Table of Contents:

1   PURPOSE

This initial listing of frequently asked questions provides answers to specific SC questions raised during the Preparatory Rerun of the October to November 2000 period. The list of frequently asked questions will be supplemented as the rerun progresses.

2   FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. File Headers

1.1. What are the file headers and where can they be found?

The CAISO file Specification contains the details regarding the files, including the headers. File Specification are published on the CAISO website.

Link: www.caiso.com/clientserv/settlements/

2. File Format

2.1. What is the file format on the data disks?

File Name	Abbreviation	Trade date range	Spec File Version
Gross Intertie	GI	10/2/00- 12/11/00	12.1
		12/12/00 – 12/31/00	12.2a
GMC	GM	10/2/00- 12/11/00	12.1
		12/12/00 – 12/31/00	12.2a
Ancillary services	AS	10/2/00 – 6/20/01	15.1
Imbalance Energy	IE	10/2/00 – 6/20/01	15.1
Preliminary Summary	P	10/2/00 – 6/20/01	15.1
GMC Wheeling	GW	1/1/01 – 6/20/01	15.1
Zonal MCP	ZP	10/2/00 – 6/20/01	15.1

Please note: As of 1/1/01, the Gross Intertie (GI) and GMC (GM), files were replaced by the GMC Wheeling (GW) file.

3. Dispute Timeline

3.1. What is the dispute process for this re-run?

The SC can dispute up to 30-business day after the last day of the rerun month is published. For example, the SC can dispute up to Feb 17, 2004 for October 2000 data (30 business days from Jan 5, 2004, the day the CAISO published October 31, 2000).

4. Data Delivery Timeline

4.1. When can we expect the data disks?

The data disk will be delivered on or before the day the statements are published. The CAISO will regularly send out market notices with the schedules for rerun adjustments and expected CD delivery dates.

4.2. When will the re-run days show on the Settlement statements?

The CAISO publishes a Rerun calendar, including updates on market notices

4.3. I received a rerun statements disk for October 02, 2000 to October 24, 2000. Are these all the dates that have been released so far?

CAISO delivered: October 2, 2000 to October 24, 2000 on December 16, 2003; October 25, 2000 to November 13, 2000 on December 22, 2003; November 14, 2000 to November 30, 2000 on January 6, 2004; and December 1, 2000 to December 5, 2000 on January 12, 2004.

5. Difference Between this Re-run and the FERC Compliance Case

5.1. Please explain the difference between the Preparatory re-run and the FERC compliance re-run.

The Preparatory re-run incorporates 17 primary issues to establish a "baseline" database, to which the CAISO will apply the mitigated prices. Applying the mitigated prices occurs during the FERC compliance phase. During the FERC Compliance phase, no new data (other than the price changes) will be introduced.

6. Purpose of the Data Disks

6.1. What are the data disks used for?

The Data disk contains the rerun settlement detail files plus summaries for the detail files calculations, which will help the SCs in validating their rerun statements, and the SCs will be invoiced based on the Prelim Statements at a later date (expected to occur as part of a market clearing after the refund rerun)

7. Statement File Version used (production vs. re-run)

7.1. Please explain the difference between the re-run and production statement file versions.

The PSS is version 15.3, now updated to 15.4 while the CDs that were sent out were version 15.1.

There is no difference between the file specifications in 15.1 and 15.4 except CAISO modified the charge type matrix. Whenever the Charge type Matrix changes, requiring that a new version number be assigned, the CAISO will update the version of the File Specification for consistency with the Charge Type Matrix.

7.2. The downloaded version and disk version of our Reruns are different. Which one should I use?

The PSS is version 15.3, now updated to 15.4 while the CDs that were sent out were version 15.1.

There is no difference between the file specifications in 15.1 and 15.4 except CAISO modified the charge type matrix.

7.3. Which version are we going to be invoiced on?

The CAISO will use the version in place at the time the invoice occurs.

8. Purpose of Re-run

8.1. Why are we doing this re-run?

The Preparatory rerun is being done to correct the Settlements baseline data. The issues being corrected are outlined in Attachment A of the Settlements A-51 Compliance filing.

9. How to validate the Statements based on the Disk

9.1. The information downloaded and on the CD is different. Which one is right?

Both are correct, The CD is based on the batch calculation, after including new information, but before performing the manual adjustments.

The CD originally contained a breakdown of the rerun calculations and manual adjustments. This has created some confusion among the SCs as the old manual adjustments or the "A" records are not needed to validate the statements. Beginning with re-run date Dec 1, 2000 the CDs will no longer contain the "A" records.

The adjustments that appear on the Preliminary rerun statement are the difference between the original settlements and the rerun "D" records from the CD.

For example:

Original D record = $100.00

Manual Adjustment = $20.00

Original Summary = $120.00

Rerun "D" record = $150.00

A manual adjustment of additional $30.00 will appear on the SC's rerun statement.

Please note: If there is no difference between what was originally settled and rerun calculation: either an adjustment for $ 0.00 will appear on the Prelim Statement or no adjustments will be made.

10. Responses from January 26, 2004 Conference Call

10.1. The ISO agreed to maintain a current document on its website that will assist SCs in tracking the various versions of trade date data that have been issued. When will the ISO begin numbering versions as requested?

ISO has posted on the web a rerun calendar that has all the information about any adjustments that the ISO made in addition to the schedule. The ISO Settlements System does not provide the requested versioning on the manual adjustments.

10.2. The ISO agreed to maintain an updated calendar for the Preparatory Rerun process on its website. Will the ISO include both projected data production dates as well as dispute deadlines as part of that calendar? If there is a rerun of a trade date, does that mean that all disputes for that date then have a new dispute window? If not, how does the ISO plan to distinguish between which aspects of that day have a new dispute window and which don't in the updated calendar?

The ISO has posted the calendar on the ISO website on Friday January 30, 2004. Also the calendar has the updated dispute timeline and all the adjustments that the ISO made in addition to the schedule.

The Dispute window in general will not be adjusted due to minor corrections. The overall dispute period was set to approximately 6 business weeks, so in most cases there will be sufficient time to review small charge changes that occur within this period.

10.3.   The ISO stated on the call that the manual records relating to refund trade dates that are being published on individual SC current statements would be provided on a market-wide basis to requesting parties. We would like to request receiving these manual records for all SCs.

The purpose of the Preparatory rerun is to correct the baseline data and rerun Settlements System amidst a tight schedule. The ISO has been providing information to all the SCs to validate their statements. Manual records for all SCs will not be published at this point.

10.4.   The ISO indicated that neutrality would be applied to pre-refund period adjustments. Does the ISO plan to have pre-refund participants pay for pre-refund adjustments? Did the "walling-off" requested by the ISO in Amendment 51 apply to pre-refund as well as refund period adjustments?

Yes, The Pre-refund participants will pay for the Pre-refund period and the "wall off" applies to both the prior and the FERC Refund Period.

10.5.   How is it that the ISO is able to proceed with calculating the MMCP while there are potential changes to MCP that has not been through a review and dispute process? It is our understanding that any transaction that is able to set MCP is also able to set MMCP. Does the ISO agree with this understanding? If yes, would these MMCPs be preliminary in nature?

Yes. The ISO is calculating a MMCP based on the set of additional non-congestion OOS transactions eligible to set the MCP provided by Settlements. To the extent this list of additional non-congestion OOS transactions is subject to a review and dispute process, these MMCPs may be considered preliminary. However, the ISO intents release these preliminary MMCPs and underlying data as soon as possible so that other aspects of how these preliminary MMCP were calculated may also be reviewed. The ISO hopes to release these preliminary MMCPs by the end of this week

10.6.   The Jan 26 Market Notice states that the ISO introduced new software to price Ancillary Services. We understand the ISO will describe the correction to the software in a "cookbook" explanation similar to that being provided for each of the Amendment 51 preparatory adjustments. Has the ISO made other changes to its software that were not described in Amendment 51 that result in changes to prices or quantities that appear on settlement statements?

The ISO has made no other distinctive software changes after Amendment-51. But the ISO has continuously upgraded the software versions over time, and the most current software version that was used in production during the A-51 filing is used for the Preparatory rerun.

10.7.   The Jan. 26 Market Notice states that ISO discovered errors relating to Option B Price. Were these errors present in original settlement statements? Are there other settlement errors that have been detected that were present in the original settlement statements? If so, what are they?

Yes, the original statements contained errors pertaining to Option B Prices. ISO has and will continue communicating with the Market Participants regarding the errors that are encountered with the Rerun statements.

10.8.   The Jan. 26 Market Notice states that CAISO discovered errors in CT 401, 1010 and 1210. Are these solely due to the three items listed below this statement?

Yes. The reason for the errors was isolated to the three issues that were described in the market notice.

10.9.   The Jan. 26 Market Notice states that where the miss-logging corrections led to recalculated MCPs above OOS bids, manual adjustments will be made to compensate suppliers at the new MCP levels. Will the charges for this increase in compensation be allocated via CT1010, and when will such allocations be included in settlement statements?

Yes. The corrections that appeared on the 11/25/03 Preliminary Statement consisted of both the charge to the SCs under CT 401 and allocation of the charge to the market under CT 1010 and CT 1210.

10.10.   The Jan. 12 Market Notice gave notice of an error on the 11/5-11/20 statements, with respect to manual adjustments not having been reversed out. Was this error limited to the preparatory rerun or was some or all of the error also present in the original settlement statements? In the process of creating a new automatic run, does the ISO eliminate all previous manual adjustments? If so, why?

The error was isolated to the Preparatory rerun only. The ISO reverses out the last adjustments made and recalculates manual adjustments based on the new system calculations. The reason behind this is the old adjustments are made based on the old system calculation. There is one exception to this rule: disputes are not reversed and redone.

10.11.   On the ISO call, the ISO indicated that it would study and report back on what issues would change historical MCP.

This information is provided in the Rerun Process Overview documents posted on the ISO web site under issue 17.

10.12. On the ISO call, the ISO indicated that it would study and report back to us regarding written questions that were previously submitted on January 23, 2004 and that were not answered on the call.

> ISO will answer and post as many questions as possible by Tuesday, February 3, 2004 on the CAISO website.

10.13. Given all the corrections being made to the daily settlement statements, will the ISO also be reissuing market-wide data on CD's? Many of these corrections to settlement statements have occurred after CD's were received by SCs.

> No, the ISO will not reissue the CDs as the errors were "fixed" with the manual workarounds and system recalculation was not required. Therefore the CD information did not change.

10.14. Will the ISO provide details on what part of the November 14, 2003 FERC Order it is implementing in its reruns?

> The ISO will implement all applicable parts of the Commission's order in the matter of Tariff Amendment 51, FERC Docket No.ER03-746. It will provide all relevant information as indicated to the Commission.

10.15. For Preparatory rerun Issues #11, #15, and #17, the ISO had not previously provided dollar impacts in their Amendment 51 compliance filing, Attachment A. Now that the Preparatory rerun is underway for these issues, can the ISO provide estimated dollar impacts for these items?

> For issue 17, the ISO will publish the OLD MCP and the NEW MCP by Trade date, Trade hr and Sub hour interval on the ISO Website. Dollar impacts for AS software (issue 15) and Intra zonal Congestion (issue 11) are difficult to estimate, but ISO will continue to explore any summary data that can be provided.

10.16. The Jan. 12 Market Notice gave notice of an error on the 11/5-11/20 statements, with respect to manual adjustments not having been reversed out. Was this error limited to the preparatory rerun or was some or all of the error also present in the original settlement statements? In the process of creating a new automatic run, does the ISO eliminate all previous manual adjustments? If so, why?

> To clarify, the ISO did not utilize a feasibility test to determine which of the transactions was OOS non-congestion. As directed in the FERC order, the ISO converted all GG exceptions to OOS, than used OSMOSIS and SLIC to identify which transactions were non-congestion. Of the total 71,349 GG exceptions, 660 were found ineligible to set the MCP because they were congestion related. The ISO then determined which of 70,689 OOS non-congestion transactions involved pricing that would reset the MCP, as only these transactions would have been eligible to set the MCP. The ISO looked at bids (price and quantity) for each of the OOS non congestion transactions and compared them to the actual dispatch level so that bids were consistent with the actual volume of power dispatched

11. Neutrality

11.1.   Is the ISO preparatory rerun introducing the possibility for duplicate payments for neutrality? For example, consider the following:

There are two periods: Period 1 and Period 2. Period 1 is during the refund period. Period 2 is after the refund period.

Suppose in Period 2, a meter error was discovered relating to Period 1 and SC X supplied a larger quantity of energy to the ISO than was previously recognized.

This meter error is corrected through a manual adjustment in Period 2 associated with the trade date in Period 1.

Because the manual adjustment occurs in Period 2, participants in Period 2 paid for it through neutrality. This neutrality payment is associated with the Period 2 trade date.

When the ISO conducts a preparatory rerun for Period 1 that absorbs this meter mistake into the automatic system, the automatic system calculates a new neutrality payment to pay for this adjustment, *again*.

Because a neutrality payment was made to pay for this refund period adjustment outside of the refund period, the walled-off preparatory rerun does not see this. The preparatory rerun merely recalculates what neutrality should have been, and compared to the original neutrality records in the refund period, more money is due to the ISO.

Thus, SCs in Period 1 will cumulatively pay the same neutrality adjustment that had already been paid in Period 2.

ISO agrees up to Step # 11.4.

Participants from Period 1 will bear the charges/credits for the neutrality and not from Period 2 even when the rerun adjustment is made during the Period 2. Therefore ISO does not agree with the rest of the example.

12. Energy Exchange

12.1.   Will the ISO provide a summary of the various Energy Exchange Program (EEP) including the dates they were effective and the return ratios associated with them?

Yes. The EEP summary has been posted on the web at http://www.caiso.com/docs/2004/02/20/2004022016375212796.xls.

12.2.   According to the cookbook, under "Expected Impact" #1, the ISO states it will reverse all previously made manual adjustments associated with the energy exchange. Will the ISO provide the database that results from that reversal?

Yes. The ISO will provide the detail on the CDs, in settlement details with the new manual adjustments. The reversals will be only for the months of Nov00, Dec00 and Jun01, as these are the only months previously in production. And the reversals are only for BA 2970, as there have been no allocations of EEP net costs to date.

12.3.   In the Background section of the cookbook, the ISO states, "with the advent of Amendment 33, effective December 8, 2000, the excess costs were allocated to the net uninstructed deviations in the return period." Does "excess costs" here refer to total

costs of energy returned or the costs of energy above the MCP? Can the ISO confirm that this is different than the newly calculated "net costs" which will be allocated according to net negative deviation over the receiving period?

> The cookbook reference, "with the advent of Amendment 33, effective December 8, 2000, the excess costs were allocated to the net uninstructed deviations in the return period," is to excess cost of energy above the MCP. This is different from the EEP "net costs". [Excess cost of energy above the MCP is <u>any</u> MW that is procured above MCP, <u>not only EEP</u> MWs. EEP "net costs" may include MWs procured above MCP.]

12.4.   According to the cookbook, the ISO calculates net costs when an "energy exchange account is closed or reaches a zero MWh balance." Does the zero MWh balance condition account for the exchange multiple or is it counting received and returned MWh one for one?

> Yes. The "zero MWh balance condition" in an EEP account is considering the exchange multiple. Each exchange account has a running total of MWs to be returned until the exchange agreement is fully satisfied.
> Example:
> "Zero MWh balance condition" is achieved when CAISO borrows 100 MWs at 1:2 ratios from Control Area XYZ and returns 200 MWs the next day, and no other exchange MWs have been received from Control Area XYZ prior to the return of the <u>200th MW</u>.
> "Zero MWh balance condition" is achieved when CAISO borrows 100 MWs at 1:2 ratio from Control Area ABC, returns 25 MWs the same day during off peak hours, the next day again borrows 100 MWs at 1:2 ratio from Control Area ABC, then returns 375 MWs five days later without borrowing any more MWs from Control Area ABC prior to the return of the 400th MW or <u>last MW to be returned</u>.

12.5.   Is CT1487 the charge type for accumulating the net costs for an energy exchange program but not for allocating the net costs? The settlement records produced thus far in the preparatory rerun process do indicate CT1487 as holding the total amount but not being used to allocate that total amount. If CT1487 is not the allocation charge type, which charge type is used to allocate the amounts calculated in CT1487? The ISO's Amendment 51 compliance filing indicates that CT487 will be used to allocate the amounts calculated in CT1487. If CT487 is used for holding the allocation amounts, what charge type is used before December 12, 2000?

> Yes. Charge Type (CT) 1487 is used for allocating the net costs. See question 2.9 below for information regarding the CT 1487 transaction on November 30, 2000. Business Associate 2970 (SC_ID ISO1) is the "pseudo" account for accumulating the net costs. There are no CT 1487 allocations to date because none of the EEP accounts have reached a "zero MWh balance condition" during the preparatory rerun. CT 487 is the CT for allocating "excess costs" from CT 481.

12.6.   Is the allocation of CT1487 amounts conducted using manual records?

> No. The settlement system identifies the EEP transactions, identifies the EEP users, and calculates the "net cost" allocation. The allocation will be entered as a

"manual" adjustment in order to provide additional information in the comment field.

12.7.   On what trade date, will the allocation of CT1487 amounts appear?
The EEP "net cost" allocations will appear for the first time shortly after the first exchange account achieves a "zero MWh balance condition" on trade date 12/18/00.

12.8.   Do the settlement files record the allocation quantity for the individual SCs (as well as the total) that the ISO calculates in order to perform its allocation of CT1487 amounts?
Yes. Each SC will have the detail of their individual billable quantity, settlement amount, and a comment. The comment field will provide the total details from which the allocation was calculated. Example: "ENERGY EXCHANGE PROGRAM FOR ACCOUNT PACW_CISO_EXCH FROM 10-DEC-2000 TO 31-DEC-2000. TOTAL AMOUNT = 3008137.53; TOTAL UE = -147451.7089"

12.9.   The sample comment given in the cookbook (Assumptions #3) does not match the style of comment that appears for SC 2970 on November 30, 2000. The November 30, 2000 record lacks the details that appear in the sample comment. Why is this the case?
Business Associate 2970 (SC_ID ISO1) is only a "pseudo" business associate (i.e. holding account). An end of month transaction is generated by the system to avoid producing a settlement invoice for BA 2970. Note the balance for BA 2970 is zero for November. At the end of any month with allocations, the allocations will also be included in the system-generated CT 1487 transaction.

12.10.   How does the ISO plan to treat energy exchange programs that begin during the refund period but that do not close out until after the refund period?
All exchange accounts between the CAISO and other control areas were zero as of June 20, 2001.

12.11.   Please explain the methodology for determining the price of energy exchange transactions both in the receiving and the return periods.
The **receiving period** energy is treated as Out-Of-Sequence (OOS) Instructed Energy and is valued at the Incremental MCP for the interval. The **returning period** energy is treated as Real-Time Operation Adjustments and is valued at the Incremental Price for the interval to ensure the return energy value includes any above-MCP energy costs that may have been incurred.

12.12.   Specifically, in the receiving period, did the ISO price the value of the energy based on the "incremental energy" it would otherwise have purchased from the market, or the average price of the energy it did purchase, or some other approach? In the delivery period, did the ISO price the cost of the energy based on the highest price energy purchased by the ISO, or the average price of all energy purchased, or some other approach?
Receiving and Returning period energy is valued as 'Incremental'. Receiving is 'Incremental MCP' and Returning is 'Incremental Price to include excess cost'.

12.13.   What was the basis for whatever approach the ISO used?
The ISO determined the program allocation based on cost causation. The total cost to bring the market settlement neutral are shifted back to the original net negative deviators, whose initial shortfall necessitated the transaction.

13. Master File - Issue # 5

13.1.   We have not seen any impacts yet from Issue #5. Can the ISO verify that the issue does not affect settlements until after December 5, 2000? Previous ISO guidance stated that Issue #5 started November 6, 2000.

       Yes. Issue 5 affects Settlements from December 2000 onwards.

14. AS Obligation - Issue # 15

14.1.   Given the error in software as described by the ISO in its Issue #15 documentation, how did the ISO achieve balance in payments and receipts for ancillary services in the original settlements? With this software fix, does something need to be reversed on the original settlements beyond the charge types of ancillary service payments due to the ISO?

       The pro rata share amounts were adjusted between those SCs that had AS obligation to achieve balance.

       No, nothing is reversed on the original statement. The Settlements System will generate Deltas (difference between the Rerun calculation and the Original calculation) that appears on the SCs statements in the form of manual adjustments.

15. RESPONSES FROM APRIL 15, 2004 CONFERENCE CALL

15.1.   As original settlements are being compared to re-runs, I am noticing that the prices reflected in the original settlements are not as they arrear on the statements. In other words, if one were to take a value and divide it by quantity, one would obtain a different price other that the price noted in the settlement statements. I mention this because what I am seeing is that as manual records are reversed and re-billed a different amount and qty is invoiced. As I compare the settlements on the bid curves I am noticing that in some cases settled prices are lower than bid in for OOS and In-sequence bids. Can the ISO please explain why this is the case and if a correction is planned? Also, the other concern is the change in the quantity during the refund phase?

       We need to review a sample data set to determine out why the Prices are different. Below are some examples of when the SC can expect to see the Price change:

Example:1

	OOS	OOS Price	Bq*Price	In Seq	MCP	Bq * Price	CT 401 BQ	CT 401 Price	Stlmt_Amt
Original	1.11	$300.00	($333.00)	1.01	$250.00	($252.50)	2.12	$276.18	($585.50)
Rerun CD	1.11	$300.00	($333.00)	1.01	$250.00	($252.50)	2.12	$276.18	($585.50)

RR Manual Adj	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		$ -	$ -

In Example 1

OOS = 1.11 MW * $300 = ($333.00)

In Seq = 1.01 MW * $250 = ($252.50)

Total STLM AMT = ($585.5) (that is (333.00) +(252.50))

Price = $(585.5) / 2.12MW = $276.18

Example:2

	OOS	Price	Bq * Price	In Seq	MCP	Bq * Price	CT 401 BQ	CT 401 Price	Stlmt_Amt
Original	45.9	$250.00	(11,475.00)	$0.00	$250.00	$0.00	45.9	$250.00	($11,475.00)
Rerun	19.5	$250.00	(4,875.00)	$0.00	$250.00	$0.00	19.56	$250.00	($4,875.00)
RR Manual Adj	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	**-19.56**	**$337.42**	**$6,600.00**

In Example 2

OOS = 45.9 MWH * $250 = ($11,475)

For Rerun

On CD

OOS = 19.56 MW * $250 = ($4,875)

First calculate the dollar adjustment:

STLMT AMT = $6,600 (($4,875) – ($11,475))

Then the system calculates the rerun BQ of 19.6 MW (when the Bill Qty changes between the original and rerun, the system uses the rerun BQ to calculate Delta) and back calculates a price of $335.03

Therefore,

Price = $6,600 /19.6MW = $335.03

15.2.   How does the ISO calculate the CT 485 Price? Hourly vs. Sub hourly?

The CT 485 is an hourly charge type. The CT 485 Price is twice the highest price paid in an hour. (It is 2 times the highest interval price during the hour). Please refer to the following link:
http://www.caiso.com/docs/2000/12/08/200012081434720066.pdf

15.3.   Can the CAISO please explain the reason for reversing CT 485-Insufficient Response to AWE Instruction daily and re-billing with the last trade date of the month for the whole month? This is very deceiving as one monitors the daily financial impact of the re-runs and adds an extra layer of review to an already complex process.

The last trade date of each month is used for CT485 calculation out of necessity. CT485 is calculated manually (by the ISO's Compliance Department) and the pace of the rerun made daily presentation of the data infeasible. Rather than

leave it out of this phase, we instead chose to use month-end for data presentation. Many of these prices will be mitigated during the next phase of the process. Please refer to the market notice that went out on January 26, 2004.

15.4.   My initial review of the preparatory calendar showed May 7,2004 as the cutoff for Dec 2000 disputes, however, I recently double checked the dates and noticed April 30,2004, as the Dec 2000 dispute cutoff. Can the CAISO please explain the reason for the change in the cutoff?

> The cutoff date was originally changed from 5/7 back to 4/30 for tariff consistency. The "30 business days from the last trade date of the month statement publishing" requirement from FERC results in a due date of 4/30 and not 5/7. This date was changed, but since the ISO plans to extend that date to support PX timing. The new extended dispute timeline for December 00 will be May 28, 2004. An updated rerun calendar is posted on the ISO web site.

15.5.   For the month of Dec 2000, the ISO stopped the re-run process partially due to manual line items that were reversed that should not have been reversed. The CAISO went back and corrected some of these reversals but not all, is the CAISO done with this process?

> Yes, the ISO is done with known production work for December 2000. Additional adjustments may occur, based on disputed items.

15.6.   Please confirm or deny whether some dispute related manual adjustments are automatically corrected by the system rerun. If the previous statement is confirmed, please indicate whether ISO has reversed that subset of disputed related manual adjustments and how SCs can identify those corrections.

> Yes, some manual disputes are corrected by the system re-run. Specifically, disputes relating to the OOM call, which have been uploaded into a system template. Yes, the ISO has reversed these manual disputes and they can be identified by reading the description text, which states, "dispute reversal". In addition the following Ref Ids can also be used: R71, R4 , R5.
> Disputes that are not fixed in the Prep rerun will be fixed with the Refund Rerun.

15.7.   Please confirm or deny whether the second set of System Rerun resulted in a different set of allocation factors than the ones calculated from the first set of System Rerun. Deny. The allocation factors (metered demand) did not change between the first run and the second run. The generation meter data for PX was not zeroed out where the SC was getting charged for load and paid for the Generation. Also the PMAX value used was incorrect. Therefore the rerun calculations impacted Imbalance Energy, No Pay, UFE etc

15.8.   Please describe the process ISO goes through to identify Reversals and New adjustments.

> Reversing out previous adjustments is a manual process. The latest adjustments have to be reversed. The analyst can identify the latest adjustments based on the file date/creation date. The reversals will have a ref id of either R# or RN#.

15.9. Please state when the "cutover" took place (by file date and trade date) from System Rerun 1 and System Rerun 2 and back to the System Rerun 1. Please state when each "cutover" Settlement Statement and the CDs containing Detail Files were sent out to the SCs. Furthermore, please state when complete sets of Settlement Files (Settlement Statements and corresponding Detail Files) were sent out to the SCs
The ISO has posted the rerun calendar on the web that shows all the dates when the ISO published the data. The CDs also had the dates they were mailed to the SCs on the label.

15.10. Please explain in detail what quality control measures are in place to coordinate all the manual adjustments that are being made by multiple analysts. In addition, please explain what sort of quality control measures are in place to validate whether ISO has made all Rerun related adjustments correctly.
There is no way to ensure 100% accuracy across the board in any business process. But the ISO has introduced significant internal controls to ensure accuracy with the rerun statements. Some of the controls are:
- Internal audit team: that reviews all the rerun processes, ensures documentation is current.
- SAS 70 system audit: to ensure the system generates the results as they are expected to.
- Internal Validation: A validator has been assigned who ensures all the adjustments made follows some guidelines.
- Documentation: all process are well documented and updated regularly
- Training: Extensive in-house training is provided to all analyst to ensure consistency and accuracy

16. ASSUMPTIONS
16.1. The answers provided are based on general questions related to the Preparatory Rerun. SC specific questions may vary and should be handled on a case-by-case basis.