UNITEDSTATESOFAMERICA BEFORETHE FEDERALENERGYREGULATORYCOMMISSION

CaliforniaIndependentSystemOperator)	DocketNos.	ER02-1656-009,
Corporation)		ER02-1656-010,
)	and	ER02-1656-011

MOTIONOFTHECALIFORNIAINDEPENDENTSYS TEM OPERATORCORPORATIONFOREXTENSIONOFTIME TOMAKECOMPLIANCEFILING

Pursuant to Rule 212 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal

Energy Regulatory Commission ("Commission"), 18 C.F.R. § 385.212, the California

Independent System Op erator Corporation ("ISO") ¹ respectfully requests an extension

in the time permitted to make its filing in compliance with the Commission's November

27,2002orderinthisproceeding.

I. Background

InanorderissuedonDecember19,2001,theCommission directed the ISO "to file by May 1, 2002 its revised congestion management proposal and a plan for

¹ Capitalized terms not otherwised efined herein are defined in the Master Definitions Supplement, ISOT ariff Appendix A, as filed August 15, 1997, and subsequently revised.

² *CaliforniaIndependentSystemOperatorCorp* ., *etal* .,101FERC¶ 61,266(2002)("November27 Order").

implementationofaday -aheadmarket." ³OnMay1,2002,theISOfiledthefirstpartof itscomprehensiveMarketDesign2002proposal,or"MD02"proposal, withtheintention offollowingthedirectionoftheDecember19Orderandaddressingknowndeficiencies intheISO'sexistingmarketdesign("May 1Filing").TheISOdividedtheelementsofits redesignintothreephases,reflectingthetiminginwhich eachelementoftheproposal wouldbeimplemented.

The Commission issued an order on the May 1 Filing on July 17, 2002. ⁴ In this order, the Commission accepted, rejected, and modified various elements of the May 1 Filing. Afterruling on the Phase Id esignelements, the Commission directed the ISO to hold Technical Conferences with stakeholders to refine and develop further its Phase II and III designelements. July 17 Order at **3**.

AttheCommission -sponsoredTechnicalConferenceinSanFranciscoon August 13-14,2002,theISOadvisedMarketParticipantsandCommissionStaffofthestatusof MD02 implementation. Atthis conference the timeline for implementing MD02 Phases II and III, and the specific market design elements that might be implemented in each Phase, were discussed extensively. As part of the discussions, and at the direction of Commission Staff, the ISO investigated whether it could accelerate implementing a forward energy market and subsequently indicated that it would be possible by January 31,2003 to implementa "Phase IILite" concept, including anhourly, Day -Ahead energy market on a zonal basis (by eliminating the balanced schedule requirement and the

2

³ San Diego Gas & Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy and Ancillary Services into Markets Operated by the California Independent System Operator C orporation and the California Power Exchange,etal., 97FERC¶ 61,275(2001)("December19Order")at62,257.

⁴ *CaliforniaIndependentSystemOperatorCorporation, etal.,* 100FERC¶ 61,060(2002)("July17 Order").

marketseparationrule), and move the Hour - A head market closer to real time. T he ISO did not advocate adopting Phase II Lite, however.

In an Order issued on October 11, 2002, ⁵ the Commission directed the ISO to implementPhaseIILitebyJanuary31,2003.October11Orderat¶ 85.

On November 8, the ISO requested rehearing of the October 11 Order. Among other issues the ISO raised in the Request for Rehearing was the date by which Phase II Lite could be implemented, together with the desirability of implementing it at any time.

In the November 27 Order, the Commission acknow ledged the concerns about implementing Phase II Lite that the ISO had raised in its Request for Rehearing, and ruled that the ISO was no longer required to implement Phase II Lite by January 31, 2003. November 27 Order at ¶ 7. Instead, the Commission dir ected the ISO to file "a full implementation plan" regarding the elements of MD02, including the timeline for rolloutofthevariousdesignelements, the software required at each step along the way, the vendors to provide such software, and an account of thecostsinvolvedinsoftware Id. at ¶ 8. The Commission ordered the ISO to file the and hardware development. implementation plan by January 6, 2003 and to provide updates on the plan on a monthlybasisthereafter. *Id*.at¶ 9.

At the ISO's request, a technical conference was held on December 9, 2002 "to assess the progress of the Stakeholder Working Groups, and to facilitate continued discussions between the CAISO and stakeholders regarding the development of the remaining elements of the CAISO market redesign and to identify related

3

⁵ *CaliforniaIndependentSystemO peratorCorporation, etal.,* 101FERC¶ 61,061(2002)("October 110rder").

implementation issues." *California Independent System Operator Corp* ., "Notice of TechnicalConference,"November8,2002.

II. RequestforExtensionofTime

The ISO greatly appreciates the accommodation made by the Comm ission in removing the requirement for the ISO to file Phase II Lite by January 31, 2003. Moreover, the ISO is anxious to provide the Commission with the information required in theformoftheMD02fullimplementationplan.TheISOisawarethatsucha planwould be a useful tool both to the Commission and to stakeholders involved in the MD02 process. Nonetheless, due to the press of other vital business, the intervening holiday season, the need to reflect consultations with other ISOs, the need to take intoaccount additional issues that were raised and existing issues that were modified as a result of the December Technical Conference, as well as the need to address additional requirements from the December Technical Conference beyond those set forth i nthe November 27th Order, the ISO will not be able to comply with the Commission's direction to file a full implementation plan and the additional reporting requirements 6 imposed on the ISO at the December Technical Conference by January 6.

Therefore, the ISO requests a limited extension of time to file the full implementationplanasdirected in the November 27 Order. The ISO requests that it be permitted to make this filing on January 10, 2003, four days later than required by the

4

⁶ Although, as the Commission notes in the November 27 Order at n. 8, the ISO does brief its Board of Governors regarding the status of MD02 implementation on a monthly basis, thi sbriefing does not lend itself to filing with the Commission, as it takes the form of an oral presentation supported by bullet point slides. Moreover, the information provided to the Board of Governors is in the nature of an overview, and does not includ ethelevel of detail the Commission has directed the ISO to provide in the fullimplementation plan.

November 27 Order. Th is should allow the filing to meet all of the requirements set forthbytheCommissioninitsNovember27OrderandattheTechnicalConference.

III. Conclusion

For these reasons, the ISO requests that the Commission grant an extension of time, as discu ssed above, to make the filing required to comply with the November 27 Order.

Respectfullysubmitted,

CharlesF.Robinson GeneralCounsel MargaretRostker RegulatoryCounsel TheCaliforniaIndependent SystemOperatorCorporation 151BlueRavineRoad Folsom,CA95630 Tel:(916)608 -7135 <u>/s/JuliaMoore</u> KennethG.Jaffe DavidB.Rubin JuliaMoor e SwidlerBerlinShereffFriedman,LLP 3000KStreet,N.W.,Suite300 Washington,DC20007 Tel:(202)424 -7500

Dated: January3,2003

CERTIFICATEOFSERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each

person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in the above

captioneddockets.

DatedatWash ington,DC,onthis3 rddayofJanuary,2003.

_/s/ *JuliaMoore*____ JuliaMoore

Submission Contents	
ISO_MOT_EXT.DOC	
ISO_MOT_EXT.DOC······	1-6