

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

February 11, 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.
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 <a href="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&amp;FolderCTID=%2639591228&amp;pr=17">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&amp;FolderCTID=%2639591228&amp;pr=17</a>	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. 01/25: CAISO has met with WECC (01/22), but as yet there is no clear path for resolution.
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 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.  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.  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	To be closed	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.  02/05 update: The fix was deployed to PROD on February 3, 2010. The CAISO validated that the issue has been resolved.
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.  02/10 update: The CAISO continues to work on the long-term fix for re-posting the missing data for the MPM reports. In the interim, the CAISO has developed a script to get the missing data on a "upon request" basis. The CAISO will have the capability to generate this information beginning sometime next week, and market participants can submit requests through their Client Rep. However, the turnaround of such data requests may require a significant amount of time, considering that the script can take a long time to execute.

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

February 11, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
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_HINSONO	12/22/2009	To be closed	A contingency was to be enforced in order to handle planned outages affecting La Fresa-Redondo No. 1&2, Mesa-Redondo and Lighthipe-Redondo lines. The contingency was not working correctly, hence, 24074_LA FRESA_230_24065_HINSON _230_BR_1_1" flowgate was biased to approximately 60% in the DA market. In the Real Time market the operators had to adjust the biasing level by monitoring the actual flow. The flowgate was biased in real time until it binds in the market. This action was necessary to get the mitigating units to increase their output.  02/01 update: More details of the analysis on this constraint is available at the Quarterly Report on Market Issues and Performance that was released by CAISO's Department of Market Monitoring and posted at <a href="http://www.caiso.com/2730/2730ee1e71a10.pdf">http://www.caiso.com/2730/2730ee1e71a10.pdf</a> .
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 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 <a href="http://www.caiso.com/2715/27159d2351d90.pdf">http://www.caiso.com/2715/27159d2351d90.pdf</a> for the calculation of the Marginal Cost of Congestion.  02/10 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	To be closed	01/27 update: Under review.  01/29 update: The market participants resolved the congestion outside the market. A 2300 MW de-rate on Path 15 might affect congestion. However, this de-rate was due to a scheduled outage which would have been posted on OASIS previously, thus market participants would have had an opportunity to adjust their self scheduled generation ahead of time, avoiding congestion of the path.  For the specific example of HE 21 on 1/4 and 1/5, It should be noted that the DA scheduled energy was below the limits on both days (3571 on the 4th and 3050 on the 5th), and although hourly unscheduled TR capacity is reserved, it may not actually be used.
276	SCE	Wei Zhou	Can you please provide the reasons for the congestion on Mead since last week?	1/21/2010	Pending	This is attributed to the outage of Mead-Camino E line.  02/10 update: For further review.
277	Customized Energy Solutions	Mike McGuffin	We request the CAISO to post data for the following: the date of the gas price index used for each trade date, and Potomac energy price component.	1/21/2010	Open	

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

February 11, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
279	ECCO	Dave Perrino	<p>In reference to the Market Notice, "Enforcement of Operating Procedures G-217 and G-219" sent 1/26/2010. We are pleased that the CAISO has included more constraints in the IFM. It is critical that as many recognized constraints be included in the DAM market process. The issue that we have encountered is that due to the current restricted access of operating procedures G-217 and G-219 we cannot appropriately model these constraints. This problem effects participants who want to manage their own assets in the affected region(s) as well as those that need to prudently manage their exposure to potential congestion.</p> <p>The key component to the formulation that is missing seems to be, <math>P_{Gt}^{moc}</math> as well as the definition of units/resources. ECCO is a signatory to the CAISO FNM model and would request that we obtain access to the procedures addressed in the Technical Bulletin 2010-01-02 Minimum Online Commitment Constraint document.</p>	1/27/2010	To be closed	<p>The G-217 and G-219 procedures are not shared with anyone other than the PTO (SCE) due to "Market Sensitive" reasons and "Security" reasons. The foundation for these procedures is that if forecasted load gets to certain thresholds then certain amounts of local generation needs to be committed. Moreover, the procedures can only be shared with an operationally affected entity. Operationally affected means (1) an entity that is a party to the Transmission Control Agreement, a neighboring Balancing Authority or a Market Participant and (2) the Operating Procedure, if implemented, would require a change outside of the CAISO Markets in the operation of that entity's facilities that are part of or interconnected to the CAISO Controlled Grid.</p> <p>02/08 update: ISO Tariff section 22.11.3 (Requests for and Access to Nonpublic Operating Procedures) states that, subject to agreed upon controls, the CAISO will provide access to employees or representatives acting as agents of the requesting entity that is operationally affected by implementation of the Operating Procedure or any proposed changes to the Operating Procedure. The tariff section provides the abovementioned two part condition for an entity to be considered as operationally affected. An entity that may merely be affected economically or financially by implementation or revision of a non-public Operating Procedure or portion thereof is not entitled to access to that Operating Procedure or portion thereof pursuant to the Section 22.11.3. However, this tariff section also states that any entity that believes it is operationally affected by a non-public CAISO Operating Procedure may seek access to that Operating Procedure by providing a written request to the CAISO. Any such request must identify the specific Operating Procedure to which the entity seeks access, the name and position of the employees and representatives of the entity that seek to review the non-public Operating Procedure, a representation that each employee or representative needs to review the non-public Operating Procedure or portion thereof to perform their employment responsibilities and a representation that each employee or representative does not perform a market function on behalf of the requesting entity. The requesting entity should submit the written request to their ISO account or client representative.</p>
281	Conoco Phillips	Trevor Lindhout	<p>It was mentioned that Palo Verde ITC was derated due to the outage of Captain Jack - Olinda and Olinda - Tracy lines. Can you please provide further explanation on this?</p> <p>Per Edward Cheon of Merrill Lynch, issue also shows up for El Dorado and Westwing.</p>	1/28/2010	To be closed	<p>A reliability procedure for this outage scenario was followed and that resulted in a limit imposed on Paloverde, among other transmission elements. The release of the details of such a procedure is restricted.</p>
282	DC Energy	Leo Hergenroeder	<p>Why did Laughlin_ITC bind in the DAM for 1/28/2010 when it had zero flows, a positive limit, and positive available transmission capacity (ATC) in every hour of the day according to OASIS. Furthermore, the transmission interface usage information on OASIS is identical for hours 6 and 7 for 1/28/2010, yet the constraint bound in hour 7 and not in hour 6.</p> <p>It is our understanding that this must either be a reporting error on OASIS, or that the constraint binding is invalid and should be eliminated through price correction.</p> <p>02/03 update: What was the cause of the variance? When did it begin? Was it announced to market participants? How many other interfaces have this same issue? Does it affect all interfaces where BG/ITC flows are reported on OASIS but the ITC is always the constraint that binds? Will the ISO be back-populating accurate data for this (and any other) interfaces with this issue?</p> <p>One other constraint where we have noted strange OASIS data relative to binding activity is Mead_ITC, does it have the same issue?</p>	1/28/2010	Pending	<p>02/03 update: The CAISO is aware of this issue and has registered a defect with its IT department as the app is internally developed. The issue affects both DA and HASP.</p> <p>02/08 update: This will be in the OASIS Functionality List at <a href="http://caiso.com/235f/235fcbd556310.html">http://caiso.com/235f/235fcbd556310.html</a>. The fix is supposed to be deployed by 02/19.</p> <p>02/10 update: [for the 02/03 follow-up questions]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What was the cause of the variance?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scenario is when an ITC has no Import Schedules, but has Export Schedules that are greater than zero. This causes a calculation error in the view logic. This can occur in both the DAM and HASP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- When did it begin?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A defect was logged on December 9, 2009 regarding incorrect data for the Scheduled Net Energy from Imports/Exports in the following reports: Current Transmission Usage, Transmission Interface Usage - Both DAM and HASP, and Market ATC report. (Indirect impact, as if the Net Energy is wrong, the ATC calculation is not correct). Potentially, the impact can go as far back as TD 04/01/2009.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Was it announced to market participants?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMS tickets were opened for SC's that surfaced the issue (#33665 and # 32842). There was no general announcement for this issue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- How many other interfaces have this same issue?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All ITC's could be impacted, as the logic applies to all ITC's. In reality, most ITC's have at least 1MW Import Schedule for each hour. There are some ITC's where it is more common to have zero MW of Import Schedules (LAUGHLIN_BG, MARBLE_BG)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Does it affect all interfaces where BG/ITC flows are reported on OASIS but the ITC is always the constraint that binds?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Will the ISO be back-populating accurate data for this (and any other) interfaces with this issue?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When the patch is deployed, all values going back to 4/1/2009 will be corrected. The impacted logic was in the view, so upon any request for any day, the result set will be correct.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- One other constraint where we have noted strange OASIS data relative to binding activity is Mead_ITC, does it have the same issue?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. This will be corrected, too.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
283	PGAE	Anders Hur	<p>Some nnodes have inconsistent naming between the "TAC Area - Pnode Mapping" report and the "Pnode Listing" report. In the TAC Area report these nodes have underscores "-" while the Pnode Listings report use dashes "-".</p>	2/1/2010	Pending	<p>The "PNode Listing" report is correct while the "TAC Area - Pnode Mapping" is not correct. These two listings should be the same. The TAC area listing may contain logic to replace any dash with an underscore.</p> <p>A defect has been logged for this issue.</p>

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

February 11, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
284	Citigroup	Ryan Burkhalter	There were numerous HASP price corrections for trade date 1/11 due to scheduling on open ties. Which recalculation method (system or individual) was used for the corrections? The price correction report has conflicting statements. Do bids on an open tie affect HASP congestion prices across the entire system?	2/3/2010	To be closed	<p>In the open tie price corrections, we essentially do a selective recalculation where we only change incorrect prices that are attributed to the invalid constraint shadow price. This does not constitute a market re-run or re-run of the market optimization, hence is not considered a system recalculation.</p> <p>The price validation group of the CAISO will be more cognizant of the use of consistent terminologies (in conjunction with the nature of the price correction methodologies used) in the reports henceforth.</p>
285	PG&E	Steven Kung	<p>The HL heat rate for 2/10 is approximately 10,000 which is among the highest this year. There was almost no difference in PG&amp;E area load or gen.</p> <p>A significant reduction in SCE area imports, increase in SCE area gen, and increases in SCE area exports were observed, as indicated in the attached file.</p> <p>As all germane differences appear to be in the SCE area, we would like to ask the Market Monitoring group to investigate whether this is possibly the result of the new minimum commitment nomograms in the IFM, as these are not visible to us as market participants.</p> <p>This is logged under IMS #33861.</p>	2/9/2010	Open	Under review.
286	SCE	Willy Wang	<p>Last Sunday, on 2/7/10, the RTM AS clearing price for spin and nonspin for AS_CAISO_EXP was -11.01 and -9.75 in HE02, intervals 1 and 4, respectively. It was also -3.16 in HE07, interval 3.</p> <p>With a bid floor of \$0 for AS, we do not understand how these negative prices are occurring. Please explain.</p>	2/9/2010	Open	Under review.