



California ISO

**Bid cost recovery and variable energy resource
settlement**

Straw proposal

April 9, 2015

Table of Contents

- 1. Background 3
- 2. Schedule for policy stakeholder engagement..... 3
- 3. Initiative scope 3
- 4. Summary of proposals..... 4
- 5. Ramp rate for variable energy resources 4
- 6. Residual imbalance energy with regard to variable energy resources 5
- 7. Persistent deviation metric..... 15
- 8. Default energy bids 17
- 9. Day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor 18
- 10. Tariff clarifications on residual imbalance energy 21
- 11. Next Steps 21

1. Background

On March 20, 2015 the ISO published a market issues bulletin describing a corrected methodology to account for the ramp rates of self-scheduled variable energy resources.¹ This will significantly decrease how often these resources erroneously trigger the persistent deviation metric. The bulletin also clarified the categorization of residual imbalance energy as related to self-scheduled resources.

The bulletin only describes changes that the ISO can make under the ISO's existing tariff authority. This stakeholder initiative will address related items that require stakeholder input leading to tariff changes or clarifications on the existing policy.

2. Schedule for policy stakeholder engagement

The proposed schedule for the policy stakeholder process is listed below. We have omitted the issue paper since the issue was already discussed in the market issues technical bulletin

Date	Event
Thu 4/9/15	Straw proposal posted
Wed 4/15/15	Stakeholder call
Thu 4/30/15	Stakeholder comments due
Wed 5/20/15	Draft final proposal posted
Wed 5/27/15	Stakeholder call
Wed 6/10/15	Stakeholder comments due
Thu/Fri 7/16-7/17/15	Board of Governors meeting

3. Initiative scope

This initiative is narrowly scoped to address potential tariff changes that could not be made pursuant to the ISO's current tariff authority during the market issues bulletin discussion. Specifically, the ISO proposes to revise the current settlement of residual imbalance energy for economically bidding variable energy resources. More broadly for variable energy resources, the ISO will explore the application of the persistent deviation metric and the calculation of a default energy bid. Lastly, this initiative will address minor improvements to the day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor as applied to all resources.

¹ CAISO, Market Issues Bulletin: Residual imbalance energy settlement and ramp rate changes for self-scheduled variable energy resources, March 10, 2015. Available at: http://www.caiso.com/Documents/MarketIssuesBulletin_ResidualImbalanceEnergySettlement-RampRateChanges.pdf

The remainder of this paper is divided into the following sections. Section 4 summarizes all of the proposals. Section 5 clarifies how ramp rates should be reflected in the Master File. Section 6 provides examples of the proposed settlement for residual imbalance energy for economically bidding variable energy resources. Section 7 discusses the application of the persistent deviation metric to variable energy resources and Section 8 discusses the calculation of the default energy bids. Section 9 describes modifications to the day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor as applied to all resources to consider certain boundary conditions. Section 10 will outline tariff clarifications based on discussion with stakeholders relating to the market issues bulletin. Section 11 discusses next steps.

4. Summary of proposals

Table 1 summarizes the proposed changes.

Table 1
Summary of proposals

#	Section	Topic	Proposal	Type of change
1	5	Ramp rate for variable energy resources	Ramp rates are physical characteristics and should not be “9999 MW/min”	Clarification on existing policy
2	6	Residual imbalance energy settlement for economic bidding variable energy resources	Residual imbalance energy due to the forecast changes across intervals shall be settled based on LMP rather than bid. Residual imbalance energy due to economic dispatch across intervals shall continue to be settled based on the reference bid.	Tariff
3	7	Persistent deviation metric applied to variable energy resources	Continue to apply	Clarification on existing policy
4	8	Default energy bids for economic bidding variable energy resources	If no cost is provided, will use variable cost option. If LMP option is selected, the variable cost option will be used until the LMP option can be calculated.	Clarification on existing policy
5	9	Day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor	Corrected for boundary conditions	Tariff
6	10	Tariff clarifications following market issues bulletin [forthcoming]	Provide for clarifications on tariff language pre-dating MRTU	Tariff

5. Ramp rate for variable energy resources

As explained in the market issues bulletin, the persistent deviation metric evaluates a resource’s response based on the “amount the resource can be dispatched at full ramp over the Settlement

Interval.”² However, the “full ramp” for a self-scheduled variable energy resource is not the ramp rate provided in Master File since the ISO market does not consider this value. Instead, the ramp rate is implied from the forecast used by these self-schedules. Consequently, the ISO proposed to use “9999 MW/min” as a proxy for the implied ramp rate for variable energy resources following a forecast and only submitting self-schedules.

Using this proxy does not replace the Master File ramp rate. It only recognizes that the ISO market does not use it when there is only a self-schedule. Ramp rates in the Master File should still reflect the physical capability of the resource and the best operational ramp rate should reflect the maximum for an upward or downward ramp. Resources should not enter “9999 MW/min” in the Master File.

On the other hand, the ISO market will consider the best operational ramp rate of resources with an economic energy bid, whether the resource is a conventional resource or variable energy resource. The ISO market considers the best operational ramp rate as listed in the Master File when it economically dispatches the variable energy resource. Therefore, it is important for all resources to have ramp rates in the Master File that reflect the physical capability of the resource and the best operational ramp rate can reflect an upward or downward ramp. Therefore, resources should not enter “9999 MW/min” in the Master File.


6. Residual imbalance energy with regard to variable energy resources

As explained in the market issues bulletin, residual imbalance energy is the appropriate settlement classification for a portion of the energy output of variable energy resources, regardless if the resource is self-scheduled or has economic energy bids.³ Figure 1 below is reproduced from the bulletin and shows residual imbalance energy produced by a resource ramping down at the top of an hour. It shows that as the energy crosses the hour mark, the portion ramping down from a dispatched economic bid is classified as residual imbalance energy with a bid and the portion ramping down from a self-schedule portion is classified as residual imbalance energy without a bid. Residual imbalance energy with a bid is settled at the “reference hour bid,” which, for a resource ramping down at the top of an hour, is the bid in the previous hour. When there is no dispatched economic bid, the ISO settles the energy at the locational marginal price (LMP). This is true for variable energy resources and conventional generation.

² CAISO tariff, section 11.17.

³ http://www.caiso.com/Documents/MarketIssuesBulletin_ResidualImbalanceEnergySettlement-RampRateChanges.pdf

Figure 1
Residual imbalance energy settlement



During the market issues bulletin discussion, it was concluded that the ISO’s current settlement for economically bidding variable energy resources does not differentiate whether the resource is driven by a forecast change or a change in the LMP with regard to the bid. For example, these resources typically submit negative bids, which will be used to settle residual imbalance energy. An inconsistency was identified when the resource is ramping from a forecast change and not because of market dispatch resulting from a resource’s bid price relative to the LMP.

Table 2 below describes four main scenarios and whether each scenario requires a change in the current settlement logic. Scenario 1 is for self-scheduled resources while scenarios 2 through 4 are for economically bidding resources. Scenarios 2 through 4 are presented as pairs where one shows an increase and the other shows a decrease in the LMP, forecast, or both. All scenarios assume the persistent deviation metric has not been triggered.

These scenarios are intended to help the discussion. More scenarios may be explored and stakeholders are encouraged to suggest additional scenarios for analysis.

Table 2
Residual imbalance energy and optimal energy settlement for variable energy resources

	Scenario	Settlement	Issue	Proposed solution
1	Self-scheduled with forecast change	Residual imbalance energy settled on LMP	None	None
2a	Economic bidder and forecast increase (no LMP change)	Optimal energy settled on LMP in current hour.	None	None
2b	Economic bidder and forecast decrease (no LMP change)	Residual imbalance energy settled on reference hour bid.	Bid did not drive change in energy.	Settle at LMP in current hour (analogous to derate).
3a	Economic bidder and LMP less than bid (no forecast change)	Residual imbalance energy settled on reference hour bid.	None	None
3b	Economic bidder and LMP higher than bid (no forecast change)	Optimal energy settled on LMP in current hour.	None	None
4a	Economic bidder and LMP less than bid and forecast decrease	RIE settled on reference hour bid.	Portion of RIE not driven by bid.	Settle at LMP for energy above forecast (analogous to derate); settle at reference hour bid for energy within forecast.
4b	Economic bidder and LMP higher than bid and forecast increase	OE settled on current hour LMP.	None	None

Scenario 1 is for self-scheduled variable energy resources. Since these resources do not have a bid, the settlement is at the LMP. There are no issues identified with the current approach.

Scenario 2a is a variable energy resource with economic bids but is dispatched up based on an increase in the forecast while the LMP does not change. The increase in energy to the higher forecast is considered optimal energy and was not driven by the bid so the settlement is at the LMP. There are no issues identified with the current approach. A detailed example is provided in Figure 4 below.

Scenario 2b is a variable energy resource with economic bids but is dispatched down based on a decrease in the forecast while the LMP does not change. Currently the ISO settles the residual imbalance energy based on the bid. The issue identified is that the bid did not drive the residual imbalance energy from the reference hour. Instead, the resource is (at least partially) dispatched based on its forecast. Note that the ISO currently sets the upper economic limit for economically bid variable energy resources at its forecast. Therefore, a decrease in the forecast is a reduction of this limit, analogous to a derate of the Pmax of a conventional

generator.⁴ Therefore, the ISO proposes to settle the residual imbalance energy ramping down to a new forecast output at the LMP, similar to derate energy.⁵ A detailed example is provided in the discussion of Figure 4 below.

Scenarios 3a and 3b are variable energy resources with economic bids dispatched based on the bid price relative to the LMP. The ISO has not identified any issues with the current settlement of residual imbalance energy on the resource's reference hour bid or optimal energy at the LMP in the current hour. Detailed examples are provided in the discussion of Figure 5 and Figure 6 below.

Scenario 4a is a variable energy resource with economic bids and the LMP is lower than the bid in the current hour *and* the forecast decreases. In this scenario the residual imbalance energy is attributed to both the decrease in LMP and the forecast but it is currently all settled on the bid in the reference hour, as if the LMP was the only driver. Therefore, the ISO proposes to settle the residual imbalance energy due to the forecast changes on the LMP similar to de-rate energy. However, the ISO proposes to settle the portion within the forecast on the bid since the energy is driven by the bid price relative to the LMP. A detailed example is provided in Figure 8 below.

Scenario 4b is a variable energy resource with economic bids and the LMP is higher than the bid in the current hour *and* the forecast increases. The energy increases because of an increase in the forecast and is supported by the higher LMP. The energy is considered optimal energy settled at the LMP in the current hour and there are no issues identified with the current approach. A detailed example is provided in Figure 8 below.

The following charts illustrate the current and proposed settlement for each scenario listed above.

⁴ See ISO tariff Section 34.1.6: Eligible Intermittent Resources Forecast and Business Practice Manual for Market Operations, Section 7.8.2: Real-Time Economic Dispatch Constraints & Objectives, version 41. The "Pmax" for an economically bidding variable energy resource is referred to as the "upper economic limit" or "upper dispatch limit."

⁵ See ISO tariff Section 11.5.1: Imbalance Energy Settlements for real-time derate energy settlement at the LMP.

Figure 2 shows that a self-scheduled variable energy resource will be settled on the LMP for its residual imbalance energy (in blue). There are no proposed changes.

Figure 2
Scenario 1: Self-scheduled with forecast change




Figure 3 shows that an economically bidding variable energy resource with a forecast increase but no change in the LMP will not have residual imbalance energy. Instead, the energy in hour ending 2 (HE2) is considered optimal energy (OE) and is settled at the LMP in HE2 (gray triangle). There are no proposed changes to the current settlement.

Figure 3
Scenario 2a: Economic bidder and forecast increase (no LMP change)




Figure 4 below compares the difference between the current and proposed settlement for an economic bidder dispatched in hour ending 2 (HE2) pursuant a decrease in the forecast. The forecast in this example decreases from 50 MW to 25 MW from the first to second hour (shown by the dotted red line). As mentioned above, the forecast for an economically bidding variable energy resource is its upper economic limit, analogous to a Pmax of a conventional generator. HE2 is therefore similar to a derate from the first hour. The current settlement uses the \$10/MWh bid for all residual imbalance energy, which is lower than the prevailing LMP of \$20/MWh (shown in green on the left). The ISO proposes to settle for the portion of residual imbalance above the forecast on the LMP, the same as the ISO’s current settlement of derate energy (shown in blue on the right).

The ISO proposes to settle for the portion of residual imbalance above the forecast on the LMP, the same as the ISO’s current settlement of derate energy (shown in blue on the right).

Figure 4
Scenario 2b: Economic bidder and forecast decrease (no LMP change)




Figure 5 shows the current settlement of economically bidding variable energy resources when there is no forecast change but the LMP is lower than the current hour bid. The residual imbalance energy is settled based on the bid in the reference hour. There are no proposed changes.

Figure 5
Scenario 3a: Economic bidder and LMP less than bid (no forecast change)




Figure 6 shows the current settlement of an economically bidding variable energy resource when there is no forecast change but the LMP is higher than the current hour bid. The optimal energy is settled at the LMP in the current hour. There are no proposed changes.

Figure 6
Scenario 3b: Economic bidder and LMP higher than bid (no forecast change)




Figure 7 below compares the difference between the current and proposed settlement for an economic bidder dispatched in HE2 pursuant to a decrease in the LMP below the resource’s bid and a decrease in the forecast. The LMP in this example is \$5/MWh in HE2 as compared to a bid of \$10/MWh. The forecast in this example decreases from 50 MW to 25 MW from the first to second hour (shown by the dotted red line). As mentioned above, the forecast for an economically bidding variable energy resource is analogous to the Pmax of a conventional generator. HE 2 is therefore similar to a derate from the first hour. The current settlement is the \$10/MWh bid from the reference hour for all residual imbalance energy, which is higher than the prevailing LMP of \$5/MWh (shown in green on the left).

The ISO proposes to settle for the portion of residual imbalance above the forecast on the LMP, the same as the ISO’s current settlement of derate energy (shown in blue on the right). However, the ISO proposes to settle the portion within the forecast on the reference hour bid since the energy is driven by the bid being lower than the LMP (shown in green on the right).

Figure 7
Scenario 4a: Economic bidder and LMP less than bid and forecast decrease





Figure 8 below is the same basic concept as presented in Figure 7 except both the LMP and forecast increase in the second hour. The LMP in this example increases from \$20/MWh to \$30/MWh and the forecast increases from 25 MW to 50 MW in HE2. In this scenario, the energy increase is considered optimal energy and is settled at the LMP in the current hour.

Figure 8
Scenario 4b: Economic bidder and LMP higher than bid and forecast increase




7. Persistent deviation metric

Some stakeholders have advocated for the removal of the persistent deviation metric for all variable energy resources. With the changes proposed in this initiative the ISO believes that resources will not erroneously trigger the metric. The metric is still effective for capturing behavior that would seek to inflate bid cost recovery or residual imbalance energy payments.

For example, the current settlement for economically bidding variable energy resources decrementing because of a decrease in LMP rather than the forecast is paid on the bid for the residual imbalance energy from the reference hour. The graphic from Figure 5 is reproduced in Figure 9 below but modified to show a persistent deviation into hour ending 4 and higher bid price.

Figure 9
Scenario 3a with persistent deviation



In this illustrative example, the resource is deviating to capture the higher residual imbalance energy payment based on the bid of \$100/MWh rather than the lower LMP of \$5/MWh starting in the second hour. The forecast remains unchanged during all four hours. The yellow triangle represents the dispatch of the resource based on its ramp rate while the larger green triangle is the deviation. Without the metric, both the yellow and green triangles will be paid the reference hour bid.

Similarly, a resources may deviate from dispatch to inflate bid cost recovery as shown in the illustrative example in Table 3 below. Assume a resource has a day-ahead schedule of 100 MW at a bid of negative \$1/MWh for a total bid cost of negative \$100/MWh. The day-ahead LMP is \$3/MWh for a total revenue of \$300/MWh. Since the revenue minus the cost is a positive number, there is no bid cost recovery (BCR).

In the real-time, the resource deviates from the 100 MW forecast and only provides 10 MW of response even though the dispatch is economic (assuming a negative \$1/MWh bid and an LMP of \$5/MWh). Therefore, there is a 90 MW buy-back of the day-ahead schedule (reflected as a negative 90 MW quantity multiplied by a negative \$1/MWh bid for a bid cost of positive \$90/h). For revenue, the same negative 90 MW quantity is multiplied by the real-time LMP of \$5/MWh resulting in a negative revenue of \$450/h. Under the bid cost recovery calculation the negative \$450/h revenue minis the positive cost of \$90/h results in negative \$540/h, which is eligible for uplift.

Table 3
Illustrative deviation from day-ahead schedule

Market	Bid cost	Revenue	Rev minus Cost	BCR?
Day-ahead	100 MW x -\$1/MWh = -\$100/h	100 MW x \$3/MWh = \$300/h	\$300 - (-\$100) = \$400	No
Real-time	-90 MW x -\$1/MWh = \$90/h	-90 MW x \$5/MWh = -\$450/h	-\$450 - \$90 = -\$540	Yes

This example is not limited to differences between the day-ahead and real-time. This example is the same if this is a deviation between the fifteen and five minute markets.

These are two illustrative examples and there may be others. Therefore, the ISO proposes to retain the metric for now but monitor its impacts on all variable energy resources.

8. Default energy bids

The ISO requires default energy bids for resources in case of local market power mitigation. In addition the persistent deviation metric will evaluate a resource's default energy bid in case it is triggered. The ISO adjusts the bid basis for real-time bid cost recovery and residual imbalance energy as follows:

Incremental energy: the minimum of the (a) default energy bid cost, (b) the bid price, or (c) the LMP

Decremental energy: the maximum of the (a) default energy bid cost, (b) the bid price, or (c) the LMP

The ISO has found that many variable energy resources have not supplied default energy bids. The ISO tariff Section 39.7.1 allows for three methodologies: 1) variable cost option, 2) negotiated rate option, or 3) LMP option. If no cost is submitted and approved then the variable cost option will be the default.

For resources that select the LMP option, the current tariff rules provided in Section 39.7.1.2 require that the ISO calculate the weighted average of the lowest quartile of LMPs at the generating unit PNode in periods when the unit was dispatched during the preceding ninety (90) day period for which LMPs that have passed the price validation and correction process. This is further subject to a feasibility test to determine whether there are a sufficient number of data points to allow for the calculation of an LMP-based default energy bid.

The ISO proposes to use the variable cost option for variable energy resources applying for an LMP-based default energy bid until such a bid can be calculated.

9. Day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor

This issue was not discussed in the market issues technical bulletin and is applicable to all generators, not just variable energy resources.

This section describes two scenarios that were not considered when developing the day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor scenarios. The formula for the factor is calculated as the minimum of: (1) the number one (1); or (2) the absolute value of the ratio of the resource's (a) Metered Energy less the Day-Ahead Minimum Load Energy and less the Regulation Energy, and (b) the minimum of (i) the Expected Energy and (ii) the Day-Ahead Scheduled Energy, less the Day-Ahead Minimum Load Energy. In cases where both the denominator and numerator produced by this calculation equal zero (0), the Day-Ahead Metered Energy Adjustment Factor is set to one (1). If the denominator produced from this calculation equals zero (0), but the numerator is a non-zero number, the Day-Ahead Metered Energy Adjustment Factor is set to zero (0).

Scenario 1: Metered energy is below P_{min}

When the metered energy is below P_{min} , the resource is not considered “On” and eligible for bid cost recovery. However, the formula for the day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor will allow for some ratio of bid cost recovery between 0 and 1. Aside from circumstances in which the real-time market shut-down a resource, this was an oversight in the MEAF design because resources dispatched to be operating by the real-time market but that do not operate should not receive bid cost recovery for day-ahead scheduled energy not delivered

Scenario 2: Meter or total expected energy is equal to or greater than P_{min}

The factor was revised to incentivize resources to follow ISO dispatch, even if this differs from the day-ahead schedule. However, when a resource is instructed to decrement to P_{min} and follows dispatch (*i.e.*, the metered energy is equal or close to expected energy, which in turn equals the day-ahead minimum load energy), the current rule in the business practice manual states that any denominator of zero with a non-zero numerator will result in a day-ahead factor of zero. The policy did not contemplate the boundary scenario when dispatch equals P_{min} in which the day-ahead scheduled energy is equal to the day-ahead minimum load. This results in a denominator equal to zero but potentially a non-zero numerator. The day-ahead factor is inadvertently penalizing resources for following dispatch.

CAISO proposal to address both scenarios

The CAISO proposal will address both issues by adding in additional conditions either in lieu of or before applying the main day-ahead metered adjustment factor formula. Each step of the new conditions is outlined in the table below.

The calculation proceeds only if the resource is not decommitted in real-time as the day-ahead metered energy adjustment factor is not relevant upon being shut down.

Step [1] ensures that the expected energy is at least equal to minimum load, which means there is no shut-down instruction from the CAISO. In the absence of a shut-down instruction, the formula will set the factor to zero if the meter is below Pmin (minus the tolerance band) or is Off. This addresses the inadvertent application of a factor greater than zero when the resource deviates below Pmin.

Step [2] will reset the factor to one if the difference between the metered energy and expected energy are within the tolerance band. This is not a change to the existing rules.

Step [3] will set the factor to one if the expected energy is equal to the day-ahead minimum load energy (within a zero tolerance, as newly defined in this process). This formula addresses the boundary condition when expected energy is equal to day-ahead minimum load and the resultant factor was automatically set to zero. Note that in step [2] we already checked to see if the resource delivered at least within the Performance Metric Tolerance Band. Thus, step [3] assumes the resource is outside of this band while checking for whether or not the expected energy equals the day-ahead minimum load energy (within a small tolerance of 10^{-9}). If the resource over-delivers, the DA MEAF remains 1 because the resource has delivered at least its total expected energy. However, over-delivered amounts will be subject to the real-time performance metric, which may disqualify bid cost recovery on energy in excess of the expected energy quantity.

Step [4] provides two formulas to use based on the following conditions. The first formula modifies the current factor by adding in a tolerance band. This formula is to be used when the metered energy is *less than* the day-ahead minimum load energy. This ensures that the resource is not penalized when it is within the tolerance band. In other cases when the metered energy is equal to or greater than the day-ahead minimum load energy, the current factor should be used.

Step [5] adds in a modification to address participating load, which may have negative day-ahead energy.

Step	Conditions and Actions
[1]	If (Expected Energy ⁱ >= DA Minimum Load Energy) and Expected Energy > 0 Then If ((Metered Energy – Regulation Energy < DA Minimum Load Energy –Tolerance Band) Or (Metered Energy – Regulation Energy <= 0)) Then DA MEAF = 0
[2]	Else If (Abs (Metered Energy – Regulation Energy - Expected Energy) <= Performance Metric

	<p>Tolerance)</p> <p>Then</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">DA MEAF = 1</p>
<p>[3]</p>	<p>Else (noting from Step 1 that Expected Energy should be >= DA Minimum Load Energy here, first test to determine if Expected Energy = DA Minimum Load Energy to avoid a divide by zero condition in the next “Else” statement below...)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">If (Expected Energy – DA Minimum Load Energy <= Zero Toleranceⁱⁱ)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Then</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">DA MEAF = 1</p>
<p>[4]</p>	<p>Else</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">If (Metered Energy – Regulation Energy < DA Minimum Load Energy)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Then</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">(over the range for which DA Minimum Load Energy > Metered Energy – Regulation Energy >= DA Minimum Load Energy – Tolerance)</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;"> $\text{Min} \left[1, \text{Max} \left(0, \left(\frac{\text{Metered Energy} - \text{DA Minimum Load Energy} - \text{Regulation Energy} + \text{Tolerance Band}}{\text{Expected Energy} - \text{DA Minimum Load Energy}} \right) \right) \right]$ </p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Else</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;"> $\text{Min} \left[1, \text{Max} \left(0, \left(\frac{\text{Metered Energy} - \text{DA Minimum Load Energy} - \text{Regulation Energy}}{\text{Expected Energy} - \text{DA Minimum Load Energy}} \right) \right) \right]$ </p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">End if</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">End if</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">End if</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">End if</p>
<p>[5]</p>	<p><i>This condition occurs after all of the other IF, Else statements from above</i></p> <p>Else</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">If Expected Energy >= 0</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Then</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">DA MEAF = 1</p>

	<p>Else</p> <p>(for the case of a BCR-Eligible Resource such as a pump-storage device from which negative DA energy is expected)</p> <p><i>DA MEAF</i> =</p> $\text{Min} \left[1, \text{Max} \left(0, \frac{\text{Metered Energy}}{\text{Expected Energy}} \right) \right]$ <p>End if</p> <p>End if</p>
--	---

- i. The term Expected Energy, for purpose of the calculations within the above table, is defined to be the minimum of the real-time expected energy and the day-ahead expected energy.
- ii. The term Zero Tolerance is a constant that equals the (very small) number 1×10^{-10} .

10. Tariff clarifications on residual imbalance energy

Based on discussions with stakeholders during the market issues bulletin, there are certain tariff sections that were written before MRTU that could be clarified. The ISO will present the specific tariff sections in a later draft or during the tariff stakeholder process.

11. Next Steps

The ISO will discuss this straw proposal with stakeholders on a conference call on April 15, 2015. Stakeholders should submit written comments by April 30, 2015 to initiativecomments@caiso.com.