Stakeholder Comments Template

Subject: Payment Acceleration Proposal

This template has been created for submission of stakeholder comments on the following topics in regards to Payment Acceleration. Upon completion of this template please submit (in MS

Submitted by	Company	Date Submitted
Mike Strong Manager – Settlements & Systems *858-650-6154*	*SDG&E*	*October 24, 2008*

Word) to pacceleration@caiso.com. Submissions are requested by close of business on October 24th, 2008.

Please submit your comments to the following questions for each topic in the spaces indicated.

1. **Bifurcation of DA/RT, Estimation & Settlement Timeline Options**
   During the Payment Acceleration Stakeholder meeting on October 16th, 2008, alternatives were discussed in regards to the Settlements timeline, estimation, and bifurcation of DA/RT settlements. The following options were discussed:

   - Option #1 - Add a Settlement calculation at T+9B (in addition to the proposed 'DA only' calculation at T+2B). This would provide a settlement run for RT charges prior to the proposed T+50B timeline, as well as allow for a DA/RT bifurcation at T+2B. The T+9B calculation would use one of the following estimation options absent polled or SC submitted data availability:
     o DA IFM Schedules Only
     o DA IFM + adjustment based on CAISO Actual Load
     o Current Credit Liability Meter Data estimation (uses the IFM DA schedule and adder of + /- 10% factor (or other % Factor).
     In addition, T+9B would replace the T+7B credit run.

   - Option #2 - Replace the proposed T+2B DA Only Settlement calculation with a T+5B calculation that includes both DA and RT charge codes. The T+5B calculation would use an estimation methodology based upon hourly load forecast data, which is used for all real-time load settlement calculations prior to receiving actual meter data. In addition, T+5B would replace the T+7B credit run.

	Timeline	Estimation
Option #1	T+2B – DA Only T+9B – DA &RT T+50B – 1st true-up T+100B – 2nd true-up	One of three proposed options (i.e. DA IFM schedules)

	T+18M - 3rd true-up T+35M - 4th true-up	
Option #2	T+5B – DA &RT T+50B – 1st true-up T+100B – 2nd true-up T+18M - 3rd true-up T+35M - 4th true-up	DA schedules + hourly load forecast data

Please provide comments on these options:

SDG&E Response: SDG&E advocates postponing these options until the ISO and market participants attain reliable processing of MRTU settlement statements. Attempts to implement this any sooner, such as concurrent with MRTU go-live, would add further demands on both ISO and market participant settlement staffs already impacted by the complexity of MRTU settlement statements.

2. **Methodology for Estimating Meter Data**
   SCE has suggested the CAISO to seek additional alternatives to the three estimation options presented on September 18th. In particular, SCE recommends the CAISO to investigate the meter estimation methodology used by the New York ISO. It is their understanding that the NYISO methodology is based upon hourly load forecast data which is used for all real-time load settlement calculations prior to receiving actual meter data. NYISO has been using this methodology since its market inception in 1999 and may provide the CAISO with a fair and viable alternative to the estimation approaches currently being proposed.

   CAISO is exploring this option. Would you support an estimation methodology based on hourly load forecasts?

   SDG&E Response: Although SDG&E is not familiar with the New York ISO model, conceptually an estimation methodology based on hourly load forecasts should be superior to estimation based on day ahead schedules or load forecasts. Use of an hourly load forecasts should be a more accurate estimation of actual load as because they would account for changes closer to real time conditions as compared to day ahead forecasts or schedules.

3. **Implementation Schedule**
   Do you a support the phased implementation approach discussed in the October 16th Stakeholder Meeting? Assuming invoicing remains the same as the MRTU implementation (monthly at month-end), could you support an accelerated timeline within 1-3 months post MRTU go-live? .

   SDG&E Response: Any phased implementation would be superior to payment acceleration concurrent with the implementation of MRTU. SDG&E recommends implementing

payment acceleration 6 months after MRTU implementation but only if the ISO's processing of settlement statements has been successful.

4. **Invoicing**
   Would you support an invoice solution that meets the following criteria?

   - Does not mix initial and true-up statements from previous accounting months
   - Includes trade dates from a specific month only, but not necessarily includes trade dates that encompass a full month (i.e. could include a partial month).
   - Monthly charges are on invoice that included the month end date.

   Please provide detailed examples of your preferred invoicing solution.

   SDG&E Response: SDG&E would support invoicing based on the above criteria. This would avoid mixing initial and true-up statements across different accounting months on the same invoice.

5. **Other Comments?**

   (Submit Comments Here)