

Payment Acceleration - Client Outreach Result Matrix

	Scope					Implementation			Future Considerations
	Settlement Timeline (T+9 business days for Initial)	Estimation of Meter Data using polled, meters, and schedules	Invoicing Date of third Tuesday of each month	Invoicing Frequency of once per month	Sunset Provision at 36 months	Deployment Schedule at 6 months after MRTU go-live	Sample Calendar	Transition Period (90 days with both accelerated and non-accelerated statements)	
Client 1	In agreement with timeline and supports further acceleration of settlements	Supports use of schedules rather than estimating meter data	Need to confirm that proposed invoicing date will meet their month end process	Supports monthly; no strong need for greater frequency.	Understands benefits in terms of administrative costs and ability to end of life software versions and data archival/retention	Understands deployment schedule	Understands sample calendar	Is flexible to how transition period is done	Would like to see CAISO payment timelines aligned with WSPP timelines for the bulk of the revenue timeline (end of month + 20 days). Would like CAISO to consider other structural changes, such as having certain charge codes (6011, 6031) settled on a faster timeline.
Client 2	Understands that timeline implies that meter data is required at T + 5B, and they can support this schedule	Do not want to use schedules; want to be able to use their meter data. Realizes it must be Settlement Quality meter data.	A set invoice date is not a significant item as long as it does not impact Settlement quality	Prefers once a month, but are open to keeping it twice a month.	Expressed concern over the sunset provision as it would create long lag times in between settlements	Does not support the work on Payment Acceleration while the MRTU implementation date is being replanned because it is a distraction from getting MRTU deployed.	Understands sample calendar	90 days is both an achievable and preferred transition period	Reiterated the question of why the CAISO is pursuing Payment Acceleration at this time and feels that it should be solely focused on MRTU
Client 3	Expressed the need for a Day Ahead settlement to be done on an even more accelerated timeline	Supports use of schedules for estimating meter data. Understands that meter data must be Settlement Quality and will be subject to compliance standards.	Meets their request of aligning the invoice data with the WSCC and other industry standards	Prefers once a month, and sees no benefit to increase it to twice a month or weekly	Supports provision at 36 months	Would like to see Payment Acceleration implemented with the start of MRTU	Understands sample calendar	No feedback on transition period	Would like Payment Acceleration to be available at MRTU go-live and the Day Ahead energy settlement to take place as soon as possible. Would like there to be more precise/accurate data on the initial settlement statement and interest charged and collected between initial and true-up settlements.
Client 4	In agreement with timeline	Supports use of schedules rather than estimating meter data as it would allow for faster settlement and remove constraints associated with the timeline	Support invoicing to be done on a fixed date rather than triggered by month-end	Supports weekly, rather than monthly	Understands the proposed sunset provision at 36 months	Would like to see Payment Acceleration implemented as soon as possible; would consider making it coincident with MRTU go-live	Expressed that contingency plans are needed to keep the Settlement calendar on schedule	Requests that as MRTU date is reassessed, the Payment Acceleration deployment is considered as well, which would avoid the need for a transition period	Requests consideration that the Day Ahead Market be settled the next day as it is not dependent on meter data. Project that 70-80% of their involvement in the CAISO market will through the DAM and would like this market to be cleared quickly

Payment Acceleration - Client Outreach Result Matrix

	Scope					Implementation			Future Considerations
Client 5	Understands the timeline	Not affected by meter data estimation	Neutral to positive on the consistency of a fixed invoice date of the third Tuesday of the month	Indifferent to the number of invoices. Feels that the increased administrative costs of additional invoices would not cover the incremental gain	Does not support the sunset provision. Does not agree with the benefits in terms of reduction of administrative costs and ability to end of life software versions and data archival/retention	Understands deployment schedule, however is concerned about implementation during peak summer months. CAISO agrees to take the concern regarding implementation during peak summer months into consideration.	Understands sample calendar	Will evaluate idea to switch to the Payment Acceleration invoicing method from the start (based on calendar date rather than trade date)	Support any changes in the direction of getting paid sooner, but do not want to see any changes that sacrifice accuracy for speed
Client 6	In agreement with the timeline. Written comments - believes that the DA market can and should be settled on a weekly basis, upon implementation of MRTU.	Supports use of schedules rather than estimating meter data	Prefers the consistency of a fixed invoice date of the third Tuesday of the month. Written comments - supports monthly settlement as an initial settlement frequency but strongly recommends that the CAISO expand the scope to include weekly settlements.	Would ideally like to have a weekly invoice	No specific feedback on the sunset provision	Understands deployment schedule, however is concerned about implementation during peak summer months. CAISO agrees to take the concern regarding implementation during peak summer months into consideration. Written Comments - Strongly recommends to implement on Feb. 1st, 2009 or with MRTU Go-Live, whichever is later.	Understands sample calendar	Will evaluate idea to switch to the Payment Acceleration invoicing method from the start (based on calendar date rather than trade date)	Would like to see CAISO address default treatment and unsecured credit limits
Client 7	Understands the timeline	Comfortable with using the market schedules as the estimated meter data at T + 5B	No feedback on invoicing date	No feedback on frequency	Suggests implementing the sunset provision at MRTU go-live to prevent the need to keep the first six months of MRTU results and all legacy systems available with no end date	Understands deployment schedule	Understands sample calendar	No feedback on transition period	Would like to see CAISO cash clearing timelines line up better with WECC practices, which would include lining up the Inter-SC Trades settlement timeline. Supports CAISO's direction on moving on to a more dynamic assessment of aggregated credit liability
Client 8	Understands the timeline	Agree with using schedules for estimating meter data where there is no polled or submitted meter data	Fine with set invoicing date of the third Tuesday of the month	Prefer weekly from a credit management perspective and do not have an administrative burden associated with this greater frequency	Supports sunset provision as long as it is possible to override it with a FERC order	Understands the deployment schedule	Understands sample calendar	Achievable transition period; prefer for Settlements calendar to run its course over other approaches	Reviewed the responses to comments made through the prior stakeholder process on Payment Acceleration and suggests that CAISO close out some of the old issues still remaining on the website

Payment Acceleration - Client Outreach Result Matrix

	Scope				Implementation			Future Considerations	
Client 9	Understands the timeline	Agree with using schedules for estimating meter data where there is no polled or submitted meter data	Seen as a difficulty to implement. Expressed that the invoice must contain the level of detail to determine the sub-totals by charge code and month	Prefer monthly since any greater frequency would create an additional burden based on their accrual process	Agrees with the sunset provision and understands that a FERC order can override the sunset date	Understands the deployment schedule	Understands sample calendar	Achievable transition period	Suggests that DA schedules be settled separately as there is no dependence on meter data
Client 10	Understands the timeline	Agree with using schedules for estimating meter data where there is no polled or submitted meter data.	Prefer to have the invoice at month end + 10 days. This will require follow up discussion to understand the implications of reversal of accrual and other business impacts.	Prefers monthly Invoicing	Understands the benefits of the sunset provision.	Understands the implementation plan of six months after MRTU go-live. They need to check with their software vendor to see if they can meet this plan.	Understands sample calendar	The 90 day transition period would be achievable and prefer for the Settlements calendar to run its course over other approaches.	Suggests that the Market Simulation plan needs to be elaborated and any changes to configuration files would need to be known in advance.
Client 11	Understands the timeline	Agree with using schedules for estimating meter data where there is no polled or submitted meter data.	Sounds resonable, but would like to discuss with their Cash Management department.	Prefers monthly Invoicing	Understands the benefits and fully supports the sunset provision.	Strongly believes that PA will be considered "scope creep" if PA is incorporated with the MRTU go-live date. Agrees with propped 6 months after MRTU go live.	Did not discuss sample calendar	Achievable transition period, but needs to discuss with their Cash Management department.	
Client 12	Understands the timeline	Agree with using schedules for estimating meter data where there is no polled or submitted meter data.	A set invoicing date of the third Tuesday of the month is a potential issue for them. They initially preferred having the invoice at month end + 10 days, but will discuss the option of dual invoicing (1 st & 3 rd Tuesday's) internally and report back to CAISO. The challenge is with energy accounting.	Prefers Monthly Invoicing	Supports provision at 36 months	Understands the implementation plan to implement Payment Acceleration six months after the MRTU go-live and thinks that should be the minimum timeframe.	Understands sample calendar	Achievable transition period	Requested CAISO document their preference of monthly invoicing until they have the opportunity to further discuss their accounting issue and a potential semi-monthly invoice solution internally.
Client 13	Understands the timeline	Concerned about potential penalties for forecast errors.	Needs to take away and discuss internally	Needs to take away and discuss internally	Thought it was a good idea, but needs to review furhter internally.	Supports plan to implement 6 mo. After MRTU go-live. Feels an even longer window should be considered.	Did not discuss sample calendar	Did not discuss	Not is support of splitting DA and RT settlements. Would like follow-up meeting.

Payment Acceleration - Client Outreach Result Matrix

		Scope				Implementation			Future Considerations
Client 14	Initial bifurcation of DA and RT settlements to facilitate timely settlement of day ahead transactions.			Weekly settlement of DA markets		Implementation of changes to DA settlements at the same time as MRTU startup. Implementation of accelerated clearing for RT within 6 months of MRTU startup.			
Client 15	Possible bifurcation of the Day Ahead and Real Time settlements so that issuance of initial settlement statements with DA market results can occur on or about T+1 (with corresponding changes in subsequent settlement statements to settle the RT market).			Monthly, semi-monthly or weekly invoicing		Prefers deployment with MRTU go-live. If CAISO does not believe PA can be implemented by 2/1/09, then the earliest possible date should be used for planning purposes. Stable implementation of MRTU is essential, and an objective criteria should be developed to guide the timing of the implementation of payment acceleration relative to MRTU go-live.			CAISO should provide a comprehensive framework to help explain the costs and benefits of different approaches to implementing payment acceleration, and should present the impacts and risks to each system and process affected by the Payment Acceleration Project under alternate assumptions.