ENERGY COMPLIANCE, INC. | *Field Reference for Organized Markets*

MARKETS · RTO/ISO SERIES · EC-WP-403

Market Operations & System Reliability

Where markets and reliability functions coexist and where they pull apart.

Markets and reliability share institutional infrastructure, but they do not share the same logic. The market settles in price; reliability settles in performance. This reference covers the seam between them, from the handoff of the market schedule to real-time control through out-of-market action, restoration, seams, accountability and oversight.

energycomplianceinc.com

OCTOBER 2026

Disclaimer & Legal Notice

This publication is the work product of Energy Compliance, Inc. and is provided for general information and educational purposes only. It does not constitute legal advice, regulatory guidance, engineering advice, or formal interpretation of any NERC Reliability Standard, FERC order, RTO or ISO protocol, or state commission rule.

This publication may not be used or cited as authority in any audit, enforcement, regulatory, or legal proceeding. Compliance with NERC Reliability Standards depends on facts and circumstances unique to each registered entity, and the reader should consult qualified counsel and subject matter experts when making compliance decisions.

NERC, FERC, and the names of Regional Entities and RTOs/ISOs are referenced here for descriptive purposes only. Energy Compliance, Inc. is not affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, any NERC Regional Entity, or any RTO or ISO.

Energy Compliance, Inc. assumes no responsibility or liability for errors, omissions, or outcomes resulting from the use of this publication.

Foreword

This professional reference is one of a series Energy Compliance, Inc. publishes for registered entities and the people who run their compliance programs.

I have spent more than thirty years on every side of the bulk electric system. I have operated control centers as a Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, and Power System Operator. I have audited grid facilities and signed off on findings as a senior compliance auditor. I have worked enforcement matters from inside the regulator's process. For the last several years I have advised registered entities directly through the firm I founded.

The entities that do reliability well share a habit. They take the standards seriously without confusing them with reliability itself. A NERC Reliability Standard is a floor, not a ceiling. Compliance is something an auditor evaluates; reliability is something a system either delivers or does not. So these entities prepare for audits by building programs that survive real questions, not binders that look thick.

That is the perspective these references try to share. Each one takes a single topic, whether a standard family, an operational function, a regulatory framework, or an emerging industry challenge, and walks through how it actually works.

They are written for the compliance manager who wants to understand the system and not just memorize requirements. For the legal counsel who has to brief a board honestly. For the senior operator who has been told that compliance and reliability are

the same thing and suspects they are not. And for the new compliance hire who was handed a binder and told good luck.

These references are not marketing material disguised as content. They come from three decades of doing this work and watching it succeed and fail. I have written them in the same voice I use in a control room or in front of a Regional Entity audit team: direct, grounded in evidence, and honest about what the standards do and do not require.

Energy Compliance exists because much of the consulting offered to registered entities today is structured for billable hours rather than for outcomes. Every engagement is overseen by a senior practitioner. We do not bring five people to a meeting that needs one. We automate the work that should be automated and apply senior judgment to the work that requires it. If that is what you want in a compliance partner, the back of this reference has our contact information.

If not, the reference still belongs to you. Take what is useful and apply it well. And remember the only test that ultimately matters: when the system needs to perform, does it?

Rob Smith

Founder and Principal, Energy Compliance, Inc.

Executive Summary

Markets and reliability share institutional infrastructure. They do not share the same logic. The market settles in price. Reliability settles in performance. The two converge in real time, and that convergence is where most operational complexity lives. Programs that engage one without the other end up coordinating after the fact, usually under enforcement pressure. Programs that do not recognize the difference get caught at the seam.

The authority lines are written down. An RTO must have exclusive authority for the short-term reliability of the grid it operates, including the right to order redispatch of any connected generator. The Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator and Balancing Authority act through Operating Instructions that the receiving entities must follow, with narrow exceptions. The Market Monitoring Unit watches the market and refers suspected Market Violations to FERC's Office of Enforcement. Each of those paths has its own evidence expectations.

- A market design that ignores reliability constraints produces unreliable markets. A reliability framework that ignores market behavior produces incomplete oversight.
- Reliability exposure does not need a dramatic event. Market behavior optimized for revenue can create it as a side effect.
- When market and reliability conflict, reliability wins in the moment. The market settles after. The order matters.
- The handoff from market schedule to real-time operation is the most consequential interface in organized markets.
- Reliability override of market signals is not arbitrary. It is procedurally defined and reviewed. Programs that override without documentation cannot reconstruct the decision.
- Stress amplifies the market-reliability tension. Under normal conditions the two coexist; under stress they diverge.
- When a market monitor flags a behavior, you may have a FERC issue, a NERC issue, both, or neither. Sorting that out fast determines whether you have a compliance question or a market mitigation.

1 Operational Coexistence of Markets and Reliability Functions

1.1 What This Reference Covers

This reference looks at how the real-time operation of the power system relates to market activity. It sets the standards-based reliability framework beside market operations and walks through the services markets provide, their constraints, their influence on real-time operation, and the role of the reliability authorities. It looks at when coordination works and when it fails, and it closes with operational risk, accountability and governance in market-based systems.

1.2 Same Control Rooms, Different Principles

Market and reliability operations are carried out in the same control rooms, on the same information systems, by the same organizations. They run on different principles because they serve different goals under different rules. That distinction is deliberate. It gives economic transactions a degree of functional independence while preserving the centralized command that system reliability may require under real uncertainty.

The federal rules make the split explicit. An RTO approved under 18 CFR 35.34 must have exclusive authority for maintaining the short-term reliability of the grid it operates. The market it runs sits on a tariff the Commission approves under the Federal Power Act. The reliability side answers to NERC Reliability Standards under Section 215.

1.3 Forecast Versus Present Condition

All market operations involve forecasting. Loads, resources and network conditions are forecast so that pricing, scheduling and contracting decisions can support the intended operating outcome. In effect, the market supplies a picture of what normal looks like under expected conditions. That picture is a reference point. Operators measure real conditions against it to spot deviations that may carry reliability risk. What the picture does not do is tell anyone what level of operating performance is acceptable.

Reliability works on the present condition, not the predicted one. System security has to be monitored continuously against actual voltages, flows, switch positions, line and transformer status, and the emergency resources needed to stay secure after the next contingency. The reliability authority's basic job is to issue the operating instructions current conditions require. Cost can shape which feasible action is chosen; it never decides whether a needed action is taken.

1.4 Controlling the Boundary

Running both functions at once means controlling the boundary between them. Market operations produce the schedules and prices that create economic incentives. Those do not, by themselves, make the system secure. Reliability assessments say whether operating conditions are within limits. They say nothing about whether the system is running efficiently. The boundary has to be managed so that economic management supports operational decision making and does not get in its way.

Coexistence is easiest to see in the sequencing. Market results set the initial dispatch and reserve positions and give operations a starting point and a horizon. As real time approaches, operators check whether conditions are tracking expectations. When they are, the market schedule proceeds with little adjustment. When they are not, reliability takes precedence over market alignment, and economic efficiency drops out of the decision.

1.5 Accountability and Shared Data

Accountability is split along the same line. Market administration is accountable for carrying out the tariff, for transparent market mechanisms and for accurate settlement. Reliability functions are accountable for preventing operating limit violations and for keeping the system secure. Neither substitutes for the other, and that separation is what makes it possible to sort out responsibility after a disturbance or a market incident.

Information flow is the other half of coexistence. Both functions draw on the same real-time system conditions, resource states and network status. They read that data differently. The market uses it to set schedules and prices. Reliability operations use the same data to judge margin, exposure and capability. One data set, two purposes, and no separation of the market from the grid.

1.6 Structure and Discretion

Coexistence explains why organized markets cannot do without operating expertise. A set of transactions can follow every market rule and still push the system so close to its reliability thresholds that simply executing the market's dispatch sequence is not enough.

The balance here is between structure and discretion. Markets give structure to a system that has become highly decentralized. Reliability authority provides the discretion to handle the uncertainty and uncontrollable factors that no schedule anticipates. Reliable operation needs both, and it needs the border between them kept intact.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Market operations and reliability functions run side by side under an institutional separation built to allow economic coordination while keeping the system secure. Market activity sets up, in advance, the structure the system runs on. The reliability authority acts in real time when conditions depart from that structure. Keeping both in place, with clear lines between them, is what keeps responsibility clear in system operation.

2 Transition from Market Schedules to Real-Time Control

2.1 The Most Critical Interface

The move from market schedules, built on models of expected conditions, to real-time conditions that start to depart from those models is arguably the most critical interface in an organized power system. Reliability is not decided by how accurate the day-ahead schedule was. It is decided by how well, and under what rules, the system moves from the scheduled state to the real one.

The market schedule is a coordination and timing tool. Day-ahead schedules and their real-time revisions rest on estimates of load, resource availability and network conditions, bounded by the constraints in the market model. They reduce uncertainty and let a large number of participants plan in a coordinated way. From a reliability standpoint, the schedule is a reference state, not an enforceable operating plan.

2.2 When Reality Departs from the Plan

Real-time control takes over as unforeseen events arrive: sudden load changes, equipment failures, weather and line outages. Operators keep the system reliable by watching System Operating Limits, frequency, voltage and contingency exposure. The standards set the cadence. Each Transmission Operator and each Reliability Coordinator must ensure a Real-time Assessment is performed at least once every 30 minutes, and a Transmission Operator must initiate its Operating Plan to mitigate an SOL exceedance it identifies.

When deviations stay within defined bounds, operations proceed with minimal adjustment to market schedules. When they do not, operators act. The reason to depart from the schedule is a reliability criterion, not an economic one. A limit exceedance gets corrected regardless of price or settlement consequence. That principle is built into organized markets: the market supports reliability; it does not define its boundaries.

2.3 Procedures, Communication and Settlement

Operating procedures and communication rules govern the transition. The operator has to know the system margin and the reserves required, and decide from that whether to deploy reserves, adjust interchange or reallocate resources. Those decisions can determine whether the final energy flows still match the market result. Either way, the procedures have to preserve transparency and accountability. Deviations from schedule and their settlement are handled afterward under separate rules.

Information technology made fast real-time transition possible, and it also exposed modeling limits that have been there since markets began. Market clearing relies on models good enough

for coordination but not exhaustive. They were built to clear quickly, not to capture every real-time complexity. In real time, the reliability authority handles the interactions and constraints that the clearing model's assumptions leave out.

2.4 Clear Accountability at the Handoff

Accountability at the transition has to be clear. When operators take reliability actions, their performance is judged against reliability criteria and operating procedures, not against the market schedule. When market outcomes create difficult conditions without breaching any reliability criterion, accountability runs through market governance, not operations.

This transition is often misunderstood in both directions. Treat it purely as an operational matter and the market-side response comes too late. Treat every operational intervention as a market failure and the interventions get dismissed, even though departing from schedule is part of the normal regime that keeps reliability high. Good governance does not treat the market schedule as something to be followed at all costs. Some deviation from schedule is routine and expected.

End-of-Chapter Summary

The change from market schedules to real-time control is a defining feature of organized systems. Schedules give participants coordinated expectations; real-time control shapes how the system responds to actual conditions under reliability criteria. The transition has to preserve security, accountability and the intended relationship between the market and the reliability authority.

From the Field

Schedules are predictions. Real time is reality. The reconciliation between them is operating work, not market work.

Programs that treat schedule deviations as a market issue misframe what is happening. Schedule deviations are reliability information first.

3 Operational Authority, Decision Making, and Accountability

3.1 Why Reliability Holds the Authority

Reliability operations hold operational authority in an organized market because their decisions are made to keep the system secure, not to produce a market outcome. Markets supply the load and resource expectations that guide operation and coordinate resource use, but operating decisions follow operating procedures built around the functional roles defined in the Reliability Standards and in operating agreements. That authority exists so the system stays within reliable limits whether or not the resulting market outcome is efficient.

3.2 Deciding Under Uncertainty

Operating decisions are needed almost instantly and under heavy uncertainty. System-wide information on frequency response, voltage, equipment condition and contingency exposure is sometimes unavailable, and when it is available it may be stale or partly wrong. The margin for error is small. The control center's first duty is the stability and integrity of the system, and that usually calls for precaution and adherence to established standards. Operators do not chase the optimal solution. They work to feasible operating practices inside established operating and design limits, and when in doubt they err on the side of caution.

Responsibility for those decisions is defined inside the reliability framework. Entities performing operating functions are held to the Reliability Standards and operating procedures, not to market efficiency or outcomes. That keeps market considerations from driving decisions about the Bulk Electric System.

3.3 How Authority Is Exercised

Authority flows through Operating Instructions. IRO-001-4 requires each Reliability Coordinator to act to address the reliability of its area, by direct action or by issuing Operating Instructions. It requires each Transmission Operator, Balancing Authority, Generator Operator and Distribution Provider to comply with those instructions unless they cannot be physically implemented or would violate safety, equipment, regulatory or statutory requirements. TOP-001-6 sets up the same structure one level down for instructions from the Transmission Operator and the Balancing Authority. Redispatch, transmission reconfiguration and interchange changes may all be needed as risk develops. The instruction binds the recipient whether it is long or short in the market and whether or not it is economically harmed.

How well that authority works depends on clear roles, disciplined communication and a shared understanding of reliability priorities. Operating decisions need coordination across functions. Reliability Coordinators, Transmission Operators and Balancing Authorities each do distinct

work, but their decisions are tightly linked. Organized markets add schedules, commitments and operating agreements that all have to be managed alongside real-time needs. When no function clearly leads during stressed conditions, the result is delay and inefficiency.

3.4 Accountability After the Fact

Operating authority is only as strong as the accountability that follows it. After a disturbance or near miss, the questions are about timing and appropriateness: was the action taken when it should have been, and was it consistent with the applicable Reliability Standards and operating procedures? Market effects are a secondary question. The Measures in IRO-001-4 and TOP-001-6 name the kinds of evidence that may be used: dated operator logs, dated and time-stamped voice recordings or transcripts, electronic communications, or equivalent documentation.

Clear rules for involuntary actions matter to market integrity too. Without them, operators may hesitate to take actions that disrupt their own facilities while providing reliability service to the system. If the consequence of an action, or of failing to act, is an unpredictable regulatory response, the certainty that market rules are meant to provide disappears. Participants would then face intervention, and possible penalties, on grounds open to economic argument rather than defined in rule.

Operating authority and accountability are the reasons reliability cannot be left to market dynamics. Markets organize planned behavior. They do not remove the need for real-time decisions that keep the system reliable and meet the accountability obligations that come with them. Organized markets stay resilient only if that authority is preserved and the accountability that goes with it is enforced.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Each RTO and ISO holds operational control in its region, exercised through functions defined in the Reliability Standards, market rules and operating agreements. Operating decisions focus on preserving reliability under uncertainty and are judged against reliability standards, not market criteria. Keeping that authority and accountability intact remains a priority as organized markets grow more complex.

From the Field

An override record that holds up in review shows four things: when the instruction was issued, which entity issued it, the reliability basis for it, and what happened after. A log that captures only the action leaves the basis to memory.

Reliability authority and market authority overlap. Knowing which one is in play at a given moment is part of operating effectively.

4 Managing Uncertainty and System Stress in Market Environments

4.1 Three Stages of Uncertainty

Uncertainty is a permanent feature of real-time operation. Forecast error, equipment failure, weather and human error cannot be designed out through market mechanisms. In an organized market, managing that uncertainty runs through three stages: pre-operational planning, where coordination and scheduling rest on expected conditions; real-time control, where uncertainty is managed while reliability and efficiency are maintained; and fast response once a departure from expected conditions is detected.

Markets narrow uncertainty; they do not eliminate it. Forecast-based scheduling, reserve procurement and unit commitment give a basis for anticipating likely conditions. That reduces exposure and the likelihood and impact of an event. It does not remove the need to respond in real time when something unexpected happens.

4.2 What Stress Looks Like

System stress occurs when unexpected events or uncertainty threaten operating limits. Severe weather, common-mode resource outages, deratings and sudden load changes are the usual examples. Market schedules are not enough to manage stressed conditions. The reliability organization has to look at both current conditions and where stress is heading, and act before limits are violated.

Decisions under stress are about preserving margin. Typical actions include bringing additional reserves online, adjusting real and reactive power flows on the transmission system, limiting interchange and adjusting resource output. Those actions may distort the market and may cut against generator practices and participant expectations. They are still appropriate because the obligation to provide reliable service overrides them. The market informs the decision; it does not determine it.

4.3 Conservative Assumptions

Stress is also where conservative assumptions earn their place. System models rest on probabilistic and statistical assumptions. Under stress, operating assumptions need to be more adverse than market outcomes imply. Those conservative assumptions are part of reliability management. They are not a sign that the market has failed.

4.4 Communication and Discipline Under Stress

Communication is a primary tool for managing uncertainty. Operators, Reliability Coordinators and neighboring systems coordinate their responses through it. Markets share some situational

information through load and price schedules, but reliability communication needs more: direct operating status, available recovery options and planned actions.

Stress tests institutions as well as networks:

- The pull to protect market prices and economic consequences puts real pressure on the people making reliability decisions. In the moment, there is rarely time to weigh price impacts, and trying to can erode discipline.
- Those exercising operating authority need to be insulated from market and economic pressure. When they act under reliability rules, the only question in front of them should be system reliability. That is how the institution protects reliability and its own credibility.

4.5 Learning from Stress

Post-event review of a stress period teaches a great deal. It looks at how the market performed, how operations responded and how well entities coordinated, to see where actual uncertainty exceeded what was anticipated and which assumptions were wrong. The adjustments that follow fall into two separate buckets, market preparation and operating procedure, and the two should not be confused.

Managing uncertainty and stress in markets means understanding where predictability ends and authority has to take over. Markets provide stability and readiness. When uncertainty turns into a crisis, reliability depends on decisions, caution and fast intervention.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Uncertainty and stress are inherent in power system operation and cannot be driven to zero through market mechanisms. Coordinated market design improves preparedness and reduces exposure; the reliability authority manages stress through prudent planning and timely decisions. Holding stress to acceptable levels requires defined roles, effective communication, and institutional barriers that keep economic pressure off reliability decisions.

5 Coordination Failure Modes Between Market Operations and Reliability Functions

5.1 Where Coordination Breaks

Market operations and reliability functions are designed to coexist, but nothing guarantees their interaction will be smooth. Coordination fails when the market's assumptions about the system do not hold, when system boundaries are misunderstood, or when critical information flows break down under stress. These failure modes do not mean the design is flawed. They mark the places where good governance and awareness of system dynamics matter most.

5.2 Misreading the Market Signal

One failure mode is misreading market information. A schedule that settled within the market rules does not mean real-time conditions are adequate or even known. The problem grows when model assumptions are too optimistic: correlated resource behavior treated as independent, resource availability overestimated, or local transmission bottlenecks left out. Without a close-in assessment of actual conditions, it can take time to see the full effect on adequacy.

5.3 Timing Misalignment

Another failure mode is timing. Market processes run on defined intervals; operating conditions change continuously. Conditions can deteriorate quickly between market runs, leaving operators to manage developing risk with no immediate market adjustment. Coordination then depends on a willingness to depart from market alignment promptly instead of waiting for the next formal run.

5.4 Boundary Confusion

Coordination also suffers when institutional boundaries blur. Market staff, participants or outside parties may wrongly assign reliability responsibility to the market, and that can change how market operators act. For example, they may:

- try to justify every reliability action in economic terms; or
- ask market operators to resolve disputes or events that fall outside market administration's responsibility.

Clear institutional boundaries remove that ambiguity.

5.5 Degraded Information and Seams

Degraded information is a less obvious failure mode. Market and reliability functions use partly overlapping data. In a critical situation, delays, errors and dropouts in data channels can damage operator situational awareness. Handling information well under those conditions is a matter of interpreting it and picking out what matters most, and it has little to do with market economics or price settings.

Seams between market regions add another layer. Differences in market timing, interchange practices and operating conventions have to be coordinated when a condition reaches across more than one region. That is hard when formal agreements and procedures do not cover what happens once assumptions about neighboring systems turn out to be wrong. The reliability organization has to account for this regardless of the market structure in place.

5.6 Reviewing Failures Fairly

Governance cannot anticipate and prevent every coordination failure, so it has to respond well afterward. That takes post-event analysis done at enough distance for tempers to cool. The review has to separate three possible causes: a market design flaw that needs to be fixed, an implementation shortfall that calls for tighter monitoring, and an external event that was unavoidable and should not prompt more preventive control. Mislabeling one as another wastes the lesson. Reviewers also need to watch for their own bias, which can distort what the event actually teaches.

5.7 Building in Tolerance

Treating coordination failure as a modeled risk confirms why reliability governance relies on redundancy. Independent assessment, conservative judgment and the ability to intervene are, in large part, insurance against the impossibility of anticipating every situation through coordination. The market makes the occasions that call for that insurance rarer and simpler.

Perfect coordination between market operations and reliability functions is not achievable. A system that tolerates small misalignments is. It takes some excess capacity and institutional rules clear enough that small discrepancies do not grow into dysfunction. If an organization can decide quickly and unambiguously who does what when the two drift apart, overall reliability holds.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Coordination failures between market operations and reliability functions come from misleading or hard-to-read market signals, operating timelines that do not match market horizons, confusion over what belongs to reliability and what belongs to the market, and degraded real-time information. They usually reflect gaps in foresight more than poor institutional design. Reliability holds through clear lines of authority, risk-averse decision making, and review processes that can tell a structural problem from a short-term operating issue.

From the Field

When market schedules do not match operating reality, coordination has to bridge the gap. When the bridge fails, reliability events follow.

Coordination failures are often slow rather than dramatic. Small misalignments accumulate into a stress event that no single point of failure predicted.

The framework codifies coordination expectations. Programs that operate by the codifications navigate the failure modes more cleanly than programs that improvise.

A market participant that is also a registered entity answers to FERC oversight, the market monitor and NERC compliance at the same time. Each has different evidentiary expectations.

6 Visibility, Transparency, and Operational Awareness

6.1 Two Kinds of Transparency

System reliability cannot be preserved in the dark. Operators need to know the state of the grid at all times: both the planned sequence of operation and the actual real-time condition, including in the gaps that market schedules and price signals do not cover.

Transparency supports that knowledge, but operational transparency is not the same as market transparency. Market transparency reveals prices, volumes and settlements so that outcomes can be evaluated. Knowing how prices and schedules were set and how bids and offers were submitted matters for pricing, scheduling, rule enforcement, post-event analysis and accountability. Operational awareness is a different need. It calls for a live understanding of system conditions, margins and exposure, now and ahead, not an after-the-fact reading of market outcomes.

6.2 Awareness Is Observation

Real-time operational awareness comes from observation. Telemetry, alarms, contingency analysis results and Real-time Assessments reduce the amount of interpretation and inference needed to understand conditions. Dynamic voltage behavior, frequency response, equipment status changes and weather all signal risk that the wholesale price may not reflect. Reliability Coordinators and Transmission Operators rely on those signals to understand the present state of the grid and to judge whether it can withstand the next disturbance.

Under stress, the difference between visibility and transparency becomes important. Market outcomes can lag or smooth over the actual dynamics of an unfolding instability. For operating purposes, attention should shift toward direct physical measures and away from derived economic variables. Failing to make that shift means late intervention and less time to respond.

6.3 Publication and Its Pressures

Releasing operating information has governance consequences. Publication builds public confidence in the operator's internal governance. It can also put the operator in the spotlight in the middle of a crisis, which is why governance frameworks need to protect operating decisions from that pressure. Reliability decisions should be made for the security of the network, not to avoid bad publicity.

6.4 Integration and the Wide-Area View

Integrating information is its own challenge. The market system and the operating system each hold large amounts of purpose-built data. Awareness is about filtering, prioritizing and

processing that data so it is useful. More data does not help. What helps is separating signal from noise and focusing on derived information such as position, margin and trend.

Inside one organization, awareness may be manageable. Add neighboring systems, Transmission Owners and Reliability Coordinators, and it quickly becomes clear that no one has a complete view of a system facing a shared risk. Coordinated awareness of that risk requires information sharing that crosses market and organizational boundaries, with the context to interpret it.

6.5 Why This Grows More Important

Evolving system conditions raise the stakes. With more dynamic resource and load characteristics and tighter interdependencies, a small set of static indicators that once sufficed is no longer enough. Situational awareness has to become more dynamic and add new indicators, without giving up the classic reliability criteria.

Market information is incomplete for reliability purposes, and its value depends on the quality of the analysis behind it and on how much discretion the operator has to act on it. Operators have to supplement the market with direct knowledge of the grid. That operating mindset is what keeps the grid reliable regardless of what the market is doing.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Reliable performance in a market requires an operating perspective grounded in a real-time view of the system, not in market information. Market information supports accountability and coordination, but the decision to act for reliability usually rests on physical parameters, local knowledge and a small set of operating indicators. Preserving that perspective allows timely and secure management of the system in real time.

7 Real-Time Intervention and Out-of-Market Actions

7.1 Authority at Its Most Visible

Real-time intervention is the reliability authority at its most visible in an organized market. When margin approaches zero or goes negative, operators may take actions inconsistent with the market outcome to keep the grid stable. Those actions are not departures from the rules. They are part of a broader framework that weighs reliability against consistency with the market outcome.

An out-of-market action happens when the market does not have the time, the information or the committed capacity to manage a reliability risk. Poor weather forecasts, equipment failures and transmission constraints that the market processes did not fully capture can all trigger one. In those moments, waiting for the market to recalculate is too slow or too uncertain to stop security from deteriorating.

7.2 Where the Authority Comes From

The authority comes from reliability duties, not market rules. Entities performing Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator or Balancing Authority functions must act to maintain reliability under the Reliability Standards and their operating procedures, and that duty takes precedence over any market determination. FERC's RTO rule backs it on the market side: an RTO must have the right to order redispatch of any generator connected to transmission it operates when that is necessary for reliable operation. Whether the authority was exercised properly turns on whether the action was necessary under those duties.

7.3 What Operators Do

Common real-time actions include limiting transfers, shifting generation, calling on reserves, reconfiguring transmission and reducing real-time transaction volumes. The purpose is to protect operating margin, even when that changes the market outcome or the settlement. Real-time intervention manages the physical behavior of the grid during volatility. It is not a tool for correcting market outcomes.

7.4 Governance of Out-of-Market Actions

Out-of-market actions carry governance consequences. Because they move prices, generator revenues and consumer reaction, they are visible and draw attention. The rules around them cover disclosure of the basis for the action, documentation and post-event analysis, so that the action can be shown to have been needed for reliability and the triggering criteria can be shown to have been applied consistently. Those rules do not ask whether price stability was achieved.

An out-of-market action does not mean the market failed. A market is a tool for matching supply and demand under normal conditions, and no one can anticipate every occasion when action outside normal conditions will be needed. Intervention authority covers that unpredictability and gives reliability governance a tool it can count on. Interventions that happen regularly or continuously may mean market signals are not matching system behavior. Occasional intervention is normal for a reliable system.

7.5 How Intervention Shapes Behavior

The existence of intervention authority also shapes participant behavior. Knowing that operators will act when supply and demand need to be brought back into balance encourages participants to behave with more discipline and not to trade as though every resource will always be able to deliver at any time from anywhere. Disciplined participation means planning and operating consistently with reliability requirements.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Real-time intervention and out-of-market action are a core part of reliability governance in a market-based regime. They occur when market processes cannot handle an emerging system risk and rest on the authority given to reliability functions. They protect system security, set expectations for the behavior of resources and loads, and mark the limits of where market management operates.

8 System Restoration and Market Reentry After Disturbance

8.1 Restoration Runs on Reliability Authority

System restoration is the operating mode in which reliability authority is exercised with the least regard for market outcome. After a major disturbance, the goal is to restore supply safely and rebuild system stability in a structured way under the restoration plan. In a market environment, restoration shows most clearly how market influence stops and how market processes come back in a controlled way once the system is stable again.

During restoration, priorities are set by the physical state of the system and the repairs it needs. Blackstart capability, voltage control, synchronization of islands and the sequence of load pickup follow established restoration plans and direct operator communication. The standards assign those plans. EOP-005-3 requires each Transmission Operator to have a restoration plan approved by its Reliability Coordinator, including Blackstart Resources, Cranking Paths, acceptable voltage and frequency limits, and Operating Processes for transferring operations back to the Balancing Authority under the Reliability Coordinator's criteria. EOP-006-3 requires each Reliability Coordinator to have an area restoration plan with a high-level strategy for restoring the Interconnection and criteria for transferring operations and authority back to the Balancing Authority. Market schedules, prices and participant positions do not steer restoration until a reliable operating condition exists.

8.2 Why the Market Steps Back

Many people are surprised that the market effectively steps aside during restoration. Markets assume a grid that is observable, controllable and accessible. Those assumptions fail when the grid has suffered widespread outages or deterioration. Trying to enforce market rules while command is unclear and extreme caution is needed adds risk and ambiguity where none is necessary. Each RTO's tariff sets when markets are suspended and how they resume. In a large-scale restoration, the operating plan, not the market, sets the sequence.

As conditions improve, load and resources return to market operation gradually. There is a lag while the operator confirms that transmission is secure, communications are restored and there is enough operating margin for real-time coordination before the market is fully re-established.

8.3 Reconciliation After Reentry

Market reentry brings a second task: reconciling the market. Settlement deviations, uplift for the costs of reliability interventions, and settlements tied to load shedding and other adjustments are handled under specific procedures. That work happens after restoration is complete, through market processes and not through operating instructions.

8.4 Learning from Restoration

Restoration also serves institutional learning. Post-event evaluation covers the restoration plan, the interaction among entities and the criteria for suspending and reopening markets. The results improve emergency preparedness and response procedures in the market, while restoration itself stays outside market integration.

Restoration and reentry complete the picture of the reliability governance lifecycle in market environments. Markets operate in the stable, normal part of the operating domain. When normal conditions break down, control returns to reliability operations. A disciplined reentry once conditions are restored protects overall reliability, delivery security and the integrity of the regulatory structure.

End-of-Chapter Summary

In a large-scale restoration, the reliability functions restore the physical grid under the Transmission Operator and Reliability Coordinator restoration plans, and each RTO's tariff sets when the market is suspended and how it resumes. The market comes back only when reliable operating conditions are re-established.

9 Operational Risk Concentration and Market Dependency

9.1 Risk the Price Does Not Capture

Markets create forms of operational risk concentration that prices and schedules do not capture. Market operations spread economic risk across many participants, but they can also concentrate exposure to particular kinds of risk. Understanding those exposures and how they affect reliability under stress is important work.

9.2 Synchronization Risk

Call the first one synchronization risk: many resources aligned along the same timing, the same assumptions and the same expected reactions. At the margin, synchronized market schedules use every resource efficiently. When conditions turn volatile, synchronized systems amplify forecast errors and performance drops. A synchronized system lacks diversity of response to the same market event, and that diversity is exactly what a stable, optimized, efficient market tends to squeeze out.

9.3 Physical and Common-Infrastructure Concentration

Two other sources of concentration come from the assets and the systems that tie them together. One is physical concentration, which arises from the design and location of transmission and distribution systems. The other is reliance on common infrastructure and processes that market operation needs, including shared telecommunications, databases and operating systems. Damage to that common infrastructure can prevent effective coordination of available generation even when the transmission network has adequate capacity. Reliability governance has to extend beyond generation and transmission capability to the institutional and technical processes that make market coordination possible.

9.4 Model Dependence

Another exposure comes from dependence on modeled assumptions. The market outcome rests on assumptions about resource capability, network behavior and load response, and those assumptions are idealized so the problem can be solved. Because the degree of idealization is unknown and real behavior can depart from it substantially, a modest gap between actual and modeled behavior can put many decisions that were in step with the market out of step with the physical system. Preventing operating problems from those gaps is a core reliability role. The speed and scale of action needed can be as large as, or larger than, in more diverse operating regimes.

9.5 Incentives and Flexibility

Participant behavior also drives concentration. Market incentives tend to reward assuming normal conditions and can reduce the motivation to keep skills and capabilities that are needed only in rare events or are poorly rewarded. Market signals can correct some of that underpricing, but reliability governance should consider the chance that the market under-provides certain kinds of flexibility or resilience.

9.6 Margin as Inventory

Margin is where market dependence and system stress meet. Operating margin is an inventory of time and options to find out whether the assumptions behind a market scenario hold. Prices can signal very tight conditions, but no price substitutes for having enough physical and operating margin to prevent synchronized market response from causing a rapid loss of security.

Identifying and managing these concentrations does not make markets the problem. It means complementary measures are needed. Independent analysis, preserved operating capacity and regulatory intervention mechanisms address the interdependencies the market cannot diversify away. Efficient market coordination, often taken for granted as a basic economic achievement, brings greater dependency with it. Reliability governance has to manage the tension between that dependency and the need for diversity, redundancy and room for operating judgment.

> **End-of-Chapter Summary**
>
> Operational risk concentrates through synchronized market behavior, shared physical facilities and infrastructure, and modeling assumptions. When actual conditions depart from those assumptions, stress can concentrate quickly. Maintaining margin, diversity of response and reserve capacity keeps the system reliable and gives operators time to act when synchronized market behavior works against grid stability.

10 Human Decision Making and Institutional Discipline

10.1 Rules and People

Reliability in a market-based system depends on rules and people. Even with advanced automation and controls, operating decisions take more than efficient algorithms and decision trees. People stay in the loop for good reasons, not least for the moments when weather turns unpredictable or a severe event takes lines down. Understanding the human role explains why institutional discipline matters as much as the technology the grid is built on.

10.2 Where Judgment Lives

Much of market and operations work is automated and governed by procedure. Schedules clear, prices track market conditions and forecasts, and settlements run under rules designed to minimize human intervention. Reliability operations are different. They depend heavily on judgment: assessing the situation, gauging the degree of risk and timing preventive action. Fully automating the management of physical systems and their interaction with weather and climate extremes is very difficult.

Human judgment has strengths and weaknesses. A well-supported, experienced operator can read between the lines of the data, see that a change has broader consequences and slow down when the models look questionable. People also make mistakes from bias, fatigue and workplace pressure. Training, defined roles, sound procedures and built-in redundancy manage that risk better than relying on any one person's competence. The standards require the training to be systematic: PER-005-2 requires each Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority and Transmission Operator to build its System Operator training program from a list of company-specific Real-time reliability-related tasks and to evaluate the program every calendar year.

10.3 What Discipline Requires

Institutional discipline shapes how judgment is exercised in four ways. It sets clear authority relationships that allow immediate intervention to prevent a loss of reliability. It strikes a balance between procedural detail and room for technical judgment. It uses management structure to keep political and economic pressure out of operating reliability decisions. And it keeps people from anchoring on market outcomes.

That last point deserves attention. Market outcomes can become an anchor, with operators and others treating prices and schedules as a sign of security rather than a coordination tool. Discipline means reminding everyone, constantly, that market alignment is a condition of operation and always subordinate to security criteria.

10.4 Human Performance and Communication

The language people use affects how they perform. Clear communication under stress, situational awareness and defined escalation procedures prevent confusion and delay. Market vocabulary is not always adequate to describe operating risk. In my view, all operating risk communication should be framed in reliability terms rather than market terms.

10.5 Post-Event Review Without Fear

Post-event review is one of the main tools for keeping institutions disciplined. A review of decision making, communication effectiveness and adherence to authority boundaries should be used for improvement, not to criticize necessary and prudent caution. A reliability culture reinforces good behavior and does not leave operators afraid to act because of how the review will read.

Keep the human factor in view whenever market and reliability interact. Whatever structures and mechanisms are built for a reliable grid, it is people who act within them to prevent disruptions, failures and threats. Markets create rules. Reliability depends on people using judgment inside institutions that impose the caution needed to manage risk. No matter how sophisticated the market design, operators need the authority to act when risk is high, a clear scope for that authority, and encouragement to be cautious when the unforeseen becomes a real threat.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Human judgment is critical to reliable performance under market conditions. Automated market tools help coordinate the response to market events, but reliable performance still depends on the quality of human judgment exercised under the rules and oversight of a disciplined operating environment. Managing the human side of reliability risk takes sustained governance, training and learning.

11 Institutional Learning From Operational Experience

11.1 Experience as the Test

Operating experience is the most reliable way to learn how markets and reliability commitments actually behave in practice. System designs, modeling assumptions and regulatory frameworks express intentions. Experience shows how far the real system responds as intended and where it needs adjusting. To build lasting knowledge that improves operations, institutions have to keep market management functions and reliability authority clearly distinct.

11.2 Learning from Events, Not Only Outcomes

In reliability, learning comes from events, not only outcomes. Near misses, operator actions and disturbance response all carry knowledge that can change how utilities and markets manage risk. Those events need to be reviewed from both the operating and the market perspective, so the physical causes can be separated from the operating and market assumptions involved.

The ERO already runs a structure for this. The ERO Event Analysis Process exists so that industry and the ERO learn from events and develop corrective actions to prevent recurrence. It typically starts with an OE-417 or EOP-004 report, moves through brief reports and, when warranted, a full event analysis report, and ends with lessons learned shared with industry. It does not replace mandatory reporting. Event reporting today runs under EOP-004-4; EOP-004-5 takes effect October 1, 2027.

11.3 Reliability Review and Market Review

Operating performance after an event is reviewed as a reliability matter. The review covers the use of discretionary authority, the effectiveness of communication and the measures taken to keep the system secure. Market conditions and the outcome of the event provide context, but they do not decide whether the operating response was correct. That keeps the focus on what was appropriate and maintains public confidence in prudent operating practice.

Market analysis does not replace reliability analysis. Market monitoring asks whether scheduling decisions, incentives or the timing of actions contributed to the stress or constrained the response. That analysis is for understanding the event. Its results belong at the governance level. Operating decisions should not be changed on the strength of it, should not be second-guessed retroactively, and should not have economic constraints imposed on them after the fact.

11.4 Patterns Over Time

Institutional learning also depends on seeing patterns. Some unusual events turn out, with time, to be one-offs driven by a temporary factor. Recurring events tend to point to structural problems, and those only show up with a view that spans more than one season, more than one period of volatility or more than one system configuration. Markets produce plenty of observable trends, but the data has to be read in the reliability context, not only as a statistical exercise.

11.5 Turning Lessons into Change

Learning becomes change through formal change management. Changes to market rules, procedures or planning assumptions are worked through with affected stakeholders and regulators. That deliberate approach prevents overreaction to isolated events while still allowing change when the case for it is clear. Effective reliability governance balances stability with the ability to adapt.

Learning is not limited to formal events. Operator experience, informal observation and cross-functional discussion of system performance are all valuable sources. Governance that encourages information sharing and recognizes operating knowledge improves the ability to see a risk before it becomes a disturbance. Reliability improvement is incremental. It builds on experience more than on perfect insight from sophisticated analysis, and markets improve the same way. Markets are a valuable source of information, but when the system is stretched, it is the institutions that carry the learning.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Institutional learning from operating experience is critical to reliability in organized markets. Event analysis, pattern recognition and disciplined governance turn actual operating practice into real improvement. Markets supply data and context, but the learning is rooted in reliability performance and authority, not in market outcomes.

12 Operational Interfaces Between Market Administration and Reliability Roles

12.1 Interfaces, Not Shared Authority

Market administration and transmission reliability do not share authority. The interfaces between them define how information flows, how activities are sequenced and how decisions in one domain affect the other. For reliability to work as intended, those interfaces have to be well defined and have to discipline behavior, especially when the system is under extreme conditions.

12.2 Market to Reliability

Market administration reaches reliability through schedules, commitments and system data developed before real time. Those inputs support operational planning with forecasts of available resources, expected interchange and likely congestion. They are used for situational awareness and contingency planning. They do not approve or validate operating security.

12.3 Reliability to Market

Reliability reaches real-time market management through constraint detection and enforcement. When an operator finds that real-time conditions do not confirm the assumptions in the real-time market, the operator has to take reliability action to protect the system. That can mean changing the dispatch order, limiting transfers on certain lines or changing resource assignments. The operator then communicates those actions to the market system so they are reflected in real-time settlement and visible to participants. Reliability action comes first; economic settlement and validation follow.

The interface needs clear communication to avoid lost time and misunderstanding. Market staff need to understand that their role is to carry out the outcome of a process that runs within clearly defined rules. Reliability staff need to understand that the market outcome leans toward certain operating conditions but is not deterministic and carries no authority. Blurred interfaces lead to lost coordination under pressure.

12.4 Separate Measures of Performance

Interfaces also shape accountability. Performance in a reliability role is measured against Reliability Standards and operating criteria. Market administration is measured against the tariff and procedural correctness. A functionally defined interface makes sure accountability lands in

the right place and that economic and security performance are not measured with the same yardstick.

12.5 Formal Interfaces for a Faster System

As the system grows more complex, interface design matters more. Short cycle times, wide parameter ranges and tight operating windows all shrink the margin for error at the interface. Ad hoc, implicit or informal interfaces are usually not good enough under those conditions. Responsibilities between functions need to be separated deliberately and communicated formally to the people who build and maintain the interface.

The way the two sides talk also affects reliability. Both need accurate, timely information. Market communication tends to be heavy on market terms and economic framing. Reliability communication centers on margin, trend and exposure, not on schedules or price relationships.

12.6 Interfaces That Learn

Interfaces evolve with experience. Taking the same action again and again to handle a recurring constraint, or adjusting the same settlements repeatedly, suggests the interface needs to change. Those issues go through governance and do not require redefining individual roles. Adapting means improving the interface while keeping activities at different levels of authority separate.

Operational interfaces are not points of shared control. They are the defined places where the two functions meet. Market activity must not prejudge the operating rules that apply when the system is in difficulty, and reliability requirements stay as they are. Reliability is assured when these interfaces do not overlap, are governed by rules, and are continually informed by operating experience.

End-of-Chapter Summary

The interfaces between market operation and system operation are rules for exchanging information, delegating authority and relating accountabilities. Market outcomes support preventive planning; operating decisions secure the system in response, and economic reconciliation follows once security is preserved. Those interfaces have to be clarified and tightly governed, particularly as market operation grows more complex.

13 Limits of Automation and Algorithmic Decision Support

13.1 What Automation Does Well

Automation and algorithms run through modern markets and control systems, and they play an important part in market operation and system monitoring. Their role in reliability governance should not be overstated. Algorithms apply predetermined rules to large data sets quickly. They cannot replace the management of uncertainty, the assessment of unique or unforeseen situations, or the mitigation of system-level risk. As market operations move toward full automation, understanding those limits matters more.

Market operations are automated by nature. Scheduling engines, pricing algorithms and settlement systems apply large numbers of rules quickly and transparently. Market infrastructure exists to support scale, repeatability, and fair trading and price formation for thousands of participants. From a reliability perspective, automation brings rigid structure and great efficiency, but it typically assumes conditions that may not hold in exceptional or emergency situations.

13.2 Decision Support, Not Decision Makers

Reliability operations rely heavily on automated decision support: contingency analysis, alarm processing and predictive tools. They improve situational awareness by flagging impending violations and developing trends. They exist to help the operator decide. Even when they carry real weight in suggesting actions, the operator makes the decision. The operator has to validate or discount each recommendation based on an understanding of the situation and the reliability of the analysis, and may take actions the analysis did not suggest because the situation falls outside its scope.

13.3 Where Algorithms Fall Short

The limits show most clearly in unusual or low-probability events. Severe weather, multiple failures from shared subsystems, a cyberattack, a communications failure or an unexpected system interaction may not be anticipated in algorithm logic built on historical trends. If only automated decisions are made, the response can be delayed or wrong. Reliability governance ultimately depends on adequate operator intervention when unusual events occur.

Market conditions add to those limits. Optimizing for cost does not mean choosing the most conservative value when the modeled limits are uncertain. Even when optimization is constrained to modeled reliability limits, market products do not account for risk tolerance or the consequences of failure. The application of optimization techniques has to stay clearly separate from limits set by reliability engineering judgment.

13.4 Automation Changes Behavior

Automation also changes institutional behavior. The more capable the automation, the more people tend to treat its output as the true state of the system, and the less inclined they are to act on their own unease when the conditions that would trigger the tool have not been met. Reliability governance counters that through formal training, reinforced procedures and constant reminders to operators about their discretion.

Accountability adds another constraint. A computer algorithm cannot be solely responsible for a reliability outcome. Operators and their companies remain accountable for their decisions, with or without technology. That means automated tools have to be transparent, and operators cannot hand decision authority to a computer.

13.5 Designing for Graceful Failure

Knowing what can and cannot be automated is the basis of disciplined system design. Automation should provide visibility, reduce operator workload and enforce certain patterns of behavior, while leaving key judgments and authority with the human operator. Both market and reliability designs should fail gracefully: the operator keeps the option to override or set aside automated suggestions based on an assessment of current conditions.

Reliable performance in market environments has one thing in common across cases: a mix of tools, discretion and governance. Automation can improve coordination among the parts of the system. Human discretion, exercised within a clear institutional framework, is what makes performance reliable.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Automation and algorithmic tools support market coordination and improve operational awareness. They do not substitute for handling uncertainty and the unexpected. Human judgment, clear authority and accountability cannot be delegated to automation and have to be preserved so that automation does not become a bottleneck for reliability governance.

14 Market Timelines, Operational Cadence, and Reliability Exposure

14.1 Market Time and Physical Time

How time is structured in an organized market matters to reliability risk. Market time sets the rhythm of bidding, contracting, information exchange, scheduling, commitment, delivery and settlement. Reliability cannot run on that rhythm, because reliability problems do not arrive on market time. Managing reliability exposure is a continuous real-time balancing task that is not tied to market prices. Exposure that stays hidden under normal market conditions can surface when demand is high.

Market intervals are discrete. Day-ahead scheduling, intraday adjustment and real-time steps each rest on a snapshot of system state. Discrete intervals make it easier to coordinate market participants. They do not match the continuous nature of the power system. Load changes, outages, weather and shifting flows happen between market runs. Monitoring of margin and trajectory has to continue between them. The 30-minute Real-time Assessment cadence described in Section 2.2 runs whatever the market interval. When exposure to a violation develops quickly, following the market schedule may not be a prudent protection.

14.2 When Margins Tighten

The mismatch between discrete market intervals and continuous reliability assessment is sharpest as conditions tighten. As margins shrink, so does the time available for corrective action, and the next market update may lag behind events. That calls for judgment, and reliability governance has to recognize when the timing gap demands immediate action.

Preparation is also tied to market time. Market timelines govern when resources are committed and positioned, and that limits what can be done in real time. If commitments are locked a couple of hours before the operating period, it may be too late to change course when conditions shift. Operators also have to account for the inertia that earlier, time-bound preparation built into the system.

14.3 Settlement Follows Response

Settlement separates timing from authority. Economic reconciliation deals only with how transactions occurred under market rules. Reliability actions taken between market intervals, or while the market is not running, are reflected in final settlement through designated adjustments. Reliability can respond at any time; the market's economic accounting comes after.

14.4 Faster Markets Do Not Remove the Need

Markets keep refining their intervals and timelines to set a margin for error in real-time operation, adapt to grid conditions and match supply and demand more closely. To the extent those changes align wholesale prices with real-time conditions, they may succeed. They do not remove the need for real-time reliability assessment and forecasting. Temporal refinement of wholesale markets should be judged by how much it reduces exposure, not by whether it stabilizes prices.

The pace of change on the system is increasing, and time matters more. Faster load variability, tighter margins and more interdependency all reduce the room for error and magnify small delays. The speed of the market should not become the measure of when a system is ready or when its security has been verified. Market timeframes can serve as a benchmark for some aspects of reliability, but reliability keeps its own clock.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Market operations run on discrete intervals for coordination. Reliability and the response to uncertainty run continuously. The gap between market intervals and reliability timeframes creates a window of exposure, especially in volatile periods. Reliability holds when operators identify the effects of that gap and exercise operating authority from a real-time understanding of conditions, not from schedule-based market timing.

15 Market Dependency During Prolonged Stress Conditions

15.1 Sustained Stress Is Different

Sustained stress poses its own challenges for the relationship between markets and reliability. Short bursts of high prices, tight margins or constrained resources can be handled through real-time response. Prolonged adverse conditions test assumptions about market dependence over time and about how operators handle persistent gaps between forecast and actual performance.

Market dependence grows as stress rises. Market-based scheduling, contracts and price incentives typically work well across hours or days of operation. As stress builds, reliability and market management have to judge when reliance on the market is shifting from a support to a constraint.

15.2 Reserves and Fatigue

Extended stress erodes the ability to rebuild operating reserves. Reserves that are used may not fully recover between cycles, and resource performance can start to decline. Scarcity prices may keep signaling through the market, but prices alone do not restore reserves, so operators have to account for the added risk of a long stress period.

Operator fatigue adds stress of its own. People working long stretches without rest communicate and perform less effectively, and the institutional discipline needed to work safely suffers. Market alignment does not account for fatigue, yet it materially affects reliability performance. Controls such as shift rotation, escalation and a deliberately conservative posture help limit its effect on individual and group decisions.

15.3 Neighbors Under Stress Too

Prolonged stress also exposes dependencies between systems and regions, as Section 16.4 describes.

15.4 Governance in a Long Event

Governance has to adapt in a prolonged event. Repeated interventions or persistent deviations from desired voltage and loading conditions will draw the attention of senior management and, potentially, enforcement. Operators should resist declaring conditions normal before degraded facilities have actually recovered. A documented basis for operating decisions supports the authority behind them and gives the risk justification that keeps conservative practice in place.

Learning from prolonged stress is different from learning from isolated events. Over days and weeks, patterns, relationships and assumptions emerge that a single event would hide. The

market can shed light on prolonged stress, but its signals should be judged in reliability terms, not economic ones.

Understanding market dependence under sustained stress, and learning to manage margin, diversity and discretion through it, is increasingly important. Markets support coordinated activity under normal conditions. When stress is extended and conditions diverge from what the market assumes, reliance on the market has to be actively managed. Reliability depends on recognizing that shift and adjusting the institutional posture to match.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Prolonged stress increases market dependence and tests the assumptions in coordination mechanisms. When gaps between assumed and actual conditions persist, reliability planning has to be highly conservative to account for accumulated stress, fatigue and shrinking outside support. Operators need to recognize when dependence on the market has become critical and sustain countermeasures for the full duration of the event.

16 Seams, Interactions, and Reliability Across Market Boundaries

16.1 Boundaries the Physics Ignores

Market operations and reliability functions mainly address issues within a region, but power flows, shared contingencies and external disturbances do not respect regional boundaries. They can directly affect neighboring regions, market and non-market alike. Seams are the interfaces where different functions and systems have to coordinate for the grid to operate reliably.

A market boundary is an administrative line drawn over a continuous physical network. Transactions in one market area affect real-time conditions in neighboring areas, sometimes unpredictably. Reliability planners therefore have to account for conditions outside their market boundary, especially in stress periods when inter-area relationships intensify.

16.2 What Makes Seams Hard

Seams problems come from differences in timing, scheduling conventions and the handling of interchange. They are mostly about aligning different views of what is changing and how each entity should respond. Protocols and agreements define how the interfaces between organizations should behave, but the work is mainly communication and situational awareness, not market synchronization.

16.3 Coordination by Functional Authority

Reliability coordination across seams rests on functional authority, not market harmonization. Reliability Coordinators share operating data, analyze mutual reliability risks and coordinate actions to prevent or mitigate limit violations. IRO-014-3 makes that explicit. Each Reliability Coordinator must have Operating Procedures, Processes or Plans for activities that require notification or coordination with adjacent Reliability Coordinator Areas, covering at minimum notification criteria, energy and capacity shortages, voltage and reactive coordination, outage information exchange and periodic communications. A Reliability Coordinator that identifies an expected or actual Emergency must notify the other impacted Reliability Coordinators. When Reliability Coordinators disagree on whether an Emergency exists, each impacted Reliability Coordinator must operate as though it does. On the market side, FERC's RTO rule requires an RTO to integrate reliability practices within an interconnection and market interface practices among regions.

These actions run independently of market price formation. They may change interchange schedules or the megawatts scheduled for delivery under a neighboring market's rules. They rest on reliability responsibility, not market equilibrium.

16.4 When Neighbors Converge

Seams stress grows as stress events become more frequent and last longer in some areas. As conditions converge, the diversity of mutual support shrinks. Plans that assume imports will be there at peak may find, under widespread stress, that they are scarce or gone everywhere at once. Transfers that were cheap and sensible in normal times can become a serious operating risk under stress, and the reliability assessment has to account for that rather than relying on static interchange assumptions.

16.5 Accountability Across Seams

When reliability actions affect transactions that cross into several regions, accountability has to be worked out in each region according to the functional role of each entity involved. Market effects may land unevenly, but reliability accountability still rests on the authority each entity exercised within its defined role. Clear seams agreements prevent disputes and support coordinated action.

Learning from seams problems takes an interregional approach. After an event, the review should ask how coordination mechanisms performed across the interconnection, whether information crossed boundaries in time and where control actions were effective. Market studies can help answer those questions, but only as they bear on reliability performance, not on market balance or economic symmetry.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Reliability between markets depends on careful seams management so that administrative boundaries drawn on a continuous physical system do not undermine the discipline needed to coordinate across them. Differences between markets make synchronization hard, but reliability authority, and the systems that support it, enforce coordinated response through cross-region communication and a shared understanding of risk. Good seams management affirms that reliable supply to every market is the overriding consideration.

17 Reliability Accountability in Market Operating Environments

17.1 Markets Do Not Reassign Accountability

Accountability for reliable operation does not change with the arrival of markets, and economic controls do not dilute it. Market operation leaves the original assignment of reliability responsibilities intact. In organized markets, accountability matters both for assessing reliability performance and for the institutional legitimacy of the sector.

Reliability accountability comes from rules and from the obligations those rules place on the entities that perform the covered functions. Section 215 of the Federal Power Act requires every user, owner and operator of the bulk-power system to comply with the Reliability Standards that take effect under it. Those obligations apply at all times, including when demand is low, when market outcomes sit inside price limits and when trading behavior is benign. Market circumstances do not replace the rules as the basis for accountability. They coexist with the rules, and the rules remain the basis for compliance monitoring and enforcement.

17.2 Complexity Can Obscure Responsibility

Markets add institutional complexity, with many organizations involved in transactions through layered agreements, purchases and administrative actions. That complexity can obscure accountability. Reliability governance has ways to remove the ambiguity: it identifies which entities were in charge and the criteria that should support the actions they took while they had authority over the system. How the market behaved is not the test.

17.3 Accountability in Intervention

Operational accountability is most visible during intervention. When operators act to keep the system within security limits, the Reliability Standards, developed by NERC and approved by FERC, set the criteria for those actions, together with the entity's operating procedures. Market implications are considered but are secondary to the reliability and security checks that decide whether an operator's decision was appropriate. That is what keeps confidence in operator and management decisions system-wide.

17.4 Market Responsibility and Reliability Responsibility

The market structure also creates market responsibility for non-operating roles. Market administrators must follow the tariff, market transparency requirements and the other rules of their market. Market participants must follow the participation and performance rules of the market design. None of that changes the reliability accountability of an entity registered for a reliability function.

Oversight institutions keep accountability clear. NERC and the Regional Entities monitor and enforce compliance with the Reliability Standards. FERC and the market monitors watch market behavior and enforce market rules. Keeping those functions separate prevents market economics from being confused with reliability performance and keeps governance proportionate when an incident touches both.

17.5 Public Attention and Long-Run Behavior

Public interpretation of market events can complicate things. Large price moves draw coverage and prompt reasonable questions about who or what caused them. That attention cannot be allowed to intrude on the role of reliability as the governing principle in operating the system. Lines of authority and jurisdiction need to be communicated in a way that does not confuse the attribution or interpretation of market events.

Accountability also shapes how institutions behave over time. When reliability responsibility is clearly assigned and enforced, it discourages reckless behavior and encourages caution. When it is unclear, people hesitate to act and risk gets passed along. Efficient organized markets have to make each participant's accountability clearer, not hide it.

Accountabilities for reliability continue to rest with designated responsible entities and with standards, metrics and monitoring. That is essential to reliable grid operation, effective market governance and public confidence in a market-based system.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Reliability accountability in a market environment stays rooted in functional responsibilities and standards. Markets do not automatically reallocate accountability; market responsibilities run in parallel with reliability obligations. Clearly defined lines of authority and control are necessary to maintain reliability, support risk-averse behavior and legitimize the actions entities take.

18 Market Signals as Indicators Rather Than Determinants of Reliability

18.1 What a Price Is

Market signals play a major role in organized electric systems, but their reliability implications are often misunderstood. Prices, schedules and reserve demand curves are frequently read as a measure of system reliability or availability. From a reliability perspective, market signals carry information about the state of the system and the incentives facing producers and consumers. They do not, by themselves, determine reliability performance.

A market price is a byproduct of the optimization that solves the security-constrained unit commitment and economic dispatch problems with their parameters. It conveys the relative scarcity of supply and how binding the constraints are at a given time and place. Prices are very useful indicators of stress, congestion or shortage. They are not a formal or authoritative measure of system security. Security has to be determined directly from operating limits, margins and actual contingency exposure, which cannot be captured in economic terms alone.

18.2 Price and Margin Are Not the Same Thing

As conditions tighten, the difference between indicating margin and determining it becomes critical. A rising price does not always mean margin is shrinking, and not every reliability risk shows up as a price increase. Some risks produce little or no price response, such as a structural, local or off-peak risk the models did not capture. High prices do not always mean low reliability either; the system can carry substantial margin while prices are high. Relying on market prices to make reliability decisions is not wise.

Market indicators also look backward and over intervals. At the moment of exchange or settlement, they reflect conditions at that instant. Reliability assessment has to look forward along the trajectory, at how fast margin is eroding and how the system would respond to the next disturbance. That difference in time frame is another reason market information cannot replace real-time operating analysis.

18.3 Signals in Planning and Governance

In planning and governance, market signals point to where to look. Persistent price patterns may indicate constraints or surplus capacity worth investigating. Reliability decisions drawn from that analysis still have to be confirmed by detailed engineering and probabilistic assessment. Market signals can show where challenges may exist. They cannot confirm that the Reliability Standards have been met.

Using market indicators to assign accountability causes problems. If market outcomes become the measure of reliability, responsibility for a facility's security is decided by market outcome rather than by whether the entity can show it acted properly. That blurs operating authority and the clarity of action it needs. Reliability governance treats market indicators as a way to read conditions, not as the trigger for deciding whether to act.

18.4 How to Talk About It

Communication has to reflect the difference between normal and stressed conditions. Describing the state of the system in price terms during stress can distract from what matters operationally and can mislead customers. In reliability communication, margin, limits and exposure come before price movement. Market conditions can be mentioned, but only for context.

Treating market signals as indicators rather than determinants imposes discipline on how market mechanisms and reliability functions interact. Market mechanisms supply information and analysis to support decisions, and their role should not be inflated. Excessive reliance on markets can erode the authority reliability and stability require. Keeping signals in their place preserves both the operating and the regulatory effectiveness of a market-based approach.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Market signals show system conditions but do not determine reliability. Prices and schedules rest on a model of scarcity and constraint, and whether they reflect actual reliability conditions is a judgment that has to be made directly from real-time operating limits, margin and trajectory. Treating market signals as context keeps authority clear and supports a disciplined reliability determination.

19 Executive Oversight of Market Operations and Reliability Performance

19.1 The Executive's Role

Executive oversight sits where market operation and system reliability meet. Executives are not involved in operating detail or day-to-day market activity. Their job is to make sure the organization's structure, processes and accountability mechanisms work so that reliability and market coordination can coexist. The role is about maintaining the preconditions for reliable operation and coordinated market activity, not about steering real-time operations or daily market developments.

19.2 Two Different Views

Market oversight and reliability oversight look at different things. Market performance oversight looks at adherence to market rules, transparency of data and communications, timely and accurate settlement, and the behavior of producers and consumers. Reliability performance oversight looks at adherence to operating limits, the outcome of disturbance events and compliance with the Reliability Standards. The two views are distinct, and even where they overlap, executives need to keep both perspectives in mind.

19.3 Resisting Outcome-Driven Judgment

A central oversight challenge is resisting the temptation to treat price spikes, extreme volatility or government intervention as the main event. Those outcomes can distract from the real question, which is whether reliable operations failed or succeeded. Executives need to stay focused on the core issues: the integrity of operating processes, the appropriate use of operating discretion and the preservation of accountability during turbulent periods.

19.4 Protecting Boundaries and Framing

Protecting boundaries is part of executive oversight. After a market problem, there is pressure to fix it fast, and market activity can overreach. Executives should protect the boundaries between planning, operations and market activities so that responsibilities do not diffuse and the accountability standards that apply to operations stay intact.

Framing matters too. Executives often act as the bridge between operating reliability performance and the outside world of board members, regulators and policymakers. Framing reliability only in terms of economic cost can lead to the wrong conclusions. Good oversight

frames that communication around reliability criteria, margins and risk trends, not price behavior alone.

19.5 Long-Term Risk and Culture

Long-term risk management is a core executive responsibility. Executives have to judge whether a persistent condition signals a lasting strategic mismatch or a temporary response to an external or internal shock. To do that, they draw on planning work, lessons from operating experience and their reading of market developments. None of these carries enough weight alone. Longer-term decisions about demand trends, investment needs and reform options all depend on an integrated view of the circumstances facing the organization.

Board oversight extends to culture. Executives largely decide whether reliability judgment is conservative, whether intervention is seen as an acceptable effort to keep operations safe or as a failure, and whether the organization learns or blames. Culture shapes behavior under pressure as much as the rules do.

Executive oversight ultimately secures the durability of the market and reliability system. Those arrangements have to outlast single events, leadership changes and policy initiatives. Building institutional health that keeps the focus on long-term market and reliability outcomes rather than near-term events and metrics is a central part of effective oversight. A durable system keeps markets working as effective price-coordinating institutions within a framework of standards.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Executive oversight of market operations and reliability performance provides institutional consistency. Effective oversight keeps roles separate, avoids confusing outcomes with individual responsibility, secures an accurate understanding of events and conditions, and upholds disciplined reliability judgment. Market-based arrangements last only as long as oversight stays focused on institutional factors rather than outcomes.

20 Operational Resilience Beyond Market Design

20.1 Resilience Is Operational

Operational resilience is the grid's ability to absorb and manage a wide range of disturbances, recover affected components and keep reliability performance within acceptable bounds. In organized markets, resilience is sometimes discussed as a matter of market incentives or products. Within the reliability framework, it is an operating, procedural, institutional and governance practice.

Markets contribute to resilience, but indirectly. They influence the availability of resources and signal scarcity, which only marginally affects the physical or operating side of resilience. Resilience is not created by markets. It is determined by how much margin the system has, how diverse it is, how much redundancy it carries and how well it can reorganize under stress. Those are set by more direct and tangible means: forward planning, investment in physical assets and systems, and building operating reserves.

20.2 Flexibility the Market Does Not Value

The flexibility that supports operational resilience is not usually recognized or valued in market frameworks. Deciding which lines to switch in response to unexpected events, holding back from using full transfer capability to keep headroom, and keeping enough flexible resources available for an event are all operating decisions based on engineering judgment, not market economics.

20.3 Institutional Readiness

Institutional readiness is just as necessary. Restoration plans, emergency procedures, mutual assistance agreements and communication protocols all have to be in place to prepare for, carry out and manage an event. Wholesale market design assumes adequate institutional and infrastructure support. Resilience requires preparation for institutional stress as well as for infrastructure and facility stress. Reliability governance therefore covers preparation during quiet periods, so the system is ready when it is really needed.

20.4 Resilience Has a Price

Many in the industry treat resilience and efficiency as opposites. Markets can handle some of the cost of holding back generation for high demand or for uncertainty through settlement adjustments and uplift. That does not make the case for resilience an economic one. Reliability is always the primary objective, and resilience costs money.

20.5 Learning and the Limits of Market Design

Resilience and learning reinforce each other. Each disruption or near miss is a chance to look at how the system behaved: how it absorbed the disturbance, where it adapted or failed to adapt, and how the market performed during the period. Market data will show the consequences of how trades were actually coordinated. A resilience assessment asks a different question: whether the system kept control during the disruption and recovered quickly. Governance processes use what is learned to choose the best improvements, and those may include changes to market design.

Over-emphasizing market design as the route to resilience neglects other parts of the system and can weaken them. Adjusting market rules can improve how supply and demand respond to what the system needs. It is no substitute for investment in networks, personnel training and the preparedness of companies and institutions. Resilience comes from the right mix of measures across the whole system.

Operational resilience is not the same as market performance, a theme that runs through the rest of this reference. Wholesale markets are an important coordination mechanism, but only one part of a broader reliability system. Truly resilient systems need strong links and redundancy across every component, including those that operate outside market constraints.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Operational resilience in markets goes beyond market design. It includes margin, flexibility, institutional preparedness and a conservatively built degree of operating autonomy. Markets support coordination but do not ensure resilience by themselves. Performance under stress depends on whether the system was prepared, whether it is flexible enough, and whether its governance maintains security even when optimal market performance cannot be guaranteed.

21 Sustaining Reliability Culture in Market Operating Organizations

21.1 Culture Has to Be Maintained

Reliability culture is the shared set of assumptions, values and behaviors that guide operators when they face challenges or conflicts in managing the delivery system, including keeping the grid reliable while serving peak heating and cooling demand. In a market-based system, that culture is neither guaranteed nor automatic. It has to be reinforced actively and regularly, and operators need constant reminders of the priority of reliability when it competes with other operating considerations.

21.2 The Pull of Market Incentives

Market forces create strong incentives that can shape operating behavior. Timing, payment terms and reward structures can focus attention on commercial priorities, procedural box-checking and external image. Only deliberate cultural reinforcement counteracts those effects. Without it, two things can quickly become normal: a non-conservative approach to disputed operating conditions, and reluctance to intervene when a plant is technically within limits but the situation is commercially or operationally uncomfortable. Reliability culture is what prevents that drift.

A strong reliability culture shows up at every level of the organization. Market position is not the primary driver of performance. It is an operating parameter that can be adjusted when reliability requires it. Policies have to be clear, and actions have to be evaluated and corrected in a way that affirms the priority of reliability. The culture grows stronger when management does not question reliability actions on market grounds.

21.3 Leadership

Leadership behavior is a decisive factor. What leaders ask for, tolerate and reward determines how their people act and how the company performs. Market-oriented companies need leaders who consistently enforce the rules and practices for secure operation and who make grid and supply stability a condition of economic success, not the other way around, even when the system is in trouble. Indecision or vague guidance in tense moments can easily be read by staff as an instruction to hold market equilibrium at any cost, and that undermines leadership.

21.4 Training and Drills

Training and experience form the base of the culture. Operating staff, engineers and commercial staff should be trained for situations where reliability and the market point in different directions, and they should practice acting when they diverge. Simulation, drills and cross-functional training build confidence among operators, commercial staff and management

that operations will intervene when reliability limits are approached or reached, regardless of the spot price. PER-005-2 R4 requires each Reliability Coordinator, Balancing Authority, Transmission Operator and Transmission Owner with operational authority or control over Facilities with established IROLs, or with protection systems or operating guides to mitigate IROL violations, to provide emergency operations training using simulation technology that replicates the operational behavior of the BES.

21.5 Language and Review

Operating interfaces also shape culture. The vocabulary used when market and reliability functions communicate matters. Talking about margin, exposure and trajectory keeps people thinking about reliability. Talking about prices, settlements or participant impact keeps them thinking about market equilibrium and suggests that security decisions are commercial transactions. Disciplined communication protects the culture.

Post-event review matters just as much. A review that asks whether authority was exercised at the right time and with enough caution reinforces reliability culture. A review focused on the commercial consequences of the intervention, or on how outsiders reacted, is deeply discouraging for operating staff. Review should be designed to reinforce reliable operation, not undermine it.

21.6 Keeping the Link

Sustaining the culture over time is hard in a changing system. New technology, workforce turnover and growing automation between the operator and the process can weaken the link between actions and their consequences. Reliability culture maintains that link and anchors decision making in accountability rather than in technology or the market. It has to be continuous, reinforced by leaders, governance structures, learning and accountability, in an environment where economic coordination is both necessary and highly visible.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Maintaining reliability culture in a market organization takes deliberate, ongoing action to keep the importance of system security in front of every employee. Leadership behavior, training, communication discipline and lessons learned after events all determine whether the organization supports or hinders the reliability operations the system may need. Above all, authority has to be exercised in time to resolve conflicts between market outcomes and security.

22 Market Operations as Inputs to Reliability Planning and Assessment

22.1 Inputs, Not Determinants

Market operations data is one of the sources reliability planning and assessment draw on. Market operation does not decide the outcome. Planners use historical schedules, prices, commitment levels and resource performance from the market, but only as a guide, combined with system knowledge and standards-based risk criteria.

Planning assessments look ahead and focus on consequences. They test whether the system can meet expected load and additional stress across a range of contingencies. Market outcomes help planners understand usage patterns, how long congestion persists and the likely effect of system actions. They are not the basis for setting adequacy or security margins. The reliability criteria used in planning, deterministic or probabilistic, are independent of market conditions.

22.2 Reading Market Stress

Market data is valuable for trend analysis. Persistent congestion, scarcity conditions or a recurring need to intervene, for example during heat waves or droughts, all point to something affecting the grid. That might be transmission capability, resource capability or operating practice. Market stress indicators alone do not establish a reliability problem. When planners analyze them, the analysis has to be tied to risk as defined by reliability criteria, not treated only as an economic question.

22.3 Updating Planning Assumptions

Actual market performance is also used to update planning model assumptions, including availability, ramp rates, outage correlation and response to stress. Grounding those assumptions in actual performance instead of static values improves the credibility of planning. It also guards against using market events that had other causes to validate, or weaken, conservative reliability assumptions.

22.4 Keeping Price Out of the Decision

Market pricing and reliability decisions have to stay separate. If market outcomes decide whether supply is adequate or the grid is secure, reliability needs get determined reactively, by outcome. Reliable operation requires judgment that weighs market pricing and outcomes alongside all other relevant information. Prices reflect exposure under existing conditions. They do not identify underlying needs.

Timing is another difference. Market operations deal with current, short-term coordination; planning assessments look several years to decades ahead. Short-term success does not prove long-term adequacy, and short-term stress does not prove a future capacity shortfall. Reliability assessments have to place market information in its proper time frame.

22.5 Translating Market Information

Bringing market information into planning forums takes institutional discipline. It has to be translated into terms that matter for reliability analysis, such as margin and exposure. Economic framing can obscure the link to planning and sometimes overstate the information's significance. The aim is to keep the analysis objective without letting planning and operations drift apart.

Reliability analysis should treat market functioning as an input, not a driver. Visible market operation shows how the system coordinates under current market conditions. From that, the planner can test hypotheses, study potential risks and decide how much and what kind of resources, systems or operating reserves to pre-position against the risk of unserved energy, without handing decision authority to price signals.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Market operations give reliability planning and assessment real insight into how markets behave, including actual load and resource patterns and stress levels. That information is valuable but does not determine reliability conclusions. It is one input, used with established reliability criteria and engineering judgment, to support proactive reliability management.

23 Regulatory Oversight of Market Operations Affecting Reliability

23.1 External Discipline

Regulatory oversight applies external discipline to market activity that may affect reliability. In an organized market, that discipline does not act on real-time operation or on trading outcomes. It works after the fact: it sets the rules, reviews compliance and enforces sanctions. That structure underlines the distinction between market operation and reliability management.

23.2 Market Oversight

Oversight of market operation runs through tariff approvals, rule changes and enforcement. Rules that affect resource availability, dispatch order and response need careful review to confirm they are consistent with the statute and with reliability needs. The review asks whether the rules support coordination reasonably and without intrusion, without impeding operating freedom, while the Reliability Standards continue to be met. Within the RTO, the market monitor does part of this work. FERC's rule requires objective monitoring of the markets an RTO operates to identify design flaws, market power abuse and efficiency opportunities. The Market Monitoring Unit must identify and notify FERC's Office of Enforcement of behavior that may require investigation, including suspected Market Violations.

23.3 Reliability Oversight

Reliability oversight runs in parallel and independently of market analysis. It applies two tests: did the registered entity comply with the applicable Reliability Standards, and were the actions of its reliability personnel within their authority and performed to accepted practice. FERC relies on the NERC and Regional Entity compliance monitoring and enforcement processes to answer those questions, and an ERO penalty takes effect only after notice to the Commission and is subject to its review. Market analysis may provide context about the conditions during the period under review. It does not change the standard against which reliability performance is measured.

23.4 Policing the Boundary

Boundary policing is a central regulatory activity. When market design proposals attribute reliability outcomes to market or economic developments, the regulatory process should test those claims. When reliability-related actions affect market outcomes, regulators need to confirm that any discretion was exercised within the boundaries that have been set. Boundary policing removes uncertainty about the limits of action and prevents regulatory drift.

23.5 Recurring Misalignment and Transparency

Oversight also deals with recurring misalignment. Frequent use of emergency measures, repeated exposure to stressed conditions and observed instability can prompt regulators to ask whether market rules need to change to better reflect system realities. That does not imply wrongdoing. It recognizes that rules, redundancy or disclosure may need to change to address the cause. Reliable grid governance reviews developments systematically rather than reacting to events one at a time.

Transparency is at the center of effective oversight. Published data, reports, market monitoring analyses and reliability assessments serve as evidence in the Commission's evaluation. With that evidence, the Commission can tell whether the volatility and risk inherent in energy systems are normal and manageable or a sign of a weakness in some part of the system. Market information matters, but it has to be read in light of regulatory and reliability conditions.

23.6 Restraint

Oversight covers both market design and market regulation, and restraint matters as much as either. Trying to fine-tune real-time reliability outcomes through economic means can erode the operating authority and accountability of the entities that run the system. Oversight is about making sure institutions work as intended, not second-guessing their actions after the fact. That restraint is fundamental to strong reliability governance.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Rules, monitoring and enforcement address events that have already occurred. They are a backstop that keeps operating responsibilities and market rules in place in a way that supports reliability. They reinforce the separation between market and operating responsibility and keep market activity from becoming operational in nature. Their purpose is to strengthen long-term reliability, transparency and participant accountability. They do not provide real-time control of the system; they reinforce its durability.

24 Integrated View of Market Operations and Reliability Risk Management

24.1 Risk Is Managed by Interaction

Reliability risk management in organized markets is not done by one entity or one mechanism. It comes from the interaction of market, operations, planning and regulatory functions. Each handles a different part of the risk, and reliability is the result of their interaction, not of consolidating them.

24.2 Market, Operations, Planning, Oversight

Markets manage some of the risk that comes from decentralized decisions. Price schedules, binding commitments and shared assumptions induce coordinated action that helps avoid infeasible or unstable outcomes. Markets lower the baseline risk. They do not eliminate the exposures above that baseline that come from uncertainty and dependency.

Operations manage security risk in real time: margin, trajectory and contingency exposure. Real-time management of security limits lets operating authority act when margin falls below the minimum, when a constraint pushes the system off its expected trajectory, or when committing a contingency resource leaves exposure beyond acceptable limits. Advance coordination should head off many of those risks, but some will always be too dynamic or unpredictable to manage beforehand.

Planning manages structural risk. Long-term assessment asks whether the system's design, resource characteristics and operating practices will cope with possible future conditions. The market informs that assessment, but the assessment itself rests on reliability criteria that are independent of market signals. Managing structural risk ensures the physical capability exists for adequate coordination and operating control.

Oversight manages institutional risk. Regulatory and reliability oversight preserves roles, scope of authority and processes. Oversight does not remove risk. It makes sure risk is identified and managed, and not hidden behind poorly defined institutional arrangements and misaligned incentives.

24.3 Aligned, Not Identical

Integration requires these functions to be aligned, not identical. They have different objectives, time horizons and accountabilities. Forcing uniformity across them overloads individual mechanisms and loses accountability. Good reliability governance recognizes the need for specialization while achieving integration.

24.4 When the Facade Cracks

Under stress, risk management that exists only on paper is quickly exposed. Coordination can be assumed until it cannot, and then operating authority has to act on its own. System dynamics can be handled within the normal framework until they cannot, and then planning has to address the structural problems that have suddenly surfaced. Repeated gaps between intention and performance should tell governance that something needs to change. Too often, the response looks inward, adjusting management practices instead of addressing underlying design or governance issues. Markets bring the dynamics in each domain to light, but they cannot replace any of them.

24.5 What the Integrated View Shows

An integrated view explains why reliability performance is not a direct measure of market success or failure. Reliable grid performance can hold through most market periods even when the market faces serious challenges, and heavy market activity can occur with no adverse effect on reliability. Reliability analysis should therefore ask whether each risk management action was performed as intended and whether the interactions among them stayed orderly.

That brings this reference back to its central point. Markets are coordination tools. Responsibility for risk management is shared among several entities in an architecture designed to deliver reliability, and that architecture depends on defined boundaries and complementary roles.

> **End-of-Chapter Summary**
>
> Reliability risk management in market operations comes from the interaction of wholesale markets, operating authority, planning assessment and governance. Each manages a different dimension of risk, and reliability results from their interaction, not from consolidating them. Markets coordinate, but they cannot replace the integration across risk management functions that secures long-term reliability.

25 Future System Conditions and Operational Reliability Implications

25.1 More Variability, Smaller Margins

The future system will present new challenges to market and reliability operations and to the way the two interact. Changes in resources, loads, weather and interchange will affect how markets work and how reliability risk shows up in real time. Understanding those effects is necessary to keep operations reliable without redefining what each function does.

Greater variability will define the operating environment. Supply and demand are likely to change faster and less predictably than in the past. Market systems manage variability through scheduling, operating and reserve capacity and real-time synchronization. But variability shrinks operating margin and decision windows. Reliability operators will have to manage the state and rate of change of supply and demand, not just a static balance. Exposure to assumption error grows as the gap between design values and normal operating ranges narrows. The market can stay in equilibrium while the operating risk of the system rises. Confidence that the market is synchronized does not translate into confidence in security under unusual conditions.

25.2 Interdependence

Interdependence among regions is likely to grow. Shared weather exposure, correlated resource performance and heavier interchange all reduce the historical diversity that supported regional resilience. Markets express those interdependencies through prices, but reliability assessments have to consider their real operating consequences. Simultaneous stress across regions also tests the assumption of regional support that underpins market and planning frameworks.

25.3 Automation and Judgment

The balance between automation and human judgment will shift as well. More complex systems will need more advanced decision support, yet uncertainty and novelty will remain. The reliability authority must be able to err on the side of caution when automated tools give the all-clear on questionable conditions. The market cannot set that balance. It has to be set through policy, governance and training.

25.4 Policy-Driven Change

Policy-driven change adds complexity. Policy-driven additions and retirements of generation may not be directly visible in market signals and can change system behavior in unintended ways. Reliability tools will have to adapt to those realities while neutral market signals continue to coordinate participation. Preserving the principle of institutional separation, long central to electric industry governance, matters more than ever.

25.5 Discipline Over Revolution

The future system will look very different. Markets will not disappear because the system becomes more dynamic and complex. If anything, they matter more in the conditions complexity creates. Markets coordinate in different ways in different circumstances, from stability to adaptability. Market-based coordination was originally built for stability under relatively predictable conditions. The open question is how reliability governance, and the confidence it rests on, will adjust if institutions recognize and act on the different kind of market coordination that rising complexity requires.

Even with rising uncertainty, preparing for the future is a matter of discipline, not revolution. Markets need to keep delivering coordination. The reliability authority must be able to act independently. Planning has to anticipate future developments without overestimating trends. Oversight draws the boundaries and leaves room to move within them. Reliability holds when each organization acts flexibly within its own field of responsibility and does not overstep into another's.

End-of-Chapter Summary

Greater complexity and variability in the future grid will make the interaction between market operations and reliability functions more dynamic. Markets will still coordinate, but reliability governance will have to accommodate smaller margins for error and faster action. Reliability will be maintained through the steady evolution of existing institutions and rules.

26 Enduring Principles for Market Operations and System Reliability

26.1 Principles That Outlast Design Changes

Despite rapid change in technology, policy and market design, a fixed set of underlying relationships continues to govern how markets and reliability interact. They are not products, timeframes or rules. They are more fundamental: the consequences of running a very large system subject to great volatility, in which thousands of independent parties have to act coherently to deliver reliable supply.

26.2 Physical Limits Come First

The first enduring principle is the precedence of physical system limits. The behavior of the electrical system is governed by physical laws that do not bend to economic or management considerations. Any market or economic design has to recognize those laws and the system limits they produce. Every control and management approach has to accommodate them. The reliability authority's role is to keep physical limits from being violated when market-based approaches to operation fall short.

26.3 Authority Under Uncertainty

The second is authority under uncertainty. No amount of planning or forecasting can eliminate the sources of uncertainty, from weather to equipment to human error. Authority is needed to allocate decisions and to provide grounds for conservative action when possible and fast action when necessary. Markets reward foresight; authority provides the rule for responding to events as they happen.

26.4 Separating Coordination from Accountability

The third is the separation of coordination and accountability. The market governs behavior and performance and makes them transparent. Market relationships do not provide redress when an event compromises system security. That falls to responsible entities operating within the framework of mandatory Reliability Standards, where accountability is recorded and maintained.

26.5 Margin

The fourth is margin. Margin buys time, flexibility and options when the unforeseen happens or conditions deteriorate. Markets can signal scarcity, but margin always comes from long-term planning, infrastructure investment and prudent operation. Reliability governance includes protecting margin even when market signals suggest it is not needed.

26.6 Learning Through Change

The fifth is institutional learning. Systems change, old assumptions prove wrong and new risks emerge. Keeping the system reliable requires integrating experience from real-time operation, maintenance, repair, planning and market analysis, and knowing when a planned change is called for and when to move to emergency mode. The market supplies much of the data, but it has to be read through a reliability lens.

26.7 Transparency, Restraint and Role Discipline

The sixth pairs transparency with restraint. Transparency is the ability to see what is happening. Restraint is understanding that visibility is not the same as interference. Good governance balances the two in a way that maintains accountability and reliability and preserves institutional legitimacy.

The seventh is role discipline. Markets, operations, planning and oversight are all necessary, each for a different purpose. The redundancy of the power system as a whole depends on discipline in how those parts interact. Expanding what any single institution does is not an effective way to make the whole system more reliable.

26.8 Why They Endure

These principles hold across market designs, regulatory regimes and system configurations, which suggests they reflect inherent characteristics of system operation rather than particular institutional choices. They serve as a baseline for design and policy deliberation, a fixed reference against which change can be measured.

Seen through these principles, the argument of this reference is straightforward. Organized markets are an important part of a broader reliability architecture. Their design and operation should resist change for its own sake and stay anchored in the physical, institutional and procedural constraints that do not change.

End-of-Chapter Summary

The relationship between market operation and system reliability rests on seven principles: the precedence of physical limits, authority under uncertainty, separation of coordination from accountability, preservation of margin, institutional learning, transparency balanced with restraint, and role discipline. However markets and system structure evolve, these principles hold and support effective, reliable management of both.

Glossary

Term	Meaning in this paper
Ancillary Service	Those services that are necessary to support the transmission of capacity and energy from resources to loads while maintaining reliable operation of the Transmission Service Provider's transmission system in accordance with good utility practice (NERC Glossary, from FERC Order 888-A).
Balancing Authority (BA)	The responsible entity that integrates resource plans ahead of time, maintains Demand and resource balance within a Balancing Authority Area, and supports Interconnection frequency in real time (NERC Glossary).
Bulk Electric System (BES)	Unless modified by the inclusions and exclusions in the definition, all Transmission Elements operated at 100 kV or higher and Real Power and Reactive Power resources connected at 100 kV or higher. It does not include facilities used in the local distribution of electric energy (NERC Glossary).
Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit (IROL)	A System Operating Limit that, if violated, could lead to instability, uncontrolled separation, or Cascading outages that adversely impact the reliability of the Bulk Electric System (NERC Glossary).
Market Monitoring Unit (MMU)	The person or entity responsible for carrying out the market monitoring functions that the Commission has ordered Commission-approved ISOs and RTOs to perform (18 CFR 35.28(b)). Often called the independent market monitor.
Market Violation	A tariff violation, violation of a Commission-approved order, rule or regulation, market manipulation, or inappropriate dispatch that creates substantial concerns regarding unnecessary market inefficiencies (18 CFR 35.28(b)).
Operating Instruction	A command by operating personnel responsible for the Real-time operation of the interconnected Bulk Electric System to change or preserve the state, status, output, or input of an Element or Facility of the Bulk Electric System. A discussion of general information and of potential options or alternatives is not an Operating Instruction (NERC Glossary).
Out-of-Market Action	An operator action, such as a manual commitment or redispatch, taken outside the market clearing process to manage a reliability need the market did not resolve.
Real-time Assessment	An evaluation of system conditions using Real-time data to assess existing (pre-Contingency) and potential (post-Contingency) operating conditions (NERC Glossary).
Regional Transmission Organization (RTO)	An entity approved by FERC under 18 CFR 35.34 that is independent of market participants and has exclusive authority for the short-term reliability of the grid it operates, among other required characteristics and functions.

Term	Meaning in this paper
Reliability Coordinator (RC)	The entity that is the highest level of authority who is responsible for the Reliable Operation of the Bulk Electric System, has the Wide Area view of the Bulk Electric System, and has the operating tools, processes and procedures, including the authority to prevent or mitigate emergency operating situations in both next-day analysis and real-time operations (NERC Glossary).
Seam	The interface between two market regions or reliability areas, where differences in timing, scheduling and interchange practice have to be coordinated.
System Operating Limit (SOL)	All Facility Ratings, System Voltage Limits, and stability limits, applicable to specified System configurations, used in Bulk Electric System operations for monitoring and assessing pre- and post-Contingency operating states (NERC Glossary).
Transmission Operator (TOP)	The entity responsible for the reliability of its "local" transmission system, and that operates or directs the operations of the transmission Facilities (NERC Glossary).
Uplift	Payments made outside market clearing prices to cover costs the market did not recover, such as those from reliability commitments or out-of-market actions.

How Energy Compliance Can Help

Operations, authority and evidence

EC provides NERC reliability and compliance advisory support, NERC compliance program support, interpretation and audit preparation, and operational and engineering reliability alignment. That work ties what the market desk commits to what the control room carries, and checks that Operating Instructions, overrides and out-of-market actions are logged the way IRO-001-4 and TOP-001-6 expect.

Programs, registration and review

Registration and applicability analysis; compliance program design and improvement; reliability governance and program assessments; and regulator-perspective program reviews that test whether your program survives real audit questions. Ongoing compliance program management follows from the findings.

Audit defense and enforcement

Audit and enforcement support (non-advocacy), audit defense with Notice of Penalty response and settlement posture, mitigation planning and Self-Report development, RSAW production, and data request strategy.

Senior advisory and training

Senior advisory on specific, complex reliability questions; training and executive briefings on reliability frameworks; and industry engagement in standards development and working-group participation. Each engagement is scoped to the entity's role, function, and bulk system impact.

WattOps Compliance

An override you cannot reconstruct is an override you cannot defend. WattOps Compliance is EC's NERC compliance evidence platform (wattopscompliance.com). EC will run one standard at one facility through WattOps at no cost (CIP standards excluded).

RenewOps

Stress shows up first in operations data. RenewOps is EC's renewable operations monitoring and analytics platform, with a Data Center module.

If your market desk and your control room have never walked through an override together, start there.

Website: energycomplianceinc.com · Email: rsmith@complianceforenergy.com

Phone: 763.438.4427

About the Author

Rob Smith is the Founder and Principal of Energy Compliance, Inc., with more than thirty years in the industry on every side of the system. He began in control-room operations as a Reliability Coordinator, Transmission Operator, and Power System Operator across RTO/ISO and utility control centers. On the regulator side, he was a senior compliance auditor and subject matter expert for NERC Reliability Standards. He audited grid facilities, evaluated mitigation adequacy, participated in risk-based oversight of utility mitigation activities, and supported the development of violation notifications and settlements in FERC-directed enforcement actions. He conducted a regulatory audit in the Sultanate of Oman against the Sultanate's Sector Law and Grid Code.

He founded Energy Compliance, Inc. to deliver senior regulator-side compliance authority without the layered staffing and billable-hour overhead of larger firms.

Education:

- MBA, Energy Management, University of Mary
- MSL, Compliance Law, Fordham Law University
- BAS, Energy Management, Bismarck State College
- BAS, Mechanical Engineering, Metallurgy minor, University of Florida
- BAS, Criminology, St. Petersburg College (State Law Enforcement Certification)
- AAS, Power Plant Technology, Bismarck State College
- AAS, Electrical Transmission System Technology, Bismarck State College

Certifications: NERC Lead Auditor training; previously NERC-certified at the Reliability Coordinator level; 1st Class A Boiler Engineer License, Minnesota.

About Energy Compliance, Inc.

Energy Compliance, Inc. is an independent consulting and advisory firm based in Bloomington, Minnesota, focused exclusively on electric reliability, cybersecurity reliability, and regulatory compliance for organizations connected to the North American Bulk Electric System.

We support registered entities, including Generator Owners and Operators, Transmission Owners and Operators, Reliability Coordinators, Balancing Authorities, and Distribution Providers. Our work spans NERC Reliability Standards, FERC orders, RTO/ISO market participation rules, Regional Entity oversight, and state regulatory frameworks.

We do this work differently than larger consulting firms. A senior practitioner with regulator-side experience oversees every engagement. We staff for outcomes, not billable hours. Our deliverables are written to be operationally executable and audit-defensible, structured for the auditor's question rather than the consultant's binder. Where automation can replace manual work, we build the automation. Where senior judgment is required, the senior is in the room.

Energy Compliance is not affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or any Regional Entity.

Learn more at energycomplianceinc.com.

Sources and Authorities

- Federal Power Act Section 215, 16 U.S.C. 824o, Electric reliability, including subsection (b) jurisdiction and applicability and subsection (e) enforcement. https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/16/824o
- Federal Power Act Section 205, 16 U.S.C. 824d, Rates and charges; schedules; suspension of new rates. https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/16/824d
- Federal Power Act Section 206, 16 U.S.C. 824e, Power of Commission to fix rates and charges. https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/16/824e
- 18 CFR 35.34, Regional Transmission Organizations, including paragraph (j)(4) short-term reliability and paragraphs (k)(6) market monitoring and (k)(8) interregional coordination (eCFR, current). https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-18/section-35.34
- 18 CFR 35.28, Non-discriminatory open access transmission tariff, including paragraph (b) definitions and paragraph (g)(3) Market Monitoring Units (eCFR, current). https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-18/section-35.28
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Reliability Standard IRO-001-4, Reliability Coordination – Responsibilities (effective April 1, 2017). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-001-4.pdf
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Reliability Standard IRO-008-3, Reliability Coordinator Operational Analyses and Real-time Assessments (effective April 1, 2024). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-008-3.pdf
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Reliability Standard IRO-014-3, Coordination Among Reliability Coordinators (effective April 1, 2017). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/iro/iro-014-3.pdf
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, IRO Interconnection Reliability Operations and Coordination standards listing (accessed October 25, 2026). https://www.nerc.com/standards/reliability-standards/iro
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Reliability Standard TOP-001-6, Transmission Operations (effective April 1, 2024). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/top/top-001-6.pdf
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Reliability Standard EOP-005-3, System Restoration from Blackstart Resources (effective April 1, 2019). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/eop/eop-005-3.pdf
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Reliability Standard EOP-006-3, System Restoration Coordination (effective April 1, 2019). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/standards/reliability-standards/eop/eop-006-3.pdf

- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, EOP Emergency Preparedness and Operations standards listing, including EOP-004-4 and EOP-004-5 (accessed October 25, 2026). https://www.nerc.com/standards/reliability-standards/eop
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Reliability Standard PER-005-2, Operations Personnel Training (effective July 1, 2016). https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Reliability%20Standards/PER-005-2.pdf
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, ERO Event Analysis Process, Version 5.0 (January 2024). https://www.nerc.com/globalassets/programs/event-analysis/ero-event-analysis-process-documents/ero_eap_v5.0.pdf
- North American Electric Reliability Corporation, Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards (web version, accessed October 25, 2026). https://www.nerc.com/glossary-of-terms

© Energy Compliance, Inc. · EC-WP-403 · October 2026