Stakeholder Comments Template

Monthly Extended Day-Ahead Market (EDAM) May Performance Report

This template has been created for submission of stakeholder comments on the Data Quality Procedure for Operational Requirements meeting that was held on March 25, 2026. The Stakeholder meeting presentation and other information related to this initiative may be found on the initiative webpage at: [Meetings | Forecasting forum | California ISO]

Upon completion of this template, please submit it to ISOStakeholderAffairs@caiso.com.

Submissions are requested by close of business on **July 10, 2026.**

Submitted by	Organization	Date Submitted
Carrie Bentley	*Western Power Trading Forum*	*July 10, 2026*

1. Please provide your organization's overall feedback on the Monthly Extended Day-Ahead Market (EDAM) May Performance Report meeting that was held on June 25, 2026

WPTF appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Monthly Extended Day-Ahead Market (EDAM) Performance Report for May 2026 and thanks CAISO staff for developing this new reporting process. WPTF believes these reports will become an important tool for evaluating whether EDAM is achieving its intended policy objectives and identifying areas where additional market enhancements may be warranted.

As the reports evolve, WPTF encourages CAISO to continue expanding the metrics presented and to provide additional context explaining how various market design elements are functioning in practice. Our comments below identify additional metrics that will be useful in the next iteration as well as some areas where further explanation of how the market design elements function.

Deployment Scenarios

Deployment scenarios are one of the most significant new market design elements introduced through EDAM. Additional reporting would help stakeholders better understand how these scenarios are affecting market outcomes and whether they are accurately reflecting real-time market conditions. WPTF recommends that future reports include information such as:

- The amount of congestion reflected in day-ahead energy prices that is attributable to deployment scenarios
- Whether congestion patterns observed in deployment scenarios are ultimately realized in real-time
- Whether the locations where uncertainty is assumed in the day-ahead market align with where uncertainty actually materializes in real-time

BAA-Level Market Power Mitigation
As additional balancing authorities join EDAM, understanding how frequently BAA-level market power mitigation is being applied will become increasingly important. WPTF recommends expanding reporting to include:

- The frequency with which resources in PACE and PACW are mitigated in the day-ahead market due to BAA-level market power mitigation
- The frequency and magnitude of bid reductions resulting from such mitigation
- A comparison of pre-mitigation and post-mitigation market clearing prices within each BAA whenever mitigation is triggered

RCU and RCD Pricing
CAISO noted during the meeting that Reliability Capacity Up (RCU) and Reliability Capacity Down (RCD) clearing prices have become negative, resulting in resources effectively paying to provide reliability capacity. While WPTF appreciates that CAISO is monitoring this outcome, WPTF believes additional reporting and ultimately a market design solution are warranted.
Specifically, WPTF recommends reporting:

- The frequency of negative RCU and RCD clearing prices.
- How many resources are being awarded at negative prices and for what quantity

More importantly, WPTF believes this issue should ultimately be addressed through market design rather than simply monitored. Paying resources to provide reliability capacity was not an intended outcome of the policy design. WPTF encourages CAISO to evaluate whether the formulation of the requirement constraints should be revised so that the two capacity requirements are modeled independently rather than through the current formulation, which can produce unintended negative clearing prices.

EDAM Net Export Constraint
The EDAM Net Export Constraint is a component of the market design where additional explanation would be helpful for stakeholders. WPTF recommends that future reports include additional explanation and examples describing how this constraint functions in practice.

In particular, WPTF requests clarification regarding:

- Whether the constraint can prevent transfers from a resource located within the CAISO BAA that is contractually serving load in another EDAM balancing authority (such as PACE or PACW), or whether contracted transfers (e.g., high priority exports) are always permitted while only non-contracted transfers are limited.

- Whether the constraint applies only to EDAM transfers between participating BAAs, or whether it also limits exports scheduled across external interties leaving the EDAM footprint.

Providing additional discussion and examples would improve stakeholder understanding of how the constraint affects market outcomes and commercial transactions.