

31.2.8 Determination of Necessity

31.2.8.1 Determination of Necessity of a Regulated Solution

31.2.8.1.1 The ISO shall review proposals for market-based solutions pursuant to Sections 31.2.5, 31.2.8.3, and 31.2.13.1 of this Attachment Y. The ISO will not trigger a regulated solution if, based on this review, it determines prior to or at the Trigger Date for a regulated solution that sufficient market-based solutions are timely progressing to meet the Reliability Need by the need date. If the ISO decides not to trigger a regulated backstop solution or selected alternative regulated transmission solution, the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner will be eligible to recover its costs incurred up to that point in the same manner it may recover the costs of a halted project in accordance with Section 31.2.8.2.1 for the Responsible Transmission Owner and Section 31.2.8.2.2 for the Other Developer or Transmission Owner.

31.2.8.1.2 If: (i) the ISO determines that there are not sufficient market-based solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date, (ii) the regulated backstop solution proposed by the Responsible Transmission Owner is the only proposed viable and sufficient regulated solution or is selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to meet the identified Reliability Need, and (iii) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution has or will occur within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, the ISO will trigger the regulated backstop solution at its Trigger Date. The ISO will inform the Responsible Transmission Owner that it should submit the regulated

backstop solution to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to begin the necessary approval process to site, construct, and operate the solution. In response to the ISO's request, the Responsible Transmission Owner shall make such a submission to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies).

31.2.8.1.3 If: (i) the ISO determines that there are not sufficient market-based solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date; (ii) the ISO selects an alternative regulated transmission solution as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to meet the identified Reliability Need; (iii) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution is later than the Trigger Date for the selected alternative regulated transmission solution; and (iv) the Trigger Date for the selected alternative regulated transmission solution has or will occur within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, the ISO shall trigger the selected alternative regulated transmission solution at its Trigger Date. The ISO will inform the Other Developer or Transmission Owner that it should submit the selected alternative regulated transmission solution to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to begin the necessary approval process to site, construct, and operate the solution. In response to the ISO's request, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall make such a submission to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies). Prior to the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution, the ISO will review the status of the development by the Other Developer or Transmission Owner of

the selected alternative regulated transmission solution, including, but not limited to, reviewing: (i) whether the Developer has executed a Development Agreement or requested that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6; (ii) whether the Developer is timely progressing against the milestones set forth in the Development Agreement; and (iii) the status of the Developer's obtaining required permits or authorizations, including whether the Developer has received its Article VII certification or other applicable siting permits or authorizations under New York State law. If, based on its review, the ISO determines prior to or at the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution that it is necessary for the Responsible Transmission Owner to proceed with a regulated backstop solution in parallel with the selected alternative regulated transmission solution to ensure the identified Reliability Need is satisfied by the need date, the ISO will trigger the regulated backstop solution and report to stakeholders the reasons for its determination. The Responsible Transmission Owner shall proceed with due diligence to develop its regulated backstop solution in accordance with Good Utility Practice and to submit its proposed solution to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies), unless or until notified by the ISO that it has determined that the regulated backstop solution is no longer needed as described in Section 31.2.8.2.1 below. If, based on its review, the ISO decides not to trigger the regulated backstop solution, the ISO will notify the Responsible Transmission Owner that its regulated backstop solution is no longer needed and will not be triggered. In such case, the Responsible Transmission Owner shall be eligible to recover its costs incurred up

to that point in the same manner as it may recover the costs of a halted project in accordance with Section 31.2.8.2.1.

31.2.8.1.4 If: (i) the ISO determines that there are not sufficient market-based solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date; (ii) the ISO selects an alternative regulated transmission solution as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to meet the identified Reliability Need; (iii) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution is earlier than the Trigger Date for the selected alternative regulated transmission solution; and (iv) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution has or will occur within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, the ISO shall trigger both the selected alternative regulated transmission solution and the regulated backstop solution at the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution. The ISO will inform the Responsible Transmission Owner that proposed the regulated backstop solution and the Other Developer or Transmission Owner that proposed the selected alternative regulated transmission solution that they should submit the proposed solutions to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to begin the necessary approval process to site, construct, and operate the solution. In response to the ISO's request, the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall make such a submission to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies).

31.2.8.1.5 The ISO may make its determination regarding the triggering of a regulated solution pursuant to Sections 31.2.8.1.1 through 31.2.8.1.4 in the CRP or at any time before the approval of the next CRP.

31.2.8.1.6 If the selected regulated transmission solution is an alternative regulated transmission solution, the ISO shall tender the Other Developer or Transmission Owner that proposed the selected alternative regulated transmission solution – as soon as reasonably practicable considering the project’s Trigger Date following the ISO’s selection of the proposed solution – a draft Development Agreement with draft appendices completed by the ISO to the extent practicable for review and completion by the Developer. The draft Development Agreement shall be in the form of the ISO’s Commission-approved Development Agreement, which is in Appendix C in Section 31.7 of this Attachment Y. The ISO and the Developer shall finalize the Development Agreement and appendices and negotiate concerning any disputed provisions. For purposes of finalizing the Development Agreement, the ISO shall provide the Developer with the date by which the selected project must be in-service to satisfy the Reliability Need, and the ISO and Developer shall develop the description and dates for the milestones necessary to develop and construct the selected project by the required in-service date, including the milestones for obtaining all necessary authorizations. Unless otherwise agreed by the ISO and the Developer, the Developer must execute the Development Agreement within three (3) months of the ISO’s tendering of the draft Development Agreement; *provided, however*, if, during the negotiation period, the Developer determines that negotiations are at an impasse, it may

request in writing that the ISO file the Development Agreement in unexecuted form with the Commission. If the Development Agreement resulting from the negotiation between the ISO and the Developer does not conform with the Commission-approved standard form in Appendix C in Section 31.7 of this Attachment Y, the ISO shall file the agreement with the Commission for its acceptance within thirty (30) Business Days after the execution of the Development Agreement by both parties. If the Developer requests that the Development Agreement be filed unexecuted, the ISO shall file the agreement at the Commission within thirty (30) Business Days of receipt of the request from the Developer. The ISO will draft to the extent practicable the portions of the Development Agreement and appendices that are in dispute and will provide an explanation to the Commission of any matters as to which the parties disagree. The Developer will provide in a separate filing any comments that it has on the unexecuted agreement, including any alternative positions it may have with respect to the disputed provisions.

31.2.8.1.7 Upon the ISO's and Developer's execution of the Development Agreement or the ISO's filing of an unexecuted Development Agreement with the Commission pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6, the ISO and Developer shall perform their respective obligations in accordance with the terms of the Development Agreement that are not in dispute, subject to modifications by the Commission. The Connecting Transmission Owner(s) and Affected Transmission Owner(s) that are identified in Attachment X of the ISO OATT in connection with the selected alternative regulated transmission solution shall act in good faith in timely

performing their obligations that are required for the Developer to satisfy its obligations under the Development Agreement.

31.2.8.1.8 Other Developers and Transmission Owners proposing alternative regulated solutions that the ISO has determined will resolve the identified Reliability Need may submit these proposals to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) for review. The ISO does not determine the solution that will be permitted by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) with jurisdiction over siting or whether the regulated backstop solution or an alternative regulated solution will be constructed to address the identified Reliability Need. If the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) makes a final determination that an alternative regulated solution should be permitted and constructed to satisfy a Reliability Need and that the regulated backstop solution should not proceed, implementation of the alternative regulated solution will be the responsibility of the Transmission Owner or Other Developer that proposed the alternative regulated solution, and the Responsible Transmission Owner will not be responsible for addressing the Reliability Need through the implementation of its regulated backstop solution. Should a regulated solution not be implemented, the ISO may request a Gap Solution pursuant to Section 31.2.11 of this Attachment Y.

31.2.8.2 Halting and Related Cost Recovery Requirements

31.2.8.2.1 If the ISO has triggered a regulated backstop solution under Sections 31.2.8.1.2, 31.2.8.1.3, 31.2.8.1.4, or 31.2.8.1.5, the ISO will immediately notify the Responsible Transmission Owner, post such notice on its website, and will

state in the next CRP if it determines that the regulated backstop solution is no longer needed and should be halted because either: (i) the ISO has determined that there are sufficient market-based solutions to ensure that the identified Reliability Need is met by the need date, or (ii) the ISO: (A) has triggered an alternative regulated transmission solution that the ISO selected in the CRP as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution and (B) has determined that it is no longer necessary for the Responsible Transmission Owner to proceed with a regulated backstop solution in parallel with the selected alternative regulated transmission solution to ensure the identified Reliability Need is satisfied by the need date. In making its determination under Section 31.2.8.2.1(ii), the ISO will review the status of the development by the Other Developer or Transmission Owner of the selected alternative regulated transmission solution, including, but not limited to, reviewing: (i) whether the Developer has executed a Development Agreement or requested that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6; (ii) whether the Developer is timely progressing against the milestones set forth in the Development Agreement; and (iii) the status of the Developer's obtaining required permits or authorizations, including whether the Developer has received its Article VII certification or other applicable siting permits or authorizations under New York State law.

If a regulated backstop solution is halted by the ISO, all of the costs incurred and commitments made by the Responsible Transmission Owner up to that point, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, will be recoverable by the Responsible

Transmission Owner under the cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 10 of this tariff regardless of the nature of the solution.

31.2.8.2.2 If the ISO has triggered an alternative regulated transmission project under Sections 31.2.8.1.3 or 31.2.8.1.4 that the ISO has selected as the more efficient or cost effective solution, the ISO will immediately notify the Other Developer or Transmission Owner, post such notice on its website, and will state in the next CRP if it determines that the regulated transmission solution is no longer needed and should be halted because the ISO has determined that there are sufficient market-based solutions to ensure that the identified Reliability Need is met by the need date.

If a selected alternative regulated transmission solution is halted by the ISO, all of the costs incurred and commitments made by the Other Developer or Transmission Owner up to that point, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, will be recoverable by the Other Developer or Transmission Owner under the cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 10 of this tariff.

31.2.8.2.3 Once the Responsible Transmission Owner receives state regulatory approval of the regulated backstop solution, or, if state regulatory approval is not required, once the Responsible Transmission Owner receives necessary regulatory approval, the entry of a market-based solution or an alternative regulated transmission solution will not result in the halting by the ISO of the regulated backstop solution pursuant to Section 31.2.8.2.1. Similarly, once the Other Developer or Transmission Owner receives its state regulatory approval or any

other necessary regulatory approval of its triggered alternative regulated transmission solution, the entry of a market-based solution will not result in the halting by the ISO of the regulated transmission solution pursuant to Section 31.2.8.2.2.

31.2.8.2.4 The ISO is not required to review market-based solutions to determine whether they will meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date after the triggered alternative regulated transmission solution or regulated backstop solution has received federal and state regulatory approval, unless a federal or state regulatory agency requests the ISO to conduct such a review. The ISO will report the results of its review to the federal or state regulatory agency, with copies to the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner.

31.2.8.2.5 If the appropriate federal, state or local agency(ies) does not approve a necessary authorization for the triggered regulated backstop solution or alternative regulated transmission solution, all of the necessary and reasonable costs incurred and commitments made up to the final federal, state or local regulatory decision, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, will be recoverable by the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner under the ISO cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT regardless of the nature of the solution.

31.2.8.2.6 If a necessary federal, state or local authorization for a triggered alternative regulated transmission solution or regulated backstop solution is

withdrawn, all expenditures and commitments made up to that point including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, will be recoverable under the ISO cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT by the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner regardless of the nature of the solution.

31.2.8.2.7 If a material modification to the regulated backstop solution or the alternative regulated transmission solution is proposed by any federal, state or local agency, the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner will request the ISO to conduct a supplemental reliability review. If the ISO identifies any reliability deficiency in the modified solution, the ISO will so advise the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner and the appropriate federal, state or local regulatory agency(ies).

31.2.8.3 Criteria for Cutoff Date of Market-Based Solution

31.2.8.3.1 The ISO will apply the criteria in this Section 31.2.8.3 for determining the cutoff date for a determination that a market-based solution will not be available to meet a Reliability Need by the need date.

31.2.8.3.2 In the first instance, the ISO shall employ its procedures for monitoring the viability of a market-based solution to determine when it may no longer be viable. Under the conditions where a market-based solution is proceeding after the Trigger Date for the relevant regulated solution, it becomes even more critical for the ISO to conduct a continued analysis of the viability of such market-based solutions.

31.2.8.3.3 The Developer of such a market-based solution shall submit updated information to the ISO twice during each reliability planning process cycle, first during the input phase of the RNA, and again during the solutions phase during the period allowed for the solicitation for market-based and regulated solutions. If no solutions are requested in a particular year, then the second update will be provided during the ISO's analysis of whether existing solutions continue to meet identified Reliability Needs. The updated information of the project status shall include: status of final permits, status of major equipment, current status of construction schedule, estimated in-service date, any potential impediments to completion by the Target Year, and any other information requested by the ISO.

31.2.8.3.4 The Developer shall immediately report to the ISO when it has any indication of a material change in the project status or that the project in-service date may slip beyond the Target Year. A material change shall include, but not be limited to, a change in the financial viability of the Developer, a change in siting status, or a change in a major element of the project development.

31.2.8.3.5 Based upon the above information, the ISO will perform an independent review of the development status of the market-based solution to determine whether it remains viable to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date. If the ISO, at any time, learns of a material change in the project status of a market-based solution, it may, at that time, make a determination as to the continued viability of such project.

31.2.8.3.6 The ISO, prior to making a determination about the viability of a specific proposed solution, will communicate its intended determination to the project

Developer along with the basis for its intended determination. The ISO shall provide the Developer a reasonable period (not more than 2 weeks) to respond to the ISO's intended determination, including an opportunity to provide additional information to the ISO to support the continued viability of the proposed solution.

31.2.8.3.7 If the ISO determines that a market-based solution that is needed to meet an identified Reliability Need is no longer viable, it will request that a regulated solution proceed or seek other measures including, but not limited to, a Gap Solution, to ensure the reliability of the system.

31.2.8.3.8 If the ISO determines that the market-based solution is still viable, but that its in-service date is likely to slip beyond the Target Year, the ISO may, if needed, request the Responsible Transmission Owner to prepare a Gap Solution in accordance with the provisions of Section 31.2.11 of this Attachment Y.

31.2.9 Process for Consideration of Regulated Backstop Solution and Alternative Regulated Solutions

Upon a determination by the ISO under Section 31.2.8 that a regulated solution should proceed, the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner will make a presentation to the ESPWG that will provide a description of the regulated solution. The presentation will include a non-binding preliminary cost estimate of that regulated solution; provided, however, that the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall be entitled to full recovery of all reasonably incurred costs as described in Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT. The ISO and stakeholders through this process will have the opportunity to review and discuss the scope of the projects and their associated non-binding preliminary cost estimates prior to implementation.

31.2.10 Process for Addressing Inability of Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner to Complete Triggered Regulated Solution

31.2.10.1 If: (i) the regulated transmission solution selected and triggered by the ISO is an alternative regulated transmission solution, and (ii) one of the following events occur: (A) the Other Developer or Transmission Owner that proposed the alternative regulated transmission solution does not execute the Development Agreement, or does not request that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission, within the timeframes set forth in Section 31.2.8.1.6, or (B) an effective Development Agreement is terminated under the terms of the agreement prior to the completion of the term of the agreement, the ISO may take the following actions as soon as practicable after the occurrence of the event:

31.2.10.1.1 If the Development Agreement has been filed with and accepted by the Commission, the ISO shall, upon terminating the Development Agreement under the terms of the agreement, file a notice of termination with the Commission.

31.2.10.1.2 The ISO may revoke its selection of the alternative regulated transmission solution and the eligibility of the Other Developer or Transmission Owner to recover its costs for the project; *provided, however*, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner may recover its costs to the extent provided in Sections 31.2.8.2.2, 31.2.8.2.5, and 31.2.8.2.6 or as otherwise determined by the Commission.

31.2.10.1.3 If the ISO determines that it must identify a solution prior to the approval of the CRP for the next planning cycle to satisfy the Reliability Need by the need date, the ISO may: (i) direct the Responsible Transmission Owner to proceed with its regulated backstop solution if it has not yet been halted by the ISO pursuant to

Section 31.2.8.2.1, (ii) request that the Responsible Transmission Owner complete the selected alternative regulated transmission solution, and/or (iii) proceed with the Gap Solution process under Section 31.2.11.

31.2.10.1.4 If the Responsible Transmission Owner agrees to complete the selected alternative regulated transmission solution, the Responsible Transmission Owner and the Other Developer or Transmission Owner that proposed the selected alternative regulated transmission solution shall work cooperatively with each other to implement the transition, including negotiating in good faith with each other to transfer the project; *provided, however*, that the transfer is subject to: (i) any required approvals by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies), (ii) any requirements or restrictions on the transfer of Developer's rights-of-way under law, conveyance, or contract, and (iii), if the Developer is a New York public authority, any requirements or restrictions on the transfer under the New York Public Authorities Law; *provided, further*, that the Responsible Transmission Owner and the Developer will address any disputes regarding the transfer of the project in accordance with the dispute resolution provisions in Article 11 of the ISO Services Tariff.

31.2.10.2 If: (i) the regulated transmission solution selected and triggered by the ISO is the Responsible Transmission Owner's regulated backstop solution or the regulated backstop solution has been triggered by the ISO under Sections 31.2.8.1.2, 31.2.8.1.3, or 31.2.8.1.4, and the regulated backstop solution has not been halted by the ISO under Section 31.2.8.2.1, and (ii) the ISO determines that the Responsible Transmission Owner: (A) has not submitted its proposed

regulated backstop solution for necessary regulatory action within a reasonable period of time, (B) is unable to or fails to obtain the approvals or property rights necessary to construct the project, or (C) is otherwise not taking the actions necessary to construct the project to satisfy the Reliability Need by the need date, the ISO shall: (i) submit a report to the Commission for its consideration and determination of whether action is appropriate under federal law, and (ii) take such action as it reasonably considers is appropriate to ensure that the Reliability Need is satisfied by the need date.

31.2.11 Gap Solutions

31.2.11.1 If the ISO determines that neither market-based proposals nor regulated proposals can satisfy the Reliability Needs by the need date, the ISO will set forth its determination that a Gap Solution is necessary in the CRP. The ISO will also request the Responsible Transmission Owner to seek a Gap Solution. Gap Solutions may include generation, transmission, or demand side resources.

31.2.11.2 If there is an imminent threat to the reliability of the New York State Power System, the ISO Board, after consultation with the NYDPS, may request the appropriate Transmission Owner or Transmission Owners to propose a Gap Solution outside of the normal planning cycle.

31.2.11.3 Notwithstanding Sections 31.2.11.1 and 31.2.11.2, if a Market Participant notifies the ISO of its intent for its Generator to be Retired or to enter into a Mothball Outage pursuant to Section 38.3.1 of Attachment FF of the ISO OATT or if a Market Participant's Generator enters into an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage pursuant to Section 5.18.2.1 of the ISO Services Tariff, the ISO will

evaluate whether a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need or an immediate reliability need will result from the Generator's deactivation and will address any resulting Generator Deactivation Reliability Need or immediate reliability need in accordance with the Generator Deactivation Process set forth in Attachment FF of the ISO OATT.

31.2.11.4 Upon the ISO's determination of the need for a Gap Solution, pursuant to Sections 31.2.11.1 or 31.2.11.2 above, the Responsible Transmission Owner will propose such a solution as soon as reasonably possible, for consideration by the ISO and NYDPS.

31.2.11.54 Any party may submit an alternative Gap Solution proposal to the ISO and the NYDPS for their consideration. The ISO shall evaluate all Gap Solution proposals to determine whether they will meet the Reliability Need or imminent threat. The ISO will also evaluate, as an alternative Gap Solution proposal, any Generator in a Mothball Outage or an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage to determine whether its return to service would meet the Reliability Need or imminent threat; provided, however, that the Mothball Outage began on or after May 1, 2015~~the effective date of Section 5.18 of the Services Tariff~~ and the ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage followed a Forced Outage that began after May 1, 2015~~the effective date of Section 5.18 of the Services Tariff~~. The ISO will report the results of its evaluation to the party making the proposal, or to the Generator when evaluating its return to service, as well as to the NYDPS and/ or other appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) for consideration in their review of the proposals. The appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or

authority(ies) with jurisdiction over the implementation or siting of Gap Solutions will determine whether the Gap Solution or an alternative Gap Solution will be implemented to address the identified Reliability Need. -When the return to service of a Generator in a Mothball Outage or an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage has been selected as either the Gap Solution or to resolve a reliability issue arising on a non-New York State Bulk Power Transmission Facility during its outage, the compensation and return to service procedures set forth in Section 5.18.4 of the Services Tariff shall apply.

31.2.11.~~65~~ Gap Solution proposals submitted under Sections 31.2.11.~~43~~ and 31.2.11.~~54~~ shall be designed to be temporary solutions and to strive to be compatible with permanent market-based proposals.

31.2.11.~~76~~ A permanent regulated solution, if appropriate, may proceed in parallel with a Gap Solution.

31.2.12 Confidentiality of Solutions

31.2.12.1 The term “Confidential Information” shall include all types of solutions to Reliability Needs that are submitted to the ISO as a response to Reliability Needs identified in any RNA issued by the ISO as part of the reliability planning process if the Developer of that solution designates such reliability solutions as “Confidential Information.”

31.2.12.2 For regulated backstop solutions and plans submitted by the Responsible Transmission Owner in response to the findings of the RNA, the ISO shall maintain the confidentiality of same until the ISO and the Responsible Transmission Owner have agreed that the Responsible Transmission Owner has

submitted viable and sufficient regulated backstop solutions and plans to meet the Reliability Needs identified in an RNA and the Responsible Transmission Owner consents to the ISO's inclusion of the proposed solution in the CRP. Thereafter, the ISO shall disclose the regulated backstop solutions and plans to the Market Participants; however, any preliminary cost estimates that may have been provided to the ISO shall not be disclosed.

31.2.12.3 For an alternative regulated response, the ISO shall determine, after consulting with the Developer thereof, whether the response would meet a Reliability Need identified in an RNA, whether the response is viable and sufficient to meet all or part of the Reliability Need, and the Developer consents to the ISO's inclusion of the proposed solution in the CRP. Thereafter, the ISO shall disclose the alternative regulated response to the Market Participants and other interested parties; however, any preliminary cost estimates that may have been provided to the ISO shall not be disclosed.

31.2.12.4 For a market-based response, the ISO shall maintain the confidentiality of same during the reliability planning process and in the CRP, except for the following information which may be disclosed by the ISO: (i) the type of resource proposed (e.g., generation, transmission, demand side); (ii) the size of the resource expressed in megawatts of equivalent load that would be served by that resource; (iii) the subzone in which the resource would interconnect or otherwise be located; and (iv) the proposed in-service date of the resource.

31.2.12.5 In the event that the Developer of a market-based response has made a public announcement of its project or has submitted a proposal for

interconnection with the ISO, the ISO shall disclose the identity of the market-based Developer and the specific project during the reliability planning process and in the CRP.

31.2.13 Monitoring of Reliability Project Status

31.2.13.1 The ISO will monitor and report on the status of market-based solutions to ensure their continued viability to meet Reliability Needs by the need date in the CRP. The ISO shall assess the continued viability of such projects using the following criteria:

31.2.13.1.1 Between three and five years before the Trigger Date for a regulated solution, the ISO will use a screening analysis to verify the feasibility of the proposed market-based solution (this analysis will not require final permit approvals or final contract documents).

31.2.13.1.2 Between one and two years before the Trigger Date for a regulated solution, the ISO will perform a more extensive review of the proposed market-based solution, including such elements as: status of the required interconnection studies, contract negotiations, permit applications, financing, and Site Control.

31.2.13.1.3 Less than one year before the Trigger Date of a regulated solution, the ISO will perform a detailed review of the market-based solution's status and schedule, including the status of: (1) final permits; (2) required interconnection studies; (3) the status of an interconnection agreement; (4) financing; (5) equipment; and (6) the implementation of construction schedules.

31.2.13.1.4 If the ISO, following its analysis, determines that a proposed market-based solution is no longer viable to meet the Reliability Need, the proposed market-based solution will be removed from the list of potential market-based solutions.

31.2.13.2 The ISO will monitor and report on the status of regulated solutions to ensure their continued viability to meet Reliability Needs by the need date in the CRP. The ISO shall assess the continued viability of regulated solutions~~such~~ ~~projects~~ using the following criteria:

31.2.13.2.1 Between three and five years before the Trigger Date for the regulated solution, the ISO will use a screening analysis to verify the feasibility of the regulated solution.

31.2.13.2.2 Between one and two years before the Trigger Date for the regulated solution, the ISO will perform a more extensive review of the proposed regulated solution, including such elements as: the status of the required interconnection studies, contract negotiations, permit applications, financing, and Site Control.

31.2.13.2.3 Less than one year before the Trigger Date for the regulated solution, the ISO will perform a detailed review of the regulated solution's status, including the status of: (1) final permits; (2) required interconnection studies; (3) the status of an interconnection agreement; (4) financing; (5) equipment; and (6) the implementation of construction schedules.

31.2.13.2.4 Prior to making a determination about the viability of a regulated solution, the ISO will communicate its intended determination to the project sponsor along with the basis for its intended determination, and will provide the sponsor a reasonable period (not more than two weeks) to respond to the ISO's intended

determination, including an opportunity to provide additional information to the ISO to support the continued viability of the proposed regulated solution. If the ISO, following its analysis, determines that a proposed regulated solution is no longer viable to meet the Reliability Need, the proposed regulated solution will be removed from the list of potential regulated solutions.