Absent reform,

¹⁷ The Commission’s regulations and precedent may preclude filings that propose changes to a Tariff pursuant to both Sections 205 and 206 of the FPA. *See* 18 C.F.R. § 154.203(b) (“Filings made to comply with Commission orders must include only those changes required to comply with the order. However, the Commission has explained that “instead of combining filings, filers can make separate filings for each type of filing contemplated -- each filing containing the portions relevant to the specific filing type.” *Electronic Tariff Filings*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,047, at P 8 n. 13 (2010) Such compliance filings may not be combined with other rate or tariff change filings.”); *but see PJM Power Producers Group v. FERC*, 88 F.4th 250, 259 (3d Cir. 2023) (“Notably, § 206 does not ‘give[] FERC the power to deny a utility the right to file changes’ unilaterally under § 205.” (quoting *Atl. City Elec. Co. v. FERC*, 295 F.3d 1, 10 (D.C. Cir. 2002))).

¹⁸ Order No. 2023 at P 1767.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *See* Order No. 2023 Related Revisions Transmittal Letter at 30-36 (explaining that the same factors that led the Commission to the conclusions in Order No. 2023 are present for Small Generators and ETUs in New England).

the current interconnection process will continue to cause interconnection queue backlogs, longer development timelines, and increased uncertainty regarding the cost and timing of interconnecting to the transmission system.²¹

The Commission further found that “data show that the median duration for *all* generating facilities that enter the interconnection queue hovers around 30 months, *independent of the size* of the interconnection request.”²² Such a statement indicates that this data and finding applies to large as well as small generator interconnection requests that may proceed through either a large or small generator interconnection process. The Commission determined that the reforms adopted in Order No. 2023 are the appropriate ways to mitigate these issues.

In New England, adopting such reforms for Schedule 23 and 25 not only addresses the issues identified in Order No. 2023, it is also necessary to facilitate the transition to a functioning and implementable interconnection process. Given the nature of the Administered Transmission System and the application of the same study procedures to proposed Small Generating Facilities and ETUs, there is no basis to treat those resources differently than Large Generating Facilities as all three types of projects are subject to the same queue dependencies and delays, must meet the same standards in order to interconnect to the system, and, in the case of Small Generating Facilities, typically seek to interconnect to areas in the Administered Transmission System with lower voltage lines (*i.e.*, below 69 kV), which require additional local and sub-transmission analysis and, correspondingly, coordination with multiple Affected Systems. Oftentimes this actually adds to the length of time and costs associated with Interconnection Studies.

As detailed in the Order No. 2023 Related Revisions transmittal letter, the procedures governing requests to interconnect Large Generating Facilities, Small Generating Facilities, and

²¹ Order 2023 at P 37.

²² *Id.* at P 42 (emphasis added).

ETUs in Schedules 22, 23 and 25 of the OATT, respectively, rely on common rules that exist elsewhere in the Tariff, many of which were required to be revised to account for the new Cluster Study construct. All Interconnection Requests in New England are currently subject to nearly identical rules and procedures, have the same queue dependencies, are considered in clusters under the same circumstances, have to enter in the same process to participate in the Forward Capacity Market (“FCM”) and achieve capacity interconnection service, and are included in the same cost allocation formulas. The revisions to these common, existing constructs in Schedule 22 of the OATT in order to comply with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A necessitate corresponding changes in Schedules 23 and 25 in order to ensure the processes remain harmonized, avoid inconsistencies between Tariff provisions, and ensure a seamless and implementation Order No. 2023/2023-A transition.

Pursuant to Section 205 of the FPA, the Filing Parties proposed the Tariff revisions included in the Order No. 2023 Related Changes filing to ensure all rules remain consistent and all projects subject to the same requirements. The Commission favors processes that provide interconnection customers with consistency across generator interconnection procedures.²³ Indeed, the Commission has already accepted the inclusion of Small Generating Facilities in the Cluster Study Process where it provides “greater certainty in a shorter and less complex interconnection process than the serial study process in the *pro forma* SGIP.”²⁴ Additionally, other

²³ *Idaho Power Co.*, 186 FERC ¶ 61,202 (2024) (accepting revisions to an LGIP that provide “consistency [that] will provide clarity for interconnection customers”).

²⁴ *See Arizona Public Service Company*, Order on Tariff Revisions, 184 FERC ¶ 61,188 (2023) (accepting Arizona Public Service Company’s proposal to move to a single annual cluster request window for both Small and Large Generating Facilities). The ISO also notes that the exclusion of Small Generators subject to the fast track and 10 kW inverter processes are not applicable in New England because only projects interconnecting to the Administered Transmission System (*i.e.*, Pool Transmission Facilities (“PTF”) and Non-PTF) are subject to the ISO-NE SGIP.

regional transmission organization and independent system operator (collectively, “RTOs”) regions have integrated queues that do not include a separate set of Small Generator Interconnection Procedures.²⁵

B. Flat Study Deposits Are an Existing Independent Entity Variation Necessary to Account for Regional Differences that Remains Just and Reasonable and Accomplishes the Purposes of Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A

In its protest, Glenvale argues that the Commission should reject the Filing Parties’ proposal to require a \$250,000 study deposit for Large Generating Facilities seeking to enter a Cluster Study.²⁶ Glenvale argues that Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A rejected such an approach, and determined that study costs are dictated by project size.²⁷ Additionally, Glenvale asserts that the Filing Parties failed to support a deviation from the Order Nos 2023 and 2023-A *pro forma* tired deposit structure.²⁸ The Commission should reject these arguments.

Contrary to Glenvale’s blanket claims, the Filing Parties’ Order No. 2023 Revisions fully justify the study deposit and initial CRD for the LGIP in Schedule 22 of the OATT. For decades, the Interconnection Procedures in New England have specified Interconnection Study deposits for Large Generating Facilities to be the greater of 100 percent of the estimated cost of the study or

²⁵ See *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 181 FERC ¶ 61,162 (2022), at PP 30, 33 (finding PJM’s proposed queue reforms, which included a consolidation of its small and large generator interconnection procedures, to be just, reasonable and consistent with prior rulemakings applying the independent entity standard), *reh’g denied*, 184 FERC ¶61,006 (2023), *appeals pending*, Petition for Review, *Hecate Energy LLC v. FERC*, Nos. 23-1089, et al. (D.C. Cir. Mar. 31, 2023); see also *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Tariff Revisions for Interconnection Process Reform at 29, *Docket No. ER22-2110-000* (July 14, 2022) (“PJM presently follows different interconnection procedures depending on the size and type of project, but will realize additional efficiencies in its proposed new interconnection process through the consolidation of processes for interconnection of both small and large generators.”).

²⁶ Glenvale Protest at 6-9.

²⁷ Glenvale Protest at 9-12.

²⁸ *Id.*

\$250,000,²⁹ and provided in cash. This ensures that the ISO has sufficient deposit on hand to be applied to the costs incurred by the ISO, the applicable PTO (as Interconnecting Transmission Owners), and any affected parties participating in the studies. The ISO cannot incur expenses undertaking Interconnection Studies without deposits on hand because all Interconnection Studies are funded entirely via deposits.³⁰ Because the ISO is a non-profit entity without equity, it relies totally on collections under its Tariff to fund its operational expenses and Interconnection Studies are not budgeted for in this manner. For these reasons, the ISO is not able to spend money that it does not have on hand. The Commission also recognized that RTOs/ISOs are differently situated in this regard with respect to the application of penalties for study delays under Order No. 2023.³¹

While the *pro forma*'s tiered study deposit structure may be appropriate for transmission providers that are for profit entities, or RTO/ISO regions where the RTO/ISO's budget is not subject to Commission approval,³² they are inappropriate for non-profit entities that must invoice in advance of doing study work. A tiered structure would simply result in the ISO having to invoice projects earlier in the process, presenting more administrative burdens both for the ISO and Interconnection Customers, and introducing unnecessary delays contrary to Order No. 2023's objectives.

²⁹ See *ISO New England Inc.*, Joint Filing of Proposed Revisions to the Generator Interconnection Process and Forward Capacity Market Participation Provisions Set Forth in the ISO New England Inc. Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff, Docket Nos. ER04-432-006, et al. (Oct. 31, 2008) ("FCM/Queue Amendments") at 42; see also *ISO-NE et al.*, Order Accepting Tariff Revisions, 126 FERC ¶ 61,080 (2009) ("FCM/Queue Amendments Order").

³⁰ The Commission has previously found that such a separation of expenses is appropriate in the RTO/ISO context. See e.g. *Southwest Power Pool, Inc.*, 149 FERC ¶ 61,177, at P 24 (2014) (finding that as a non-profit it was appropriate for SPP to hold deposits in a separate bank account to protect liquidity for SPP to pay for studies and to make refunds).

³¹ See Order No. 2023 at PP 994-1001 (discussing the mechanisms by which RTOs/ISOs may recover penalties for study delays).

³² See, e.g. *ISO New England Inc.*, Letter Order Accepting Capital Budget for Calendar Year 2024 and 2024 Administrative Costs, Docket No. ER24-90 (Dec. 11, 2023)

The study deposit is also appropriate in that it reflects the estimated costs of the study based on the ISO's experience in study cost estimating and actual study costs. Although not recognized in the Glenvale Protest, the Filing Parties explained, in detail, the complexity of Interconnection Studies in New England, which results in higher costs than in other regions. As the Order No. 2023 Compliance Revisions transmittal letter explains, the scope of the Cluster Study will include not only a comprehensive steady state (thermal, voltage, and short circuit) evaluation of the proposed interconnection, but also a full stability analysis, as the region has several stability-limited interfaces that cannot be degraded by system additions. The Cluster Study will include electromagnetic transient analysis in Power Systems Computer Aided Design ("PSCAD") for all inverter-based resources, such as solar, wind, and battery facilities, (which, based on the current interconnection queue, the ISO expects will make up almost the entirety of Cluster Studies) to evaluate weak-grid performance, examine any control interactions, and benchmark model performance. Due to the tightly-integrated nature of the New England system, the Cluster Study Process will also require sub-transmission analysis in multiple areas of the system, which can take more time and therefore cost more money than transmission-only studies. The Filing Parties, therefore, proposed to set the study deposits at a level that reflects the historic costs of System Impact Studies, including studies for Glenvale, as well as the expected cost of a Cluster Study with this scope.

Importantly, in the event that Cluster Study costs are lower than this projection, customers of all types and sizes will be held harmless for any unused study funds, which are subject to refund. Furthermore, consistent with past efforts, the ISO will revisit these amounts in the future if costs end up being lower as experience is gained implementing the new Cluster Study construct.

Correspondingly, Glenvale also challenges the requirement that Interconnection Requests filed pursuant to Schedule 22 of the OATT be accompanied by a \$500,000 initial CRD, arguing that it is unreasonable because it exceeds the initial CRDs required under the *pro forma* LGIP.³³ The CRD amount, however, is consistent with Order No. 2023, which requires that the initial CRD be set at double the study deposit,³⁴ and subsequent CRDs to be based on each Interconnection Customer's "identified network upgrade cost estimate."³⁵ Additionally, the CRD level is appropriate: in New England, upgrade costs have been found to exceed \$900/kW for onshore wind, \$400/kW for solar PV projects, and \$230/kW for battery projects.³⁶

C. The Proposed Study Deposit and Initial CRD Amounts for Small Generating Facilities Are Just and Reasonable, and Were Tailored to Small Generating Facilities

The Glenvale Protest next argues that the proposed study deposit and initial CRD framework for Small Generating Facilities does not meet the requirements of an independent entity variation. Specifically, Glenvale argues that a \$100,000 study deposit and corresponding \$200,000 initial CRD that the Filing Parties proposed in the Order No. 2023 Related Revisions for inclusion in Schedule 23 "exceeds the amount that Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A would require of even a small facility covered by the revised *pro forma* LGIP, pursuant to which a 20 MW resource would be required to provide up-front deposits of only \$165,000 (a \$55,000 study deposit plus a \$110,000

³³ Glenvale Protest at 9-12.

³⁴ Order No. 2023 at P 692.

³⁵ *Id.*, at P 703 (stating that "for the second and third commercial readiness deposits, the interconnection customer is only required to submit an additional deposit that brings the total commercial readiness deposit to the amount specified in sections 7.5 and 8.1 of the *pro forma* LGIP (5% of the interconnection customer's identified network upgrade cost estimate and 10% of the interconnection customer's identified network upgrade cost estimate, respectively)").

³⁶ See Lawrence Berkley National Lab, Interconnection Cost Analysis in ISO-New England (June 2023), available at https://eta-publications.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/iso-ne_interconnection_costs_vfinal.pdf.

initial CRD).”³⁷ Glenvale also argues that “the Filing Parties fail to adequately support the proposed amounts or provide meaningful explanation as to why small interconnection requests should be treated differently in New England than elsewhere.”³⁸ It states that “smaller generators could be included in the cluster study process on terms more consistent with those orders and in a manner that respects the Commission’s concern for developers of smaller facilities.”³⁹ Glenvale further argues that the deposit amounts applied to Small Generating Facilities during the transition period are unreasonable and burdensome.⁴⁰

Glenvale’s assertions appear to stem from the incorrect premise that Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A precluded the Filing Parties from proposing changes in Schedule 23 that correspond to those required by the Commission in the LGIP, which is not the case, as discussed above. Further, contrary to Glenvale’s claims, the Filing Parties justified the study deposit and initial CRD amounts both during the transition period and under the new Cluster Study rules in the Order No. 2023 Related Revisions. Indeed, in the Order No. 2023 Related Revisions transmittal letter, the Filing Parties noted that the amounts of the study deposit and initial CRDs proposed for inclusion in Schedule 23 (including the amounts for the Transitional Cluster Study) are greater than those provided for in the Commission’s *pro forma* SGIP.⁴¹ The Filing Parties further explained that the amounts reflect a reasonable estimate of both the estimated study cost for a Small Generating Facility participating in a cluster (*i.e.*, a \$100,000 study deposit), the likely network upgrade costs associated with a Small Generating Facility (*i.e.* a \$200,000 initial CRD), and the expenses

³⁷ Glenvale Protest at 18.

³⁸ *Id.* at 18-19.

³⁹ *Id.* at 20.

⁴⁰ Glenvale Protest at 19.

⁴¹ Order No. 2023 Related Revisions Transmittal Letter at 43.

associated with reviewing data and negotiating Interconnection Agreements for Small Generating Facilities (*i.e.*, a \$15,000 application fee).⁴²

As is readily apparent, these amounts are substantially less than the amounts proposed for inclusion in the LGIP in Schedule 22 of the OATT, to recognize the smaller size of the projects. The proposed study deposit for a Small Generating Facility is less than half of what is required for a Large Generating Facility, and the initial CRD is similarly proportional. Further, due to the cost allocation structure proposed by the Filing Parties, Small Generating Facilities will ultimately pay less than Large Generating Facilities due to 50% of study costs being allocated based on project size.

The Filing Parties proposed these lower amounts despite the fact that Small Generating Facilities often experience costs that are similar to those of Large Generating Facilities during the study process.⁴³ Despite Glenvale's belief that these amounts are excessive, Small Generating Facilities will ultimately provide the same percentage of subsequent CRDs as Large Generating Facilities, relative to the upgrades for which they are identified as being responsible. These shared upgrade costs are likely to be lower for Small Generating Facilities given that the projects are smaller, and, therefore, less likely to be identified as responsible for upgrade costs under the proportional impact method described in the revisions to Schedule 11 of the OATT proposed in the Order No. 2023 Revisions.⁴⁴

The Filing Parties proposed revisions to the *pro forma* SGIP are therefore just and reasonable, as well as consistent with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A. Conversely, Glenvale's

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ Order No. 2023 Related Revisions Transmittal Letter at 32.

⁴⁴ See Order No. 2023 Compliance Revisions Transmittal Letter at 54-56 (describing the ISO's proposed cost allocation approach.)

request would require the ISO to invoice for projected study costs immediately, which would introduce delays in the process as noted above, and lead to more speculative projects seeking to enter a Cluster given that they would have less money at risk.

D. The \$50,000 Application Fee for Large Generating Facilities is an Existing Independent Entity Variation that Remains Just and Reasonable, and Accomplishes the Order’s Objectives

Glenvale argues that the Filing Parties’ proposal to retain the existing \$50,000 initial application fee “is entirely unsupported, and the fact that the \$50,000 amount was previously approved by the Commission under different circumstances does not relieve ISO-NE of its obligation to comply with the superseding requirements of Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A.”⁴⁵ Glenvale also claims that “the Filing Parties failed to address an additional intended application of these funds, as well as the circumstances under which the ‘potentially refundable’ fees will be non-refundable.”⁴⁶ The Commission should reject these claims.

At the outset, the Filing Parties proposed, and the Commission accepted, the \$50,000 initial applicable fee in its Order Accepting Tariff Revisions, as part of a number of Tariff changes to increase milestone and financial requirements in the LGIP in a manner that enhances the certainty that projects in the interconnection queue are viable, serious and committed to completing the interconnection process.⁴⁷ These rules provide for the ISO to apply this fee toward the costs incurred by the ISO, such as to review Interconnection Customer’s Interconnection Requests, and any unused balance would be refunded if the Interconnection Customer withdraws its Interconnection Request within ten Business Days of the Scoping Meeting, or if the

⁴⁵ Glenvale Protest at 16.

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *See* FCM/Queue Amendments at 42; *see also* FCM/Queue Amendments Order.

Interconnection Customer executes an Interconnection Agreement. This was intended to encourage Interconnection Customers to consider the viability of their project before moving onto the next step of the interconnection process, and it continues to serve that very purpose today. In Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A, the Commission did not seek to undo the progress achieved in the region to help ensure queue discipline.⁴⁸

As the Order No. 2023 Compliance Revisions transmittal letter states, the Filing Parties propose to retain, in Section 3.4.1.1 of the ISO-NE LGIP, the existing, uniform \$50,000 initial application deposit for all requests submitted under the LGIP.⁴⁹ As is the case today, the ISO will apply this deposit toward the costs incurred by the ISO to review the Interconnection Requests, including the modeling and data prior to the start of the Cluster Study, as well as, to develop the Interconnection Agreement.⁵⁰ Given the need for prompt review of modelling, site control, and other information required to be submitted with an Interconnection Request, the ISO must have these funds on hand during the relevant Cluster Request Window.⁵¹ Additionally, the Filing Parties explained, any unspent funds would be refunded to the Interconnection Customer if it withdraws prior to the close of the Customer Engagement Window, within ten Business Days following the Scoping Meeting, or upon executing an Interconnection Agreement. Moreover, to

⁴⁸ Order No. 2023 at P 1765.

⁴⁹ Order No. 2023 Compliance Revisions Transmittal Letter at 44.

⁵⁰ Under Proposed Section 3.4.1 of Schedule 22, “System Operator shall apply the initial deposit toward the costs incurred by the System Operator associated with the Interconnection Request, the cost of developing the study agreements and their attachments, and the cost of developing the LGIA. The study deposit shall be applied toward the cost of the Cluster Study.”

⁵¹ The Commission recently determined that a non-refundable application fee was reasonable where it reasonably reflects the costs to process Interconnection Requests and the fees are used to in fact process the Interconnection Request. *See Sw. Power Pool, Inc.*, 187 FERC ¶ 61,050 (2024); *see also Midcontinent Independent System Operator Inc.*, Letter Order, 187 FERC ¶ 61,052, at P 73 (2024) (finding it just and reasonable to use forfeited funds to address the impact of withdrawals on projects remaining in the RTO’s queue).

mitigate the exact concerns described by Glenvale and the Commission in Order No. 2023-A, the Filing Parties proposed to modify Section 3.4.4 to specify that where the Interconnection Request is withdrawn due to a deficiency in the request, only \$5,000 of the initial application deposit will be forfeited, consistent with the *pro forma* LGIP fee structure.⁵² This will ensure that, despite the need for a higher initial application deposit, Interconnection Customers are not inappropriately penalized for being withdrawn at the close of the Cluster Request Window relative to the *pro forma* LGIP.

Accordingly, the Commission should accept the Filing Parties' proposal to retain the \$50,000 application fee for Large Generating Facilities, for it remains just and reasonable and consistent with the stated objectives of Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A.

E. The Order No. 2023 Compliance Package, including the Limited Independent Entity Variation to Allow for Implementation, Meets the Requirements of Order No. 2023-A Related to Surety Bonds

Longroad challenges the Filing Parties' proposed timing for accepting surety bonds as financial security for Commercial Readiness Deposits, as well as the types of deposits for which surety bonds may be used. Longroad explains that, on rehearing, it requested that "the Commission allow for use of surety bonds as financial security in the Commission's newly-mandated cluster study generator interconnection process," and that, in granting rehearing, the Commission "expressly required that surety bonds be accepted as financial security for both the transitional and subsequent studies, and for the commercial readiness deposits and all study deposits."⁵³ However, Longroad claims that the Filing Parties, "[w]ith no justification," propose to "only accept surety bonds for the commercial readiness deposit (but not other study deposits), and only after the

⁵² Order No. 2023 Compliance Revisions Transmittal Letter at 44.

⁵³ Longroad Protest at 2.

transitional studies are complete.”⁵⁴ Longroad asks the Commission to reject these proposals, and direct the Filing Parties to submit Tariff revisions that comply with Order No. 2023-A.

Contrary to Longroad’s claims, the Filing Parties proposed Tariff revisions related to surety bonds are consistent with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A, which permit RTOs to seek independent entity variations to account for regional differences.⁵⁵

Currently, under the New England Interconnection Procedures, *all* deposit amounts due to the ISO, including study deposits and readiness requirements,⁵⁶ must be submitted in the form of cash. To comply with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A, the Filing Parties have revised Section 3.1 of Schedule 22 (as well, 23 and 25 in the corresponding Order No. 2023 Related Changes filing), to allow the use of financial security in the form of letters of credit (“LOC”) and surety bonds, with narrow exceptions that are necessary to account for regional differences, and justified under the independent entity variations standard.

First, the Filing Parties propose to maintain the existing, long-standing New England construct under which all study deposits must be submitted in cash.⁵⁷ The ISO can only accept cash for interconnection study deposits, as the ISO is continuously drawing on those deposits as the studies are progressing in order to cover its costs, as well those of the Interconnecting Transmission Owners, and affected entities participating in the studies. As discussed further above, the ISO’s status as a non-profit without equity requires that it have funds on hand to conduct study work, and the ISO therefore cannot draw down on a surety bond (or letter of credit) to obtain

⁵⁴ Longroad Protest at 2-3.

⁵⁵ Order No. 2023 at P 1765; Order No. 2023-A at P 41.

⁵⁶ *See generally* FCM/Queue Amendments (establishing higher study deposits and application fees); *see also* Schedule 22, Sections 4.2.3.2.2 and 4.2.4.4 (requiring cash deposits for CETU eligible projects).

⁵⁷ Order No. 2023 Revisions Transmittal Letter at 47-48.

funds needed to conduct studies, as the draws would have to occur regularly, and in advance of study work being conducted, which would lead to administrative burden.⁵⁸

Second, the Cluster Enabling Transmission Upgrade (“CETU”) Participation Deposit applicable under Section 4.2 of Schedules 22, 23, and 25 is not a CRD, as defined in Order No. 2023 and 2023-A, and therefore the requirements do not apply. As described in the Order No. 2023 Compliance Revisions transmittal letter, the Filing Parties propose to retain aspects of the existing Clustering construct, including the proactive identification of a CETU to enable the interconnection of multiple Interconnection Requests seeking to interconnect to same part of the system, and the associated deposit construct, which is unique to New England.⁵⁹ Specifically, as relevant here, the Filing Parties proposed to retain the “CETU Deposit”⁶⁰ (currently, referred to as the Cluster Participation Deposit). Consistent with the existing construct, an Interconnection Customer with a Generating Facility, for which interconnection is enabled by a CETU, must submit an initial CETU Deposit equal to five percent of the cost of the CETU, in cash, at the time that the customer submits the Interconnection Request, or after the ISO identifies, during the Customer Engagement Window, that the proposed interconnection needs the CETU.⁶¹ Requiring

⁵⁸ ISO-NE notes that other RTO/ISO regions also require that these deposits be submitted in cash. *See e.g. Southwest Power Pool, Generator Interconnection Submission Check List*, available at <https://opsportal.spp.org/documents/studies/SPPGICHECKLIST.pdf> at 2 (stating that all study deposits are required to be submitted in cash).

⁵⁹ Order No. 2023 Revisions Transmittal Letter at 49-50.

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ Schedule 22, Sections 4.2.3.2.2 and 4.2.4.4. These provisions were accepted by the Commission in connecting with the ISO’s establishment of limited clustering rules. *See ISO New England Inc.*, Joint Filing of Revisions to the ISO New England Inc. Transmission, Markets and Services Tariff to Incorporate a Clustering Approach in the Interconnection Procedures, Docket No. ER17-2421-000 (Sept. 1, 2017) (proposing changes to Tariff, Section I.2 - Definitions, Schedule 11, Schedule 22, Procedures, Schedule 23, Schedule 25, and Attachment K to incorporate limited clustering); *ISO New England Inc.*, 161 FERC ¶ 61,123 (2017).

that the CETU Deposit be provided in cash is necessary due to the high costs related to CETUs and the potential impact on a Cluster Study if a CETU-enabled Interconnection Request were to withdraw.⁶² Interconnection Requests enabled by a CETU must be required to demonstrate this increased commitment before the CETU and the Generating Facilities enabled by the CETU are included in the Cluster Study. It is also consistent with Order No. 2023's intent to ensure the viability of projects entering the queue,⁶³ and to not disrupt Clustering efforts that are already ongoing. Once the Cluster Study Process is underway, however, the proposed Tariff revisions provide for the CETU-enabled Interconnection Requests to be subject to the same additional CRDs required for all other requests in the Cluster, which may be provided in the form of LOC or surety bonds.

Third, the Filing Parties propose to limit the acceptable forms of CRD during the transition process, which, as proposed would be due on October 12, 2024 in the form of cash or LOCs. This narrow, temporary limitation is necessary to allow the ISO time to create the necessary processes to accept a type of security that it has no experience with as it is not currently an acceptable form of security in New England. As the Filing Parties explained in the Order No. 2023 Revisions transmittal letter, the ISO currently accepts LOCs in the context of security for obligations in the wholesale energy markets, and can therefore leverage the existing processes for administering LOCs in the context of CRDs under the newly-mandated interconnection construct. However, the swift implementation of the transition process for the reasons explained in the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package, leaves the ISO insufficient time to establish all of the processes needed to

⁶² See e.g. ISO New England, First Cape Cod Resource Integration Study – Redacted Non-CEII Version, <https://www.iso-ne.com/static-assets/documents/2021/07/cape-cod-resource-integration-study-report-non-ceii-final.pdf>, at 4 (describing the cost allocation for the CETU)

⁶³ Order No. 2023 at P 49.

support surety bond acceptance prior to that transition.⁶⁴ While Longroad appears to believe that the ISO can simply snap its fingers to create a surety bond process, the development of an approved list of surety bond providers, a form surety bond, internal business processes to review, accept, and hold surety bonds, as well as participant training takes care. Nevertheless, the Filing Parties proposed Tariff revisions in Section 3.1 of the ISO-NE LGIP provide Interconnection Customers the option to replace CRDs provided as cash or LOC during the Transition Process, with a surety bond once the ISO is able to accept them.⁶⁵

The ISO submits that the Filing Parties met the standard for an independent entity variation related to the acceptance of surety bonds, and therefore Longroad's requests should be rejected.

F. The Proposed 270-Day Cluster Study Timeframe is an Existing Independent Entity Variation that Remains Just and Reasonable, and Advances the Objectives of Order No. 2023 and 2023-A

In its comments, BlueWave asserts that “protracted study timelines are one of the reasons for increased project costs and failures, [while s]hort study timelines would also result in less queue backlog, fewer restudies, and fewer requests for modifications,” and, therefore, asks “that the Commission require that ISO-NE comply with Order No. 2023’s original study timelines, including the 150-calendar day deadline for the Cluster Study.”⁶⁶ The Commission should reject this request.

⁶⁴ See Order No. 2023 Compliance Revisions Transmittal Letter at 75-78; Order No. 2023 Related Revisions Transmittal Letter at 54-55 (explaining the need for a swift effective date in order to implement the proposed transition rules).

⁶⁵ Note that while Order No. 2023-A only requires that surety bonds be accepted for Large Generating Facilities, the Filing Parties’ proposal to extend the Cluster Study process to Small Generating Facilities and ETUs will allow these facilities to also use surety bonds to satisfy Commercial Readiness Deposit requirements.

⁶⁶ BlueWave Protest at 6.

In Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A, the Commission adopted reforms to its *pro forma* LGIP, which prior these reforms, provided for Interconnection System Impact Studies to be completed within the Reasonable Efforts timeframe of 90 days, and without exposure to penalties for late studies. In adopting these reforms, including the 150-Calendar Day Cluster Study timeframe, the Commission recognized that other study processes may necessitate different study deadlines.⁶⁷ Indeed, in Order No. 2023-A, the Commission stated:

. . . transmission providers may explain specific circumstances on compliance and justify why any deviations may be either consistent with or superior to the *pro forma* LGIP or merit an independent entity variation in the context of RTOs/ISOs. Accordingly, we grant MISO’s and NYISO’s requests for clarification that Order No. 2023 does not preempt transmission providers from proposing tariff-defined study deadlines that may differ from the *pro forma* LGIP’s 150-day schedule.⁶⁸

The Filing Parties Order No. 2023 Revisions propose a tariff deadline that differs from the *pro forma* LGIP’s—that is, a 270-day timeframe for the Cluster Study—and explain the merits of that independent entity variation.

As the Filing Parties explained, the Cluster Study’s 270-Calendar Day time frame preserves the ISO’s existing Tariff-designated timeframe for System Impact Studies (“SISs”), which, as demonstrated in the ISO’s Interconnection Metrics reports filed pursuant to Order No. 845,⁶⁹ is realistic and achievable. These reports have consistently indicated that once the ISO begins a SIS, it is generally completed close to the existing 270-Calendar Day timeframe. Unlike other regions, the SIS, which is being replaced by the Cluster Study, is the single, definitive study that identifies all upgrades required to interconnect a Generating Facility, and includes cost estimates, such that following its completion, an Interconnection Customer may elect to proceed directly to

⁶⁷ Order No. 2023 at P 259; Order No. 2023-A at PP 156, 324, 327.

⁶⁸ Order No. 2023 at P 156.

⁶⁹ ISO-NE’s quarterly interconnection metrics reports are on file with the Commission in Docket No. ER19-1951-000.

Interconnection Agreement negotiations. The scope of the Cluster Study will include everything that is currently part of the SIS, including comprehensive steady state (thermal, voltage, and short circuit) evaluation of the proposed interconnection, full stability analysis, and electromagnetic transient analysis in PSCAD for all inverter-based resources, such as solar, wind, and battery facilities. Moreover, under the new Cluster Study construct, the study scope will be expanded. Unlike the SIS process today, Cluster Studies will not only identify the upgrades for multiple projects simultaneously, but also identify the upgrades necessary for the Interconnection Customer to achieve capacity interconnection service.

Importantly, while the Filing Parties propose to increase the Cluster Study deadline from 150- to 270-days, they also proposed to minimize the Cluster Restudy timelines from 150- to 90-days. In total, the difference between the Filing Parties proposed timeline and the Order No. 2023 study timeline is 60 Calendar Days (*i.e.*, 360 versus 300). In addition, the ISO has committed to work with stakeholders on improvements going forward, including methods to reduce these timelines.

Accordingly, the Filing Parties request that the Commission reject BlueWave's request and accept the Filing Parties proposed study timeframes.

G. BlueWave's Requests for Additional Flexibility to Modify Interconnection Requests Contravenes Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A

BlueWave's comments claim that "the ISO-NE Compliance Filing does not make [an] allowance for interconnection customers to request a reduction of the size of the interconnecting facility if a Cluster Restudy is *not* deemed to be necessary or if Network Upgrades are shared by other Customers."⁷⁰ BlueWave suggests that the "proposed tariff revisions thus could (and should)

⁷⁰ BlueWave Protest at 5.

be modified to allow a project developer to reduce the size of its project even when a Cluster Restudy is not triggered, provided that the project developer agrees to fund the full Network Upgrade amount identified in the Cluster Study notwithstanding the project's reduction in size.”⁷¹

First, BlueWave's premise is faulty. The Order No. 2023 Compliance Package allows for Interconnection Customers to make a request to reduce the size of a project following the conclusion of a Cluster Study under the Material Modification rules contained in Section 4.4 of Schedule 22 (and in Schedules 23 and 25 as proposed in the Order No. 2023 Related Changes filing). In such cases, the ISO will examine whether a request to reduce the size of a project is material under the Tariff, including whether the Interconnection Customer has shared upgrades that may be impacted by a size reduction.

Second, to the extent that BlueWave seeks to be able to automatically reduce the size of an Interconnection Request during the Cluster Study process, its request is at odds with the Commission's Order No. 2023-A, which explicitly rejected requests to include in the *pro forma* LGIP provisions allowing Interconnection Customers to reduce the size of their projects by as much as 60% following the conclusion of a Cluster Study.⁷² The Commission reasoned that “allowing every interconnection customer in a cluster a 60% size reduction after the initial cluster study report will significantly impact the amount of uncertainty faced by interconnection customers in a cluster—because each change in proposed generating facility size may shift network upgrade costs to other interconnection customers, who in turn, may elect to re-size—and may lead to withdrawals and restudies.”⁷³ BlueWave suggests that a size reduction where an

⁷¹ BlueWave Protest at 5-6.

⁷² See Order No. 2023-A at P 555.

⁷³ *Id.*

Interconnection Customer agrees to pay for all Network Upgrades identified to accommodate the studied project size should be allowed in all circumstances; however, such an allowance could negatively affect other Interconnection Customers in a given Cluster Study despite BlueWave's assertions to the contrary, and it therefore must be evaluated pursuant to the Material Modification rules. Allowing a project the opportunity to reduce its size may require restudy to determine the extent to which the size reduction interacts with other projects proposed in that Cluster.⁷⁴ Even if an Interconnection Customer were to agree to pay for all Network Upgrades needed to accommodate its full request, a reduced size could result in upgrades in other areas of the system changing or being reassigned. The Commission should therefore reject this request as inconsistent with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A.

BlueWave also requests that "the Commission should require that ISO-NE make explicit in the ISO-NE LGIP that equipment changes or substitutions (e.g., of inverters, transformers, or grounding configuration changes) that do not affect a facility's size, made at any point during the interconnection process, will not be deemed a material modification."⁷⁵ This, BlueWave argues, "recognize(s) the difficulties that developers face in predicting which equipment they will be able to procure in the face of long lead times and supply chain difficulties."⁷⁶ Under the Interconnection Procedures, Interconnection Customers may propose to change inverters,⁷⁷ however, such changes must be evaluated to determine materiality and impacts on other customers in the same Cluster.

⁷⁴ In the event size reductions were allowed in the manner suggested, Interconnection Customers would also be required to provide a full set of data to accurately represent the size reduction, which could cause delay to other projects in the Cluster, and potentially delay the conclusion of a Cluster unnecessarily.

⁷⁵ BlueWave Protest at 6

⁷⁶ Id.

⁷⁷ Proposed Schedule 22, Section 4.4.

Different inverters, with different sizes, or characteristics can behave differently when studied, potentially resulting in violations identified and the resulting upgrades needed to correct them changing. Order No. 2023's modifications to the Material Modification rules recognize this by modifying the definition of Material Modification to account for the equal queue positions of all Interconnection Customers in a given Cluster, and requiring that size reduction requests be evaluated through the material modification process.⁷⁸ The Commission should therefore reject this request as inconsistent with Order No. 2023.

H. Implementation Details are Best Left to the Development of Planning Procedures, which are Subject to Stakeholder Review

In its comments, RENEW suggested that future interconnection reform efforts should focus on (1) reducing Cluster Study timelines, (2) determining whether additional size reduction allowances could be deemed non-material, (3) revisiting cost allocation rules related to repowerings and project size increases, and (4) whether Cluster Study deposits can be lowered as the ISO gains experience with the process.⁷⁹ As RENEW's suggestions are beyond the scope of the Order Nos. 2023 and 2023, the Commission need not address them. The ISO, however, notes that these topics may be explored further in the future, as the region gains experience with the new Cluster Study construct.

RENEW also asks that clarity be provided regarding: (1) when each customer will be required to pay for the upgrades in the case of shared upgrades for projects that have different Commercial Operation Dates, (2) the redispatch assumptions that the ISO intends to use when conducting the NCIS portion of the Cluster Study, and (3) whether the ISO will report to

⁷⁸ See Pro Forma LGIP Section 4.4; Order No. 2023 at P 279.

⁷⁹ RENEW Comments at 9-12.

stakeholders on actual study costs as each study cycle is completed.⁸⁰ As is the case under the existing rules, the timing for payment and construction sequencing of interconnection upgrades will be addressed in the Interconnection Agreements. Regarding the remaining requests, the ISO notes that it has already begun to engage stakeholders regarding revisions to the ISO New England Planning Procedures, specifically Planning Procedure 5-6, which describes the process the ISO uses to conduct studies.⁸¹ These revisions include detailed information regarding, among other topics, redispatch assumptions and cost allocation. Further, the ISO anticipates providing information regarding Cluster Study costs in furtherance of transparency.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated in the Order No. 2023 Compliance Package and in this Answer, the ISO respectfully requests that the Commission reject the Protests, and accept the Tariff Revisions proposed in Order No. 2023 Compliance Package, without modifications or conditions, as compliant with Order Nos. 2023 and 2023-A to become effective on August 12, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Graham Jesmer

Graham Jesmer
Regulatory Counsel – Operations and Planning
ISO New England Inc.
One Sullivan Road
Holyoke, MA 01040-2841
(413) 540-4557

Counsel for ISO New England Inc.

⁸⁰ RENEW Comments at 12-17.

⁸¹ *ISO New England*, Proposed Revisions to Planning Procedure 5-6 (June 2024), available at https://www.iso-ne.com/static-assets/documents/100012/a07_02_pp5_6.zip.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at Holyoke, Massachusetts this 20th day of June, 2024.

/s/ Julie Horgan

Julie Horgan
eTariff Coordinator
ISO New England Inc.
One Sullivan Road
Holyoke, MA 01040
(413) 540-4683