

# Multi-Year Project Cost Summary

Prepared For:

Budget, Standards & Performance Subcommittee

August 31, 2005

# NYISO Multi-Year Project Cost Summary

- Project scopes and expenditures are reviewed with Market Participants as part of annual budgeting process
- Project scope is usually broken down into incremental phases that can be evaluated separately
- Multi-phase implementations that require future year investment are specified
- Deviations from project budgets and plans are reviewed regularly with Market Participants

## Multi-Year Project Cost Summary (\$ in millions)

<i>PROJECTS COMPLETED DURING 2005:</i>												
<u>Project Name</u>	<u>*Actuals Prior to 2005</u>				<u>2005 Projection</u>				<u>Total Project Cost</u>			
	<u>Labor</u>	<u>Cap.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Labor</u>	<u>Cap.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Labor</u>	<u>Cap.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
SMD 2.0 Implementation & Related Projects	\$8.0	\$14.6	\$34.7	\$57.3	\$0.9	\$0.0	\$1.1	\$2.0	\$8.9	\$14.6	\$35.8	\$59.3
DSS Customer Settlements Expansion	\$1.0	\$7.0	\$7.2	\$15.2	\$0.8	\$0.0	\$1.5	\$2.3	\$1.8	\$7.0	\$8.7	\$17.5
E-Tagging	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$2.8	\$3.2	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.8	\$0.5	\$0.1	\$3.4	\$4.0
Documentum Expanded Implementation	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.9	\$1.1	\$0.3	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.7	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$1.3	\$1.8
Controllable Tie Lines Scheduling & Pricing	\$0.3	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.7	\$0.3	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.9	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$1.6
MDEX	\$0.2	\$0.1	\$0.2	\$0.5	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.8	\$0.9	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$1.0	\$1.4

<i>PROJECTS CONTINUING INTO 2006:</i>												
<u>Project Name</u>	<u>*Actuals Prior to 2005</u>				<u>2005 Projection</u>				<u>**Total Project Cost</u>			
	<u>Labor</u>	<u>Cap.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Labor</u>	<u>Cap.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Labor</u>	<u>Cap.</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
New Headquarters Facility	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$15.9	\$0.5	\$16.8	\$0.4	\$15.9	\$0.5	\$16.8
BAS Replacement Strategy / Billing Sim.	\$0.3	\$0.0	\$3.5	\$3.8	\$0.7	\$0.0	\$1.4	\$2.1	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$4.9	\$5.9
UCAP Auction Automation	\$0.8	\$0.1	\$1.9	\$2.8	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.5	\$0.9	\$1.2	\$0.1	\$2.4	\$3.7
TCC Auction Automation	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.5	\$1.1	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$0.5	\$1.1
Intra-Hour Transaction Scheduling	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.3

\* Note: Before 2004, Labor was not tracked on an individual project basis.

\*\* Note: These projects will have costs beyond 2005, and will be included within the 2006 budgeting process.

# Key Points Regarding Multi-Year Projects

## ➤ SMD2

- *Additional labor and consultant costs tied to additional market trials and testing phases.*
- *Unanticipated hardware costs associated with unplanned replacement of infrastructure components; not in original project scope.*
- *Incremental labor and consultant cost driven by rescheduling of deployment from 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2004 to February 2005.*
- *Certain feature additions not part of original scope, but determined to be required.*

# Key Points Regarding Multi-Year Projects

## ➤ DSS Customer Settlements

- *Core infrastructure components were part of original investment.*
- *Incremental feature additions as requested by MPs on annual basis; incorporated in budgeting process.*
- *Features incorporated in data warehouse to support key strategic settlements initiatives (e.g. final bill close-out, billing automation enhancements).*

## ➤ E-Tagging

- *Tighter coordination with neighboring control areas and compliance with NERC policy drives enhancements.*

# Key Points Regarding Multi-Year Projects

## ➤ Documentum

- *Core infrastructure components were part of original investment.*
- *Incremental feature delivery as NYISO business functions leverage product capabilities.*

## ➤ Controllable Tie Lines

- *Development of generic tie line / proxy bus solution should enable easier and faster implementation of future scheduled lines.*

# Key Points Regarding Multi-Year Projects

## ➤ **Billing Simulator / BAS Replacement**

- *Initial deliverable tied to audit recommendations.*
- *Simulator system valuable for production calculation of final bill close-out numbers, as well as testing tool to find defects.*
- *Implementation of technology solution that could form the core of a new billing and settlements system.*

## ➤ **UCAP Auction Automation**

- *Additional labor and consultant costs tied to additional market trials and testing phases.*