CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

January 21, 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.
209	SaMC User Group	SaMC User Group	In the SaMC User Group call participants raised the following statements and questions: 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	The CAISO is currently evaluating the issue. Responses to the questions will be provided later. 11/18 update: The CAISO is working on the technical bulletin on price correction which will address this issue. 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. 01/20 update: Although OASIS is not considered settlement quality at this time, the ISO has implemented a monitoring process of sampling the OASIS prices with those in Settlement to ensure consistency. In the event prices are systemically inconsistent, the ISO will analyze the data and make going forward process corrections where appropriate. The ISO is also considering additional reports for CMRI. While at this time a timeline has not been established for either what additions should be made or when changes would be effective, ISO will inform participants as we move through this effort to collaborate on the various needs. It is likely that this project will not be started until the Fall 2010.
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	Pending	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. 01/20 update: Please see market notice titled "ISO Takes Corrective Action on Two Market System Issues" at http://www.caiso.com/2723/2723c7132b490.html. Additional information concerning the gas price issue including market impact is available at: http://www.caiso.com/2723/2723c41917250.pdf.
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=&View=%7bC89DE3AB%2d5537%2d4447%2d9B52%2d22ECFDBE713A%7d	11/17/2009	Pending	12/02 update: The CAISO is working with WECC to review the WECC ATEC (automatic time error correction) performance. 12/17 update: The CAISO is trying to set up a meeting with WECC in early January 2010 to discuss this issue. 01/13 update: The CAISO has set up a meeting with WECC this January 2010 to discuss this issue.

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

January 21, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
258	Powerex	Lisa Hopkins	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. For this price correction, we'd like to ask the following: Which prices were corrected outside the 5 day price correction window? Was it only Trading Hub prices or were there other prices? What Trade dates were affected? What was the root cause of the problem? 12/10/09 update: 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). 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 highlited 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. 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 highlited 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. 12/29 update: [Steven Kung of PGAE] 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").	12/9/2009	Pending	Which prices were corrected outside the 5 day price correction window? Nodes impacted by the Disconnected PNode effort. Was it only Trading Hub prices or were there other prices? No, there were others. What Trade dates were affected? See Market Notice on the Disconnected PNode effort. Changes were made from trade date 08/01/09 and onward. 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. 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. The caching mechanism has since been updated to include measures to prevent the above scenario from occurring in the future. 12/16 update: 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. 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. - 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. The above issues occur during times of peak load on the OASIS servers. The patch is expected to be deployed within the next week. 12/29 update: 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.
264	NRG	Taylor Roye	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	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. A variance has been submitted to the software vendor.
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 CAIS O 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_HINSO	12/22/2009	Open	01/20 update: Under review.

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

January 21, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
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 be 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 pnode 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. 01/20 update: Under review.
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	01/20 update: Under review.
272	PGAE	Anders Hur	On 1/13 HE18, the HASP "Scheduled Net Energy from Imports/Exports" for the following interties was 0. This is odd because the interties have a non-zero value for numerous hours before and after HE18. It seems that this 0 is a glitch. Did the HASP not run for this hour? What else could cause the 0 value? PALOVRDE PACI NOB MEAD COTP	1/14/2010	To be closed	There was a HASP failure for HE 18, hence those values will be blank on OASIS. There is no back-fill process for when this occurs, as there is no settlement or financial impact of posting the null values.

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

January 21, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
273	Dynegy	Michael Bailey	I'd liek to request more details surrounding the enforcement of SCE_PCT_IMP_BG. On the CRR call held yesterday, I heard a brief explanation of what I believe was the enforcement methodology of SCE_PCT_IMP_BG constraint. What I think I heard was that SCE_PCT_IMP_BG is enforced manually through redispatch, prior to the IFM run. I also wanted to confirm whether I heard correctly that the cost of redispatch due to SCE_PCT_IMP_BG enforcement settled as energy LMP component charges rather than congestion LMP component charges. In today's market issues report and yesterday's CRR report, Mr. Guillermo Alderete attributed recent congestion events (last week, November, . . .) to the SCE_PCT_IMP_BG. We have observed in the RT last week, and since enforcement of SCE_PCT_IMP_BG last November, spreads between LMP energy components instead of congestion components at various LAPS. In particular, we have noticed events where the SCE DLAP and SLAP nodes had identical positive LMP components of energy with no congestion components while all of the PG&E and SDG&E DLAPS and SLAPS had identical and negative LMP components of energy with no congestion components. The fact that PG&E and SDG&E had identical and negative LAP energy LMP components to SCE's identical and positive LAP energy components lead us to believe that the spread was attributable to a binding SCE_PCT_IMP_BG constraint. The technical Bulletin for SCE_PCT_IMP_BG does not go into detail of how the enforcement of this constraint is implemented nor how it is settled. To that end, I'd like to confirm: • Where is SCE_PCT_IMP_BG enforced: CRR, DA, HASP, RT? • How is the enforcement of SCE_PCT_IMP_BG implemented (as part of native IFM software or some other intervention, manual or otherwise, in the market sequence)? • In what form does redispatch take place (in-market, out-of-market, exceptional, RA, etc.) • How is the redispatch cost to alleviate a binding SCE_PCT_IMP_BG constraint settled? As an congestion LMP component? As an energy LMP component? As a combination? Neither? • What is CAISO's interpretation of the tariff language regarding this constraint and settlement?	1/14/2010	To be closed	• Where is SCE_PCT_IMP_BC enforced: CRR, DA, HASP, RT? CRR- For February Monthly CRR and beyond it will be enforced such that no additional CRR beyond what was auctioned/allocated will be released across the SCE_PCT_IMP_BG constraint. DA-Started to be enforced in the market as a corridor constraint on November 11, 2009. RT-Started to be enforced in the market as a corridor constraint on November 11, 2009. HASP-Started to be enforced in the market as a corridor constraint on November 11, 2009. (Prior to November 11, 2009, if in RT we observed the actual SCE import limit become an issue exceptional dispatch was used to resolve and get below the limit.) • How is the enforcement of SCE_PCT_IMP_BC implemented (as part of native IFM software or some other intervention, manual or otherwise, in the market sequence)? As of November 11, 2009, the SCE_PCT_IMP_BG is enforced as a corridor constraint where the corridor is defined by the individual lines identified in the Technical Bulletin http://www.caiso.com/2479/247997c52e0f0.pdf. • In what form does redispatch take place (in-market, out-of-market, exceptional, RA, etc.) As of November 11, 2009, the primary method of resolving the SCE_PCT_IMP_BG via in-market dispatch. Prior to November 11, 2009, exceptional dispatch was used where the SCE import limit became a an issue based on actual conditions. • How is the redispatch cost to alleviate a binding SCE_PCT_IMP_BC constraint settled? As an congestion LMP component? As an energy LMP component? As a combination? Neither? When the SCE_PCT_IMP_BG does bind, the congestion component of the LMP will reflect the binding constraint. • What is CAISO's interpretation of the tariff language regarding this constraint and settlement? Once the constraint was modeled it is a normal market constraint and settled accordingly.
274	Energy Management Services	Carolyn Kehrein	I wanted to ask a question about the high price spikes in SCE. The SCE import group was mentioned. Can more be explained about which lines those are and which specific ones were overloaded? (Or is that confidential) Or are all the lines analyzed together? 500 MW of generation being out is what I think caused the SCE price spikes. Did I hear that right? Was the outage planned or unplanned? Was it one unit or more than one unit? If planned, are there more outages? Can end users find that info on OASIS? If it was unplanned, is the problem fixed to the best of the ISO's knowledge? How much slack capacity exists on the SCE import group? How many MWs can go out before the price can be impacted significantly?	1/14/2010	To be closed	There were price spikes in SCE area (in January 6, 10 and 11) in real time due to SCE_PCT_IMP branch group being congested. Congestion on the 6th was because there was a forced outage of a generation unit that required to bring into SCE more imports and resulted in this branch group being congested throughout the day. Congestion on the 10th and 11th were just one- or two-interval spikes due to usual congestion. Also, I referred to one price spike on January 9th that was a result of being short of energy after losing over 500 MW of generation when a unit relayed. However, this has not relation to the congestion on SCE_PCT_IMP of the other days. Regarding the SCE_PCT_IMP branch group, this is a branch group that is in place to enforce the import 60% into SCE area and is composed of a set of elements that bring power into SCE. The elements that compose this constraint are indicated in the Technical Bulletin at http://www.caiso.com/2479/247997c52e0f0.pdf The generation outage on January 6th was forced, and that information is not publicly available. To some extent, forced outages is a "typical" event in the operations of a power system. This branch group enforces an import limit and it is not exactly a typical constraint that has associated a physical limit of power to flow; therefore, its slack capacity may not be defined. The only close value would be to sum the maximum limits of all its elements. The SCE_IMP constraint rather refers to the maximum import power that can be brought into SCE through its over-20 elements. Its MW value will be changing as load changes because it is defined as the 60 percent of SCE's load.
275	PGAE	Anders Hur	On 1/14 there were a number of small spikes between HE2 and HE4 in the 5-Minute load forecast. What is the cause of these spikes?	1/15/2010	Open	Under review