

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

January 14, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
154	NRG	Taylor Roye	The issue I described on the call is that our unit will receive a dispatch in the DAM, the LMP will clear below our Bid price, and the MPM Report in CMRI is blank. When I submit an issue I'm told that there is a variance logged. The Variance I've been given is CQ7903. A few IMS Tickets you can look at are: 27122, 27293, 2953. The first IMS ticket was submitted 5/11/2009.	8/13/2009	Closed	12/14 update: The fix has been deployed to production on 12/14 and should be effective for the DAM run for trade date 12/16/09. 12/22 update: A new action item (#264) has been created for a similar issue that has been identified in the RT market MPM report. Also, action item #265 has been created for the request for reposting data for the MPM report.
188	SDGE	Tiff Nelson	For 08/27/09 HE 17 INT 12, the resolution indicated in IMS 30131 stated that the high price were due to shift factor data corruption issue and that the prices were adjusted. However, I do not see this in the weekly prices correction report last week. Were the prices corrected?	9/24/2009	To be closed	Correction was intended; however it was not made due to manual error. All post-5 day corrections are on hold. 01/07 update: The CAISO advised market participants during the Market Issues Call on 01/07/10 that due to low financial impact of the issue, the CAISO will close this action item.
189	Powerex	Lisa Hopkins	Per my question in yesterday's Market Issues call, Powerex have some concerns around the HASP prices posted for Sept 10th HE15. Per CAISO's response to Market Issues Action Items list #177 submitted by Citigroup http://www.caiso.com/2433/243399ae2adc0.pdf , CAISO "blocked" some interties (Adelanto, PACI and TRACY500) on Sept 10th in HE16. CAISO did dispatch awards on other interties however, but the settlement prices do not seem reasonable for the Market conditions. The SMEC (System Marginal Energy Cost) should always be the same for all resources in an interval and yet in this hour CAISO is posting 2 different SMEC prices on OASIS for each interval. The Generators, Loads and some interties show an hourly SMEC = \$42.86 and many interties show an hourly SMEC = \$128.25 that is also unchanged in all 4 intervals. Similarly, the Marginal Cost of Congestion is \$0 almost everywhere for generators and load and yet CAISO is indicating that they were having serious reliability issues. CAISO is also showing identical congestion (\$87.69) on many ties which are not geographically close to one another and bringing the Intertie LMP's back down to the \$30 to \$40 dollar range. Can the CAISO please revisit the validity of these prices?	9/24/2009	To be closed	With respect to the price validation, the following is the summary. Please refer to the price correction report for more details. For HE 15 RTDs: Congestion in RTD and RTPD intervals is invalid due to the incorrect limit being modeled. Prices were corrected. For HE 15 HASP: Congestions are valid. No price corrections made. For HE 15 RTPDs: INT 2, 3, 4 only (1 has no impact) RTPD was run with no SPIN and NON-SPIN requirement. Prices replaced with interval 1. For HE 16 RTDs: INTs 10, 11, 12 - VICTVL_BG congestion is valid. For HE 16 HASP: Congestions are valid. No price corrections made. For HE 16 RTPDs: RTPD was run with no SPIN and NON-SPIN requirement. Price is replaced with HE15, interval 1. 10/07 update: For HE 15 and HE 16, there are no price corrections intended for HASP. However, there are corrections for RTPD prices for those hours that inadvertently affected the HASP prices. This issue has been forwarded to Legal for further review. 01/07 update: The CAISO advised market participants during the Market Issues Call on 01/07/10 that due to low financial impact of the issue, the CAISO will close this action item.
201	Powerex	Lisa Hopkins	Powerex is seeing instances where the prices being used in settlements are not the same as the prices on OASIS. For example, settlement dispute #57889 for August 7th HE 14 was submitted because the settlement statement price is not the same as the price on OASIS for NOB transactions in HASP. This dispute was closed with the following response from CAISO: <i>"Per The Price file report (http://www.caiso.com/2410/2410e2886c290.pdf), there was a price fill for HE 14 TD Aug 7th, 2009....no adjustments are needed. While CAISO agrees that the OASIS posting should be as accurate as possible. CAISO has prioritized the need to produce settlements prices correctly over the need of posting prices in OASIS correctly. After prices are modified as documented in the price file report, there is a high probability that OASIS and settlement prices do not match."</i> We believe that OASIS should always reflect the settlement price and if it doesn't, then either OASIS or the settlements statements should be corrected. If you don't have the legal authority to revise prices after 5 days then it's the settlements that should be corrected to match OASIS. We are concerned that there will be problems with audits at year end if we are not able to point to any public document to prove the validity of a price and it prevents us from implementing robust accounting controls.	10/8/2009	To be closed	This issue has been forwarded to Legal for further review. 11/18 update: The CAISO is working on the technical bulletin on price correction which will address this issue. 12/17 update: The ISO is currently investigating situations where resource and pnode prices appear inconsistent between Settlements and OASIS. The Market Performance group is performing a detailed analysis on dates Sept 10 through Nov 2. Additionally, the Market Data (post process group) has developed and implemented a monitor and logging system of any such differences. This system went into production on December 7 and results are being analyzed. Initial indications reveal that there are rare differences where scheduled MW are non-zero (and the resource and pnode prices are different), but more frequent differences where the scheduled MWs are zero. Why this is occurring is still under investigation but where schedule MW's are zero does not impact proper settlement. Additionally, the LMP team has a monitor to their price correction tool to double check that all price corrections are matching resource level to pnode/apnode level. This monitor provides assurance that any price corrections are performed in sync with resource level and pnode level prices. 01/11 update: With the monitoring and logging system in place and in conjunction with proactive checking of price corrections, the CAISO will now close this action item.

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

January 14, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
209	SamC User Group	SamC User Group	<p>In the SaMC User Group call participants raised the following statements and questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CAISO is not consistent. Disputes have been denied based on differences between CMRI and OASIS, but it was stated in the Market Issues calls that OASIS is Settlement quality. DMM has also stated that they use OASIS for validation of some prices because it is Settlement quality. 2. If OASIS is NOT settlement quality, how do they validate prices which appear in OASIS, but are not in CMRI? 3. Can the ISO make a formal communication on the role of CMRI and the role of OASIS? 	10/23/2009	To be closed	<p>The CAISO is currently evaluating the issue. Responses to the questions will be provided later.</p> <p>11/18 update: The CAISO is working on the technical bulletin on price correction which will address this issue.</p> <p>01/11 update: The technical bulletin will not address the issue related to differences between OASIS and CMRI. In view of the improved system of monitoring differences of prices and for ensuring price corrections are processed effectively as indicated in action item #201, the CAISO will also close this action item.</p>
215	Customized Energy Solutions	Mike McGuffin	We have seen incorrect gas price in OASIS, please see IMS 31314. Can the ISO please provide a walkthrough of the gas price indices in one of the Market Issues Calls? Please use data from the week of October 2 - 9.	10/22/2009	Open	The CAISO is working on the resolution of the IMS ticket for this issue and subsequently, a public response will be provided in the action items list. The CAISO will decide if a walkthrough is needed in addition to the response.
236	Entegra Power	Dean MacGregor	I would like to know what CAISO's plans are for handling its inadvertent account. Other BAs have already begun trading out their accounts. Here is a link to the site that tracks the accounts http://www.wecc.biz/committees/StandingCommittees/OC/ISAS/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?RootFolder=%2fcommittees%2fStandingCommittees%2fOC%2fISAS%2fShared%20Documents%2fPre%2dJuly%202009%20Accumulated%20Inadvertent%20Spreadsheet&FolderCTID=%2d7bC89DE3AB%2d5537%2d4447%2d9B52%2d22ECFDBE713A%7d	11/17/2009	Pending	<p>12/02 update: The CAISO is working with WECC to review the WECC ATEC (automatic time error correction) performance.</p> <p>12/17 update: The CAISO is trying to set up a meeting with WECC in early January 2010 to discuss this issue.</p> <p>01/13 update: The CAISO has set up a meeting with WECC this January 2010 to discuss this issue.</p>
258	Powerex	Lisa Hopkins	<p>We have noticed lately that when prices change in OASIS (For example for TH_SP15), that the CAISO's tables where our system pulls OASIS updates from do not reflect the corrected prices.</p> <p>For this price correction, we'd like to ask the following:</p> <p>Which prices were corrected outside the 5 day price correction window?</p> <p>Was it only Trading Hub prices or were there other prices?</p> <p>What Trade dates were affected?</p> <p>What was the root cause of the problem?</p> <p>12/10/09 update:</p> <p>The same problem still exists for Trade date Oct 14th TH_SP15. If you query OASIS using the "All Pnodes" method (it's a cached file - see attached spreadsheet) and it gives different prices than if you query using the "Select Pnodes" method (not a cached method).</p> <p>The OASIS cached files need to be refreshed for ALL the dates that the CAISO changed prices (which according to the Disconnected pnode prices document could be any or all days from August 1 to November). These price revisions should also be highlighted on the Market Issues Call. I don't think most people understood that the Trading Hub prices would be revised and these price revisions are not listed in the OASIS Publications and revisions log. They are not listed in any of the Price Corrections Reports.</p> <p>Could the CAISO please publish a document that indicates which dates had the Trading Hub prices affected by this disconnected pnode issue and also publish a document that indicates, when each of the cached files will be corrected (I assume that this will take some time to do). This issue should be highlighted and discussed on the Market Issues call, because the entire bilateral market (especially ICE) will need to be aware of the revision and determine as a whole whether they will resettle the bilateral deals (or not). It would be helpful to know the magnitude of the price revisions because I suspect it's not a huge \$ impact but it will be a significant amount of work for parties to resettle all of these transactions.</p> <p>12/29 update: [Steven Kung of PG&E]</p> <p>Since 12/28/2009, I have been experiencing an issue where the OASIS API is occasionally returning empty files. The data is apparent in the user interface and can eventually be pulled via the API but it takes multiple attempts. This issue was previously reported and closed and explained and resolved due to an issue with the OASIS caching. Can CAISO please investigate? Sample of the files pulled within 1 minute of each other have been attached (URL used = "http://oasis.caiso.com/mrtu-oasis/GroupZip?resultformat=6&groupid=RTM_LMP_GRP&startdate=20091228&opr_hr=17").</p>	12/9/2009	Pending	<p>Which prices were corrected outside the 5 day price correction window? Nodes impacted by the Disconnected PNode effort.</p> <p>Was it only Trading Hub prices or were there other prices? No, there were others.</p> <p>What Trade dates were affected? See Market Notice on the Disconnected PNode effort. Changes were made from trade date 08/01/09 and onward.</p> <p>What was the root cause of the problem? The DAM LMP prices were last updated on 11/10/2009, associated with the Disconnected PNode effort.</p> <p>There was a problem with the OASIS caching mechanism. By design, OASIS is to create a new cached file upon any change to the underlying data. This did not occur in this case. The system of Powerex was picking up the cached result set which did not include the 11/10 price changes. The GUI users that query OASIS for single nodes received the updated prices.</p> <p>The caching mechanism has since been updated to include measures to prevent the above scenario from occurring in the future.</p> <p>12/16 update:</p> <p>The OASIS cached files for the DAM LMP prices have been re-created for all Trading Dates from 08/01/2009 to 12/16/2009. Both the CSV and XML files have been re-created. The ISO has identified the root-cause which led to this problem and has made the appropriate changes so that this does not occur in the future. This specific condition occurs when there are corrections being published for multiple days, as was the case for the Disconnected PNode effort.</p> <p>There is still one patch related to the OASIS caching mechanism that has not yet been deployed. This patch will correct issues related to the following intermittent cache file conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cached zip file contains no files within the zip. - The cached zip file contains malformed xml/csv files within the zip. - The cached zip file contains data that is not consistent with data presented on the OASIS GUI. This can occur for DAM, HASP or RTM. <p>The above issues occur during times of peak load on the OASIS servers. The patch is expected to be deployed within the next week.</p> <p>12/29 update:</p> <p>The empty files may be due to problems during peak load on OASIS as indicated above. Mondays are considered peak days, and Mondays following a holiday are that much heavier. The CAISO will continue to monitor this issue as it works on the long-term fix.</p>
264	NRG	Taylor Royce	On 12/15, our unit was being dispatched up when the LMP is below its bid curve and the RT MPM Report is blank.	12/22/2009	Pending	<p>The unit was mitigated for the hour in question. It appears that the problem the CAISO had with communicating MPM results from the Day-Ahead market now exists in the Real-Time market.</p> <p>A variance has been submitted to the software vendor.</p>

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

January 14, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
265	NRG	Taylor Roye	Regarding reposting of data for the MPM report (see #154): We are building our own shadow settlement that runs from meter data, ISO statements, CMRI, and Submitted bid curves. Having this data populate retroactive is strongly desired so that our shadow settlement can run and be stored in our databases.	12/22/2009	Pending	The CAISO is working on reposting missing data for the MPM report.
266	LDHEnergy	Richard Wu	I noticed that the following congestion only showed up in RT recently (12/15/2009 till now) but never in DA. Do you know what's the reason for that? 24074_LA FRESA_230_24065_HINSON	12/22/2009	Open	01/13 update: Under review.
269	LDHEnergy	Xijian Sun	I got a question regarding Jan 5 2010's DA MCC for 4 locations listed at the end of this email: when "24074_LA FRESA_230_24065_HINSON _230_BR_1_1" is binding, following locations should have a positive MCC based on topology connection, which could be also supported by historical DA MCC on Dec 28, 2009, when the exact same congestion was binding on Dec 28, 2009, the following locations' DA MCC goes positive, However on Jan 05, 2010, these locations' DA MCC goes negative when this "24074_LA FRESA_230_24065_HINSON _230_BR_1_1" is binding. Could you please help me bring this issue to the DA price group at the earliest convenience and keep us updated on this? Here are the locations I refer to : REDON5G_7_B1 REDON6G_7_B1 REDON7G_7_B1 REDON8G_7_B1 One possibility is that these locations might be dead pricing nodes, could you please let know CAISO's schedule on correcting price of dead pricing nodes? 01/07 update: What caused the different shift factors on those four points for congestion "24074 LA Fresa - 24065 Hinson"? I have reviewed the outages posted by CAISO, I don't see any outage happened on Jan 5, 2010 could cause such dramatic change on these shift factors.	1/5/2010	Pending	The reason why the node MCCs had different signs while the congestion shadow prices for flowgate "24074_LA FRESA_230_24065_HINSON _230_BR_1_1" are all positive is that different NA_CASEs were used for 01/05/10 and 12/28/09. The shift factors used to calculate the MCCs were different for these dates. For 12/28/09, the shift factor is negative and for 01/05/10, the shift factor is positive. Please refer to part C of the CAISO Tariff Appendix C at http://www.caiso.com/2715/27159d2351d90.pdf for the calculation of the Marginal Cost of Congestion. 01/13 update: Under review.
270	Calpine	Hannah Wang	In ISO's Exceptional Dispatch White Paper, it's stated that "The ISO is working to constrain to model the minimum on-line capacity so current nomogram constraints G-217 and G-219 in RUC can be converted to minimum on-line capacity and be enforced in any pass of the market including IFM or RTM. It is estimated that this constraint will be available by the end of the 2009". Would you please give us an update on the status of the action, including the timeline of the implementation?	1/8/2010	To be closed	The CAISO is currently testing the software capability that will allow the CAISO to enforce minimum online commitment constraints in the IFM. Once the capability is tested and passed G-217 and G-219 will be the first constraints that will be enforced by this software functionality. As the CAISO did not complete this in 2009 it is aiming to have this functionality working and G-217 and G-219 enforced by the end of January. The CAISO will appropriately notice when this occurs.
271	Constellation Energy Commodities Group	Tom Paska	Based on the data in the "Current Transmission Usage" report on the CAISO OASIS site, how can the transfer capacity on Path 15 be repeatedly exhausted, assuming that's what the zero ATC value indicates, and not require the redispatching of units and the associated congestion? For example: On HE 21 on the 4th there appears to have been 782 MWs of excess capacity on the line based on the ATC number. On the 5th there was 2,300MWs of constraint that wasn't present on the 4th. Assuming that flows, barring the constraint, would have been similar on the two days (loads were), that would seem to indicate that something like 1,600MWs (2,300 - 700) of generation would have had to been shifted from the south to the north. There are obviously multiple things going on that are affecting relative supply and demand on both sides of the constraint, but I'm not sure I understand, given the number of hours that the transfer capacity appears to be exhausted, why there hasn't been more congestion (there were just two hours between the 5th and the 9th).	1/11/2010	Open	Under review.