

 <b>CALIFORNIA ISO</b> <small>California Independent System Operator</small>	<b>Settlements / Rerun</b>	Version No.	1.3
		Version Date	01/16/04
<b>Amendment 51</b> <b>Meter Data Issues 1A, 2A, 3A, and 4A</b>		Effective Date	01/16/04

## PURPOSE

In order to correct instances of mis-reported meter data by PG&E and CDWR in its baseline settlements system during the period October 2, 2000 through June 20, 2001, the CAISO will rerun its settlements system to incorporate an approximate combined total of 930,300 MWh. There are a total of seven requests regarding mis-reported meter data.

The impact of the mis-reported data for the period April 1, 1998 through October 1, 2000 (Issues 1B, 2B, 3B, and 4B) will be estimated and corrected using a manual adjustment that will be applied during the latter stages of the preparatory re-run. Since it is not feasible for the CAISO to rerun settlements from April 1, 1998 to October 1, 2000 the CAISO will incorporate these meter data issues using manual adjustments.

In addition to the four meter data issues described above, based on the FERC order (FERC Docket No. ER03-746-001 dated November 14, 2003), the CAISO will also incorporate meter data changes for the following: a) PG&E over reported Load for Port of Oakland and City and County of San Francisco; b) Dynegy under reported Generation for their resource DIVSON\_7\_NSQT1.

## BACKGROUND

### Issues 1A and 2A – PG&E under-reported Load meter data

At the request of CAISO, PG&E performed an internal review to identify cases of under-reported load for the Existing Contracts under the Transmission Wholesale Customer portfolio. In October 2001, it was determined that PG&E under-reported the Load of a certain Market Participant by approximately 539,700 MWh, during the period of April 1, 1998, through June 1, 2001.

### Issue 3A – PG&E Meter Data Mapping error

In March 2003, it was determined that a programming error at PG&E cross-referenced a particular meter's Channel 1 data (Load) with Channel 4 data (Generation), thus impacting the Settlement Quality Meter Data (SQMD) for the O'Neil Generator/Pump facility. PG&E reported approximately 11,000 MWh of load when the actual load was approximately 206,300 MWh. Concurrently, PG&E reported approximately 206,300 MWh of generation when the actual amount generated was approximately 11,000 MWh. The estimated impact of the meter data mapping error is approximately 195,300 MWh, for the period of October 2, 2000 and June 20, 2001.

### Issue No. 4A – CDWR distribution loss factor allocation error

CDWR identified a systemic error in their meter data management system, relative to the application of Distribution Loss Factors (DLF) to CDWR's raw Lateral pump meter reads. In attempting to apply DLFs, CDWR inadvertently programmed its meter data management system to multiply the end use data by a DLF that essentially resulted in multiplying by zero. A 3% loss factor should convert to a 1.03 multiplier. However, the CDWR system was programmed to

 <b>CALIFORNIA ISO</b> <small>California Independent System Operator</small>	<b>Settlements / Rerun</b>	Version No.	1.3
		<b>Amendment 51</b>	
<b>Meter Data Issues 1A, 2A, 3A, and 4A</b>		Effective Date	01/16/04

multiply by a factor of 0.03, essentially a zero multiplier. The total under-reported amount was approximately 167,400 MWh for 1999 and 2000. For 2001, the total MWh underreported was approximately 6,100, for a total of approximately 173,500 MWh. The time frame affected was July 16, 1999 to February 6, 2001.

**Dynegy under reported Generation Meter Data:** The impacted trade dates are from Oct 00, Dec 00- April 01 and June 01. Total MWh under reported are approximately 3,250 MWh.

**PG&E Port of Oakland:** The impacted trade dates are from Oct 00 – Dec 00. Total MWh mis reported are approximately 600MWh.

**PG&E City and County of San Francisco:** The impacted trade dates are Jan 01 – Jun 01. Total MWh mis reported are approximately 1,550 MWh

## OUTLINE OF PROCESS

- 1 Submission of Meter Data
- 2 Data Validation
- 3 Data Load
- 4 Load Validation
- 5 Re-run
- 6 Recalculation Validation

## PROCESS DESCRIPTION

All process listed below are to be completed by the CAISO unless otherwise stated.

- 1 Submission of Meter Data
  - 1.1 Communicates with the specific SCs regarding revised meter data submission
    - A Identify the Trade Dates and Resources, if applicable
  - 1.2 The SC submits the meter data to the CAISO in the CAISO specified format
  - 1.3 Notify internal departments when the data has been received
- 2 Data Validation
  - 2.1 Compare data in production against the new meter data to ensure the new data is within an acceptable variance range
  - 2.2 Evaluate the impact the resubmitted meter data has on the submitting SC
 

Example:

    - A If the SC under reported load, the SC would be charged under Imbalance Energy

 <b>CALIFORNIA ISO</b> <small>California Independent System Operator</small>	<b>Settlements / Rerun</b>	Version No.	1.3
		Version Date	01/16/04
<b>Amendment 51</b> <b>Meter Data Issues 1A, 2A, 3A, and 4A</b>		Effective Date	01/16/04

- B If the SC submitted meter data for under reported Generation, the SC would get a credit under Imbalance Energy
- 3 Data Load
    - 3.1 Load the meter data into Operational Meter Analysis & Reporting (OMAR)
    - 3.2 Confirm the expected numbers or row counts have been loaded
    - 3.3 Data is forwarded to the Settlements system
  - 4 Re-run
    - 4.1 Run the Settlements System with the new meter data
  - 5 Recalculation Validation
    - 5.1 Validate the data after the Settlement system calculation is completed to ensure neutrality and expected charge types are affected

## REFERENCES

- 1 CAISO's Amendment No. 51 filing in Docket No. ER03-746, and other pleadings filed by the CAISO in that Docket
- 2 October 16, 2003 FERC Order in the California refund proceeding (Dockets EL00-95, *et al.*)

## ASSUMPTIONS

Changes were made to the Allocations during the refund period. The CAISO will use the appropriate allocation methodologies for the specific date range.

## AFFECTED CHARGE TYPES

The following is a list of potentially affected Charge Types

- 401
- 406
- 407
- 1010

## EXPECTED IMPACT

- 1 PG&E
  - 1.1 Increased costs for load-related charges
  - 1.2 Decreased UFE costs
- 2 Serving Load in PG&E territory
  - 2.1 Decreased UFE costs
- 3 All Control Area
  - 3.1 Decreased neutrality charges