

**NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Open Market Participant Issues Summary
Updated 12/13/2004**

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
169.	11/10/2004 Go Live	Billing	<p>If we take a 10 MW GT that is scheduled to come on at 10:00 and shut off at 11:00 at the end of its minimum run time its basepoints coming out of the model are:</p> <p>9:55 0 10:00 10 10:05 10 10:50 10 10:55 10 11:00 0</p> <p>The billing pays on the 5 minute periods so</p> <p>9:55-10:00 5 MW 10:00-10:05 10 MW 10:05-10:10 10 MW 10:50-10:55 10 MW 10:55-11:00 5 MW 11:00-11:05 0 MW</p> <p>Which intervals are BPCGs calculated for?</p>	<p>BPCG will be calculated for the 9:55-10:00 interval, it will not be calculated for the 10:55-11:00 interval.</p> <p>Issue undergoing review by NYISO staff and will be discussed at the December 14, 2004 MSWG meeting.</p>	Open Issue

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Open Market Participant Issues Summary
Updated 12/13/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
173.	12/02/2004 Go Live	System	<p>MP experiencing difficulty with the certificate in use on the SMD2 bid-posting server. The problem is that the "common name (CN)" listed on the certificate at bidpost2.nyiso.com is "*.nyiso.com", rather than "bidpost2.nyiso.com". MP's systems cannot make connections unless the "common name" matches the server name exactly (both for security reasons, and because of the nature of the connection software used).</p> <p>MP asks if it is possible to change the "common name" in the certificate on bidpost2.nyiso.com from "*.nyiso.com" to "bidpost2.nyiso.com" so that it matches the server name? In the legacy environment, the "common name" on the server certificate matched the server name precisely -- both were "bidpost.nyiso.com".</p>	NYISO staff is reviewing this issue.	Open Issue
143.	10/27/2004 Exercise #6	Data	MP requesting NYISO to issue a Technical Bulletin on loss calculations. To add detail to the new process for removing Losses estimates from the Load Forecast and using the Load Flow to calculate losses	A White Paper was distributed and discussed at the 11/4 MSWG meeting. A Technical Bulletin will be published based upon the White Paper and comments received. A draft Technical Bulletin will be distributed in December 2004.	Pending Closed
157.	11/05/2004 Go Live	Training	<p>MP would like to get an update on the status of NYISO System Operator training in regards to SMD2. MP would like to know the training schedule and targets the NYISO has established to ensure adequate training for the operators.</p> <p>With the on-going software development and fixes for the December 1st deployment date, MP would like assurance the operators have had sufficient training to ensure reliability when SMD2 goes live.</p>	NYISO Operations Staff will report back to MSWG after the Legacy / SMD2 parallel operations (December 1-10) have concluded.	Pending Closed
158.	11/05/2004 Go Live	Mitigation	MP is asking for detailed documentation on how MIS will display mitigation in SMD as well as how MIS will display the potentially added extra bid point.	This information will be incorporated into the updated SMD2 AMP Tech Bulletins. A draft Technical Bulletin will be distributed in December 2004.	Pending Closed

**NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Open Market Participant Issues Summary
Updated 12/13/2004**

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
159.	11/08/2004 Go Live	Prices	<p>In reviewing the price sensitive bids information the ISO provided we have a couple of questions:</p> <p>1.) We changed to Load Weighted Zonal Prices for SMD2. Please confirm that this change applies in Bid Load Passes and that the zonal LBMPs that result in Pass 1 drive the acceptance or rejection of the Price Capped, Virtual Load and Virtual Supply bids.</p> <p>2.) In reviewing the data provided, for NYC in HB 11 and 18 there was an increase in both the Virtual Load and Supply bids taken. Similarly, for LI in HB 14, 17 & 18 there was an increase in Virtual Load, Virtual Supply and Price Capped Load bids. These were in hours where the POSTED LBMP's were greater in the Simulation than they were on June 17. Now to my recall, these bids are all evaluated in Pass 1 of the DAM and those positions - what is accepted are unchanged by later passes of SCUC that are run. Since we don't post Pass 1 LBMP's there is no way for an MP to know against what price their specific bid was evaluated. These results appear anomalous. Assuming my first question above is answered in the affirmative AND coupled with the shift in loss location (note I still have an open issue on that topic) it is not at all clear as to how we could have had increase in BOTH virtual loads and supply simultaneously. There are four other hours on LI and two in NYC where there was an increase in VLBs taken and one hour where the VSBs taken went down and the VLBs up. These were hours where posted LBMP's rose in the simulation compared to the original 6-17 day. Perhaps the Bid Load Pass LBMPs went in reverse of the Posted Pass 5 LBMPs and we don't see that - but it does deserve investigation.</p>	<p>Issue was discussed at the 11/19/04 MSWG meeting. NYISO staff to provide additional loss data from Market Exercise 6.</p>	Pending Closed

Color code: **Red** – open issue
Blue – New issue added since last posting
Green – New information / resolutions added since last posting