CAISO Weekly Market Update Call Action Items List

August 19, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
290	PGAE	Steven Kung	When reviewing the weekly price correction report today, can CAISO also address an issue I opened (IMS#34060). The description of the issue was as follows: When reviewing the corrected prices for the DLAP_PGAE-APND, it has been observed that every 5 minute interval price for 02/05/2010 has been changes. In the weekly correction pricing report, there is no mention of any correction that would impact every RTM 5 min interval price for the PGE DLAP for the entire day. Can CAISO please investigate and advise? I've attached a spreadsheet showing the differences for the first 8 hour of 02/05/2010.	2/18/2010	Pending	The disconnected pnode corrections would have resulted in these changes to every interval. Disconnected pnode corrections are run at T+5. The original intent for the disconnected PNode process was to find a substitute pricing location for CRRs that are being settled at the disconnected PNode location. Since CRR settlements are done on the Marginal Cost of Congestion component between two points retaining a zero creates an artificially high difference. Since CRRs are not awarded at individual load bus locations, but rather at the DLAP or SLAP in the allocation, the pricing of individual disconnected load bus locations was not specifically addressed due to how the DLAP and SLAP prices are calculated in the DAM and RTM. If a load bus is disconnected in the DAM or RTM that respective LDF is zeroed out and is not included in the calculation of the DLAP price. Since CRRs are settled on the DAM LMPs (MCC component) and a disconnected load bus PNode is assigned a zero LDF the assignment of any price will have no impact on the DLAP price. There is a situation where a load bus PNode is disconnected in the DAM and then comes back in-service partially through the day of the running of the RTM. As part of the initial implementation process if a PNode was disconnected in the DAM it was considered disconnected for the entire day of the RTM. In this case if the load bus PNode was disconnected for the first half of the day then the DLAP prices were not changed since the LDFs were zero but for the last half of the day the LDFs would be non-zero but the price of the electrically closest PNode would be substituted for the original load bus PNode. This created a small price difference equal to: (Original PNode LMP – Substituted PNode LMP) * LDF of Original PNode. We are currently getting ready to implement an enhancement to the process to isolate, by interval, real-time disconnected PNodes which will ensure that each interval only includes connected load bus PNodes and does not have any substituted load bus PNodes included in the DLAP calculation. 03/09 update: The CAISO has completed the testing of the RT disconnected process enhancement and is working on the process for implementation into production. 04/19 update: RT Disconnected Pnode corrections process enhancement was deployed to production effective on trade date 04/15/2010. 04/29 update: The Real Time disconnected pnode correction process has been deactivated effective trade date April 26, 2010 due to a calculation error that was discovered. The CAISO is currently working on corrections to the process. The downtime is expected to last a minimum of two weeks. 05/13 update: The ISO is still working to remediate the code for RT disconnected pnode correction process. The ISO is concurrently working on returning this process to production and a financial impact study. At this time, we cannot provide a timeline as to when either of these two tasks will complete, but it is unlikely to be less than two weeks. 06/15 update: The ISO is working on a technical bulletin on Disconnected PNode Correction process. It is expected to be completed in the next few weeks. 07/08 update: The technical bulletin is now on internal review stage.
321	SCE	Wei Zhou	We've seen one of our units had different Energy Component of LMP price than the rest of the grid in recent IFM market. Please explain. For details, please refer to the IMS# 35535.	4/20/2010	Pending	Beginning trade date 04/09/10, the ISO implemented a code to recalculate prices for PODs that have a pnode price correction due to the disconnected pnode correction process. The ISO discovered an issue with the code and put in a fix beginning trade date 04/15/10. Trade date 04/09/10 to 04/14/10 are past the T+5 price correction period at the time the issue was discovered and the ISO decided to not correct the prices because the resource level LMPs are correct and these are what are used in settlement. Hence, some POD prices in OASIS may still have different SMEC prices than the rest of the system for trade dates 04/09/10 to 04/14/10. The code to recalculate POD prices was deactivated on 04/26/10. 06/08 update: The DA POD price correction has been restarted beginning trade date 05/30/2010. The code for this correction is for updating DA POD prices that have pnode price corrections due to the DA disconnected pnode correction process. This process also propagates the DA POD prices to their respective resource specific LMP. 06/15 update: The results of the financial impact analysis will be included in the technical bulletin. 07/08 update: The technical bulletin is now on internal review stage.
320	PGAE	Nathanael Miksis	We have noticed that an issue that was raised and seemed to have been resolved has resurfaced in OASIS data for "System Load and Resource Schedules" in RTM. April 4th, HE17 interval 3 through HE18 interval 1 have MW values apparently double what would be expected (comparing with intervals before and after). Additionally, data are missing for four intervals before this period (HE16 interval 11 through HE17 interval 2). A similar thing is shown on April 13th: HE3 interval 4 and 6 are missing, while values for intervals 5 and 7 through interval 1 of HE4 are doubled. Looking backward, this seems to have happened pretty frequently. The attached spreadsheet shows all intervals that appear in an ad hoc filter I constructed to find these events, after April 30th, 2009. Note that the data raised in market issue 301 (February 23rd) have been corrected. The spreadsheet includes these intervals too for informational purposes. Can you look into the cause of this?	4/19/2010	Pending	A defect has been opened for this issue. 04/27 update: The defect is now in review stage. 05/18 update: The defect is still in review stage. 05/25 update: Status is now "In progress" 08/05 update: The issue with the report occurs when there is a contingency run. There is no deployment date for the fix at this time.
361	SCE	Wei Zhou	Can you please look into the market results published for RTM 7/29/2010? It seems that the Path26_BG was binding at Interval 0, HE19 with shadow price at $715, in addition to that it's binding for Interval 1 -12 for other hours. Line "33912_SPRNG_GJ_115_33914_MI_WU" also bound at Interval 0 at HE20. Please also indicate whether a price correction has been applied for such results.	8/3/2010	Pending	The shadow price reports have been corrected for these instances. OASIS is now posting properly. The issue with the reports occurs when there is a contingency dispatch, similar to action item #320. No price corrections were made. The permanent fix to correct the OASIS postings to account for contingency conditions is in progress. There is no deployment date for the fix at this time.

CAISO Weekly Market Update Call Action Items List

August 19, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
328	PGAE	Anders Hur	There have been no published Transmission Interface Usage values for COTP_MSL since 4/28. Is this intentional? 05/13: Can you provide more clarification on the difference between COTP_MSL and COTPISO_MSL?	5/6/2010	Pending	Yes, this was intentional. OASIS users should reference the COTPISO_MSL values. 05/13 update: The COTPISO_MSL is the CAISO capacity that it can schedule on COTP. The COTP_MSL was created for the CAISO to monitor the flows on the COTP. 05/18 update: The ISO has initiated an effort to provide clear TNAME/ITC/BG/MSL information to the Market Participants. This will be corrected with issue #331 resolution.
331	Powerex	Lisa Hopkins	The CAISO Tariff requires that SC's not submit bids if a tie is rated at 0 OTC in the both the import and export direction. Could CAISO please provide a mapping of Tname to MSL/BG naming convention used on the Tranmission Interface Useage report on OASIS? The mapping which exists in the Pnode Mapping document http://www.caiso.com/1f94/1f94cd5447620.html appears to map to secondary impacts. For example the following TNAMES are all mapped to ADLANTOSP_MSL GONIPP IPP MARKETPLACE MCCULLOUG500 MDWP MEAD5MSCHD WESTWING500 However, the CAISO does publish Transmission Interface Usage and Market ATC for Interfaces such as MCCULLGH_MSL, MEAD_BG, WSTWGMEAD_MSL. We would like to know which MSL's and BG's with a Rating of 0 would mean which TNAME cannot accept bids.	5/13/2010	Pending	The ISO has initiated an effort to provide clear TNAME/ITC/BG/MSL information to the Market Participants. 06/18 update: The ISO has sent out a paper summarizing the MSL transparency issue and proposed future action to resolve this topic.
330	PGAE	Anders Hur	It appears that the OASIS data for "Total System Marginal Loss Costs($)" is not marginal, but rather the cost of actual losses since it matches exactly the product of the "Total System Losses (MWh)" times the SMEC for all hours except HE21 and HE23. Is this the desired result? Also, why are HE21 and HE23 calculated differently?	5/11/2010	Pending	Your assumption on how the Loss Costs are calculated is correct. The posted value is the desired result. Please refer to Attachment I - Direct Testimony of Farrokh Rahimi (Exhibit No. ISO-4) [http://www.caiso.com/1798/1798f6c4709e0.pdf, see page 31] available at http://www.caiso.com/1798/1798ea1b23080.html 05/16 update: The calculations for HE 21 and 23 have been corrected to be consistent with the other hours. Also, the CAISO has initiated an enhancement request to change the calculation of the Marginal Cost of Losses as the difference between sum of sinks x the Marginal Cost of Loss component of LMP and the sum of sources x Marginal Cost Loss component of LMP as follows. Marginal Cost of Losses = (Sum ('ITIE' X COSTLMP MCL, 'GEN' X COSTLMP MCL) – Sum ('ETIE' X COSTLMP MCL, 'LOAD' X COSTLMP MCL)) The OASIS Functionality List will be updated to reflect the details and status of this enhancement. 05/25 update: Status is now "In progress." Due for release in the August OASIS monthly deployment. Will be added to the Functionality List with the next update. 06/15 update: OASIS Functionality List will be updated on 06/16 08/10 update: The enhancement release has been moved to the September 2010 OASIS monthly deployment.
333	PGAE	Anders Hur	The Marginal Loss Revenue and Actual Losses data is missing for the extra Day Light Savings 25th hour on 11/1/09. The ISO may also want to look into other DLST data to ensure data exists and is valid.	5/18/2010	Pending	This will be corrected with issue # 330 resolution.
351	Constellation Energy Commodities Group	Tom Paska	From the 11th on we have seen a significant and consistent increase in BCR Tier 1 costs. Could you please let us know what is going on with the CAISO to reflect such a large cost amount? Obviously, this is a concern given, that unlike LMPs, we are not able to hedge BCR. When broken down by hour, charges that we typically see for $1.18 jumped to over $8.00.	7/8/2010	Pending	The high BCR allocation was attributed to incorrect BCR payment due to error in the market data. The CAISO has identified the root cause of the issue and will be making corrections for all the affected resources in accordance with the settlement statement publication schedule. 07/22 update: A technical bulletin will be posted in a couple of weeks.

CAISO Weekly Market Update Call Action Items List

August 19, 2010 Conference Call

Issue No.	SC Name	SC Contact	Issue Description/Action Item	Date Opened	Status	Review and Action Item Comment
355	Powerex	Lisa Hopkins	I am curious as to the Path 26 congestion/non-congestion that occurred on the DAM results for July 17 during the peak load period HE 12 to HE16. On the Transmission Interface Usage and Market Available Transmission Capacity info on the CAISO OASIS, there is 600-800MW of room available on Path 26 during that time and the rating is shown as 4000MW. On the Intertie Constraint Shadow Prices info, there is no congestion shown for Path 26. However, in the Nomogram/Branch Shadow Prices, there is congestion shown on one of the lines that constitute Path 26: Midway-Vincent 500 Branch 3_2. This congestion is consistent with the divergence in price between the NP and SP trading hubs in those hours. It appears that one of the lines of Path 26 has congested at a lower rating than that of the path rating. Are there uneven loading or operational restrictions that is causing the facilities of Path 26 to congest while there is still ~15% or more of the path capacity available? Does the CAISO forecast this congestion below path rating to be typical of system conditions during high load periods in the future.	7/16/2010	To be closed	The binding condition on the 30060_MIDWAY _500_24156_VINCENT _500_BR_3 _2 flowgate represents a precontingent normal limit while the Path 26 limit represents a limit to protect against the next worst contingency. 08/17 update: The facility ratings indicated in the Transmission Register form the basis of defining the limits. In the pre-contingency state, system performance shall have all facilities within their facility ratings and within their thermal, voltage and stability limits. The limits are not posted. Note that the calculation of transfer capability of a transmission line is generally based on computer simulations of the operation of the interconnected transmission network under a specific set of assumed operating conditions.
362	Entegra Power	Dean MacGregor	Tarrif section 11.8.4.1.5 on page 229 says: For any Settlement Interval, the RTM Energy Bid Cost for the Bid Cost Recovery Eligible Resource except Participating Loads shall be computed as the sum of the products of each Instructed Imbalance Energy (IIE) portion, except Standard Ramping Energy, Residual Imbalance Energy, Exceptional Dispatch Energy, Derate Energy, MSS Load Following Energy, Ramping Energy Deviation and Regulating Energy, with the relevant Energy Bid prices, if any, for each Dispatch Interval in the Settlement Interval. The RTM Energy Bid Cost for a Bid Cost Recovery Eligible Resource except Participating Loads for a Settlement Interval is set to zero for any undelivered Real-Time Instructed Imbalance Energy by the Bid Cost Recovery Eligible Resource. Any Uninstructed Imbalance Energy in excess of Instructed Imbalance Energy is also not eligible for Bid Cost Recovery. This means that market participants who are delivering regulation whether it be up or down are 100% exposed to the RT price. With the floor and cap range of plus/minus $2500 this leaves significant risk on those who wish to provide this service to the ISO. Why has the ISO chosen to leave those participants exposed to prices that could be extremely underwater? What needs to be done to change this?	8/11/2010	To be closed	The management of regulation energy is performed by the CAISO's EMS/AGC function and is not performed based on submitted energy bids. Therefore settling the regulaiton energy based on the market bids has not been the practice. It has been the practice to not settle this energy as IIE both prior and after the implementation of the new market. There has been some expectation that over time a resource providing regulation up and down would net its energy delivery over time. Lastly, if we are deficient in the market and setting high prices, we are likely using regulation up resources and they would be benefiting from the high prices. If we we have excess energy and market is dec'ing, we are likely regulating down with resources when prices are low. However, this is not to suggest that this will always happen and that there is no risk. There is no explicit price floor or cap. There is a bid floor of -$30 and bid cap of $750. The prices at locations could be lower or greater than this level. The CAISO has included Regulation Energy Management (REM) as one of the issues that will be addressed in the Renewable Integration Market and Product Review (RIMPR) initiative (http://www.caiso.com/27be/27beb7931d800.html). Please see the proposal that was developed as part of the Non-Generation A/S Participation initiative last spring (http://www.caiso.com/2415/24157662689a0.html), but pulled in order to comprehensively assess it as part of the new RIMPR initiative. Essentially the proposal is to provide the opportunity for market participants that choose REM to have their net energy under regulation managed to zero (requires symmetrical reg up and reg down bids) and they would forego the energy settlement—and thereby any energy price risk.