CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

February 18, 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 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	To be closed	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 update: CAISO has met with WECC (01/22), but as yet there is no clear path for resolution. 02/17 update: This issue will be addressed separately by the CAISO group that is coordinating with WECC for the resolution of the inadvertent account; hence, this item will be closed.
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.
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	To be closed	02/11 update: The CAISO has developed a script to get the missing data on a "upon request" basis. Market participants can submit requests through their Client Rep. However, the turn-around 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 18, 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. 02/17 update: Under review.
276	SCE	Wei Zhou	Can you please provide the reasons for the congestion on Mead since last week? 02/12 update: [Mark Tribett of Constellation] Can you please add some clarity to the response given to market issue action item 276 regarding the cause of the MEAD_ITC constraint. The response claims that the CAMINO-MEAD E. (MWD) line outage is contributing to the MEAD_ITC congestion. Handling of the CAMINO-MEAD E. (MWD) outage (SLIC 1073907) in the CRR FNM: • The line was not open in the February CRR FNM V1 case. If the line was expected to be open for more than 10 days in February, why wasn't it open in the CRR model? CAMINO-MEAD E. (MWD) outage's (SLIC 1073907) affect on the MEAD_MSL interface: • The CAMINO-MEAD E. line appears to be part of the MEAD_MSL interface definition. We understand that an outage on an interface line does not necessarily result in a derating of the interface, but are surprised to see no mention of the CAMINO-MEAD E. (MWD) outage in the OASIS Transmission Outage report for the MEAD_MSL interface. Could you please confirm that this line is part of the interface and explain why the outage was not reported in OASIS. If possible please also explain why the outage did not affect the interface's TTC. The lack of transparency around this CAMINO-MEAD E. (MWD) outage is a good example of our motivation for requesting a more clear, timely and complete presentation of transmission outage data. This is a case where market participants are left in confusion about whether or not a line is open and its impact on a related interface, and then the same outage is used as an explanation for a driver of one of the most frequent day ahead market constraints over the past 3 months.	1/21/2010	Pending	This is attributed to the outage of Mead-Camino E line. 02/17 update: Under review
277	Customized Energy Solutions	Mike McGuffin	We reques 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 18, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
282	DC Energy	Leo Hergenroeder	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. 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. 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? One other constraint where we have noted strange OASIS data relative to binding activity is Mead_ITC, does it have the same issue? 02/11 update: Please provide a list of the impacted branch groups/ITCs and the time periods that these are impacted with the issue in OASIS.	1/28/2010	Pending	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. 02/08 update: This will be in the OASIS Functionality List at http://caiso.com/235f/235fcbd556310.html. The fix is supposed to be deployed by 02/19. 02/10 update: [for the 02/03 follow-up questions] - What was the cause of the variance? 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. 02/11 update: This error condition is merely one of a subset of issues that the ISO is currently investigating. - When did it begin? 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. - Was it announced to market participants? IMS tickets were opened for SC's that surfaced the issue (#33665 and # 32842). There was no general announcement for this issue. - How many other interfaces have this same issue? 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) - Does it affect all interfaces where BG/ITC flows are reported on OASIS but the ITC is always the constraint that binds? No - Will the ISO be back-populating accurate data for this (and any other) interfaces with this issue? 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. - One other constraint where we have noted strange OASIS data relative to binding activity is Mead_ITC, does it have the same issue? Yes. This will be corrected, too.
283	PGAE	Anders Hur	Some pnodes 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 "-" .	2/1/2010	Pending	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. A defect has been logged for this issue.
285	PGAE	Steven Kung	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&E area load or gen. 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. 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. This is logged under IMS #33861.	2/9/2010	Open	02/17 update: This issue has been referred to CAISO DMM for review.
286	SCE	Willy Wang	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. With a bid floor of $0 for AS, we do not understand how these negative prices are occurring. Please explain.	2/9/2010	To be closed	The negative prices observed for spin and no spin were a result of having the maximum upward ancillary service requirement constraint binding, which for some instances made the final ASMP negative. This constraint is for a maximum procurement on total upward A/S.
287	PGAE	Steven Kung	Can you please provide the reason or cause of the price spike on 02/06?	2/11/2010	To be closed	The price spike on 02/06 that is attributed to the SC-MORPK_SC-PARD_OUT_NG congestion was invalid due to error in defining the nomogram. Price corrections were made.
288	LDHEnergy	Richard Wu	Based on the price correction report, prices were corrected for HASP 01/19 HE 8 due to open tie on Silverpeak_ITC. However, the OTC for exporting direction was not zero in HASP for 1/19/2010 HE8, hence this may not be an open tie case.	2/11/2010	To be closed	For HASP 01/19/10 HE 8, Silverpeak_ITC has a non-zero OTC and therefore was not an open tie. The price correction was inadvertently made for this particular case. The CAISO has investigated steps that will be taken to improve the process for open tie validation . There was no scheduled MW on this tie for the HASP 01/19/10 HE 8, hence, there is no settlement impact.

CAISO Market Issues Call Action Items List

February 18, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
289	SCE	Wei Zhou	In recent RTM, the SCE 60/40 constraint has been binding frequently and the magnitude can change dramatically from interval to interval. Take market day 2/16/2010 for an example. On 2/16/2010, the shadow price for this constraint changed from $2.8 at HE8 Interval 10, to $907 at HE8 Interval 11 and $909 at HE8 Interval 12. Then it dropped from $909 to $0 at HE9 Interval 1 until HE9 Interval 7. At HE9 Interval 7, it jumped from $0 to $850. At HE9 Interval 10, the shadow price dropped again, from $926 to $31. The was also observed in other hours/days. Can you please provide some clarification and answer the following questions? (1) Is this constraint enforced in the scheduling run? If so, what's the shadow price and why its enforcement in the scheduling run couldn't have mitigated its impact in the pricing run? (2) For many other transmission constraints, we usually see the $500 price parameter would trigger before reaching a higher level. In the example above, what caused the shadow price to jump from $3 to $907 instead of $500? (3) The constraint was not binding for the entire HE08 in HASP and the 15-min market run. What caused the constraint binding in the 5-min run with $900 shadow price? (4) At the $900 shadow price level, would it be more economic to bring up more internal generators or/and deep into regulation reserves to solve the constraint?	2/16/2010	Open	