

Attachment A

Stakeholder Process and Open Issues

GMC Under MRTU

August 29, 2007

Stakeholder Process to Date

Activity	Date	Number of Stakeholder Representatives	Location of Documents
Stakeholder meeting, held with CAISO Budget meeting	September 14, 2006	16 onsite, 9 lines	http://www.aiso.com/185a/185ab8b91b5f0.html
Conference call	October 6, 2006	11 lines	http://www.aiso.com/187d/187dcf7553440.html
Stakeholder meeting	October 17, 2006	18 onsite, 18 lines	http://www.aiso.com/187d/187dd07055cf0.html
Conference call	October 31, 2007	35 lines	http://www.aiso.com/1893/1893d9a7170e0.html
Conference call	November 15, 2006	27 lines	http://www.aiso.com/18a2/18a2e996683f0.html
Conference call	April 30, 2007	58 lines	http://www.aiso.com/1bc6/1bc6c29617a60.html
Conference call	May 31, 2007	39 lines	http://www.aiso.com/1be7/1be780b3250a0.html
Stakeholder meeting, held with CAISO Initial Budget meeting	June 12, 2007	9 onsite, 16 lines	http://www.aiso.com/1bdf/1bdfd15822620.html
Conference call	June 25, 2007	33 lines	http://www.aiso.com/1bfd/1bfda87c346a0.html
Conference call	July 20, 2007	44 lines	http://www.aiso.com/1c18/1c1899de9e00.html
Conference call	August 30, 2007		http://www.aiso.com/1c2f/1c2fe2fc17e00.html
Note: Number of lines counts the number of connections on the conference call. More than one person may be each connection.			

Comments Concerning Applicability of GMC to Certain Scheduling Coordinators

#	Comment/Question/Suggestion	Stakeholder	CAISO Respondent	ISO's Response
1	GMC should not apply to APS and IID schedules on SWPL. (Comments posted located at: http://www.caiso.com/1bfd/1bfda56720eb0.pdf) (June 11, 2007)	Ed. Lucero, SDG&E	B. Arikawa	GMC does apply to the SWPL schedules. In at least two decisions, the FERC found that GMC did apply. (Response located at: http://www.caiso.com/1c28/1c28b7c371660.pdf) SDG&E given an opportunity to respond on August 30 conference call.
2	If an accommodation is granted to SWPL, the accommodation should also apply to flows on similarly situated Transmission Ownership Rights. (June 11, 2007)	Bert Hansen, SCE Sean Neal, MID		Comment noted.

Comments on CAISO Policy Concerning Fees and Charges

#	Comment/Question/Suggestion	Stakeholder	CAISO Respondent	ISO's Response
1	Mr. Theaker and Ms. Schneider asked if there was a policy for charging for specific services; for example, the PIRP forecasting fee and station power. Mr. Theaker requested that CAISO look for consistency of treatment, and that the primary beneficiaries should bear the costs of services. Susan Schneider noted that policy should not apply just to incremental services, but to embedded services as well. (June 12, 2007)	Brian Theaker, Williams Susan Schneider, Phoenix Consulting, CalWEA	P. Leiber, B. Arikawa	CAISO noted that it does not currently have a consolidated policy for setting fees. Mr. Arikawa noted that for any new charges or fees, they are typically filed at FERC before they are active. Mr. Leiber noted that the CAISO has will develop a policy for charging separate fees including criteria for establishing separate charges.

Comments on Cost of Service Study

#	Comment/Question/Suggestion	Stakeholder	CAISO Respondent	ISO's Response
1	Please explain why there have been changes in the cost allocation results. (May 31, 2007)	Susan Schneider, Phoenix Consulting, CalWEA	B. Arikawa	The changes in cost allocation were discussed at the June 12 stakeholder meeting. (See presentation on this topic: http://www.caiso.com/1bfa/1bfac42a694b0.pdf .) Additional information was provided in cost of service study report located at: http://www.caiso.com/1c2f/1c2fe2fc17e00.html .

Comments on Forward Scheduling Service Cost Allocation

#	Comment/Question/Suggestion	Stakeholder	CAISO Respondent	ISO's Response
2	Why does the FS category receive a large portion of the revenue credit? (May 31, 2007; June 12, 2007)	David Cohen, TANC	B. Arikawa	CAISO tracks the operating reserve separately by category, so a given service receives the portion of the operating reserve credit for over or under collection of revenues from rates related to that service. CAISO will review allocation method when 2008 Revenue Requirement is developed.

Comments on Application of Bill Determinants

#	Comment/Question/Suggestion	Stakeholder	CAISO Respondent	ISO's Response
1	Expressed concerns regarding assessment to Injections for Energy Transmission Services and use of net purchases and sales in the Forward Energy Market. (November 10, 2006; July 20, 2007)	Ellen Wolfe, WPTF	B. Arikawa, M. Shafa	The use of injections as a bill determinant for Energy Transmission Services is in recognition of workload involved in managing transmission flows on the grid, half of which are from generation and imports. Net sales and purchases is used in the Forward Energy Market as many transactions are self-schedules that are price-takers and not actively using the market. To the extent that Forward Energy Market costs should be recovered from "gross" transactions, these costs can be allocated to Energy Transmission Services.

Comments on Stakeholder Process

#	Comment/Question/Suggestion	Stakeholder	CAISO Respondent	ISO's Response
1	Expressed concern that current discussions might unravel the delicate negotiations that resulted in the current GMC Settlement. (July 20, 2007)	Ellen Wolfe, WPTF	B. Arikawa	The CAISO is open to discussions on the ultimate rate structure under MRTU. As a practical matter, as the ISO must make a GMC filing for 2008, all issues are open for discussion prior to a FERC filing. No party is bound by the Settlement where the GMC in 2008 is concerned.