

Stakeholder Comments Template

Flexible Resource Adequacy Criteria and Must-Offer Obligation Fourth Revised Straw Proposal, Posted November 7, 2013

Submitted by	Company	Date Submitted
Aram Shumavon, a.shumavon@decapower.org 415.377.2581 Sahm White, sahm@clean-coalition.org	DECA, Clean Coalition	11/27/2013

This template is for submission of stakeholder comments on the topics listed below, covered in the Flexible Resource Adequacy Criteria and Must-Offer Obligation fourth revised straw proposal on November 7, 2013, and issues discussed during the stakeholder meeting on November 13, 2013.

Please submit your comments below where indicated. Your comments on any aspect of this initiative are welcome. If you provide a preferred approach for a particular topic, your comments will be most useful if you provide the reasons and business case.

Please submit comments (in MS Word) to fcp@caiso.com no later than the close of business on November 27, 2013.

- 1. The ISO has outlined a methodology to allocate flexible capacity requirements to LRAs. As detailed in the fourth revised straw proposal¹ and at the 11/13 stakeholder meeting PG&E has put forward an alternative allocation methodology. Please provide comments for each of these proposals, particularly as they relate to cost causation. If your organization has a preference for one over the other, please state your preference and why.
- 2. The ISO believes that demand response resources should have the opportunity to provide flexible capacity. The ISO has proposed how demand response resources could do so. Please provide comments on the ISO's proposal. Specifically, please identify concerns with the ISO's proposal and offer potential solutions to these concerns. Additionally, please comment on the proper forum (ISO, CPUC, etc.) where these concerns should be addressed.

M&ID/KMeeusen Page 1 of 3

¹ PG&E's specific proposal can be found at http://www.caiso.com/Documents/PG_E-Comments-FlexibleResourceAdequacyCriteriaMustOfferObligation-ThirdRevisedStrawProposal.pdf.



- Please provide comments and recommendations (including requested clarifications) regarding the ISO's proposed must-offer obligations for the following resources types:
 - a. Dispatchable gas-fired use-limited resources
 - Please provide comments regarding the ISO's proposal that would allow resources with use- limitations to include the opportunity costs in the resource's default energy bid, start-up cost, and minimum load cost.
 - 2. Please provide information on any use-limitations that have not been addressed and how the ISO could account for them.
 - b. Specialized must-offer obligations:
 - 1. Demand response resources
 - 2. Storage resources
 - 3. Variable energy resources
- 4. At the 11/13 stakeholder meeting there a significant amount of discussion regarding the appropriate method for setting the price for the proposed flexible capacity availability incentive mechanism. Please provide comments about how this issue might be resolved.
- 5. The ISO has proposed an SFCP evaluation mechanism/formula that weights compliance with the real-time must offer obligation heavier than the day-ahead must offer obligation. Please comment on:
 - a. The merits of using such a weighting mechanism relative to the "lesser of" proposal from the previous proposal
 - b. The relative weights between the real-time and day-ahead markets
- 6. There were several clarifying questions asked at the 11/13 stakeholder meeting regarding substitution of flexible capacity that is on forced outage. Please provide comments and / or questions (and potential answers) regarding any additional clarifications the ISO should make in the next revision to clarify this aspect of the proposal.

M&ID/KMeeusen Page 2 of 3



- 7. Please provide comments regarding how, or if, the SFCP adder price and the flexible capacity backstop price should be related.
- 8. Are there any additional comments your organization wishes to make at this time?

Please see the attached comments.

M&ID/KMeeusen Page 3 of 3