NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
163.	11/10/2004 Go Live	Bidding	MP is requesting clarification on the expected MW values in bids in the Emergency Upper Operating Limit field (EUOL) under SMD2. 1. For GT's/IC's: Should the EUOL field contain DMNC (Winter/Summer Installed Capacity Contract) or Temperature corrected DMNC (Installed Capacity Contract) values? Are UCAP values used at all? 2. Is the "Max Operating Limits" on the MIS screens used to validate the upper limits in bids submitted? Are we to assume the max represents the Max listed for the period in question? 3. In reviewing the values in the MIS, we noticed that the Capacity Contract values listed for some generators did not match the submitted DMNC values of XXX and XXX MW respectively for the winter period. 4. For combined unit sites limited to XXX MW only: Can you please explain how the NYISO takes the DMNC values and applies these values to the MIS capacity values?	NYISO staff is reviewing this issue.	Open Issue
167.	11/17/2004	Bidding	Will generators be allowed to bid in fractions of MWs under SMD2? i.e. we have a unit that should be bid a XX.5 MW, but can currently only bid at XX or XX+1 MWs (this results in undergen, or overgen depending on our HAM results).	NYISO staff is reviewing this issue.	Open Issue

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
169.	11/10/2004 Go Live	Billing	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: 9:55 0 10:00 10 10:05 10 ..... 10:50 10 10:55 10 11:00 0 The billing pays on the 5 minute periods so 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 Which intervals are BPCGs calculated for?	NYISO staff is reviewing this issue.	Open Issue

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
164.	11/11/2004 Exercise 4	Commitment	Follow-up question to issue #156: Are you saying that at midnight, when SMD2 started, the difference between the actual load and the forecast load was greater than 1800 mw consuming all the reserves and that there were insufficient bids to alleviate the situation? I've seen the numbers that said we were 4000 mw short over the peak and been told that the magnitude of the shortfall is why non-synchronized reserves weren't converted to spinning reserve. I am trying to ascertain if we were more than 1800 mw short when the exercise started at midnight. Even if the shortage was greater than the available reserve I believe the software should still have converted ALL the reserve to the spinning category.	Market Trial IV was based upon the Day-Ahead load forecast of May 13, 2004. In preparation for the execution of the exercise the simulator was pre-programmed to present the May 13 load profile to RTS. Unfortunately, Market Participant load and transaction bidding for the exercise was not consistent with the forecast and SCUC saw and responded to a much lighter load. As a result, units that would have ordinarily been committed were not, and we entered the real time segment of the exercise with a significantly higher load than was addressed by SCUC. In a real life situation, the significant discrepancy between forecast and bid load in the DAM would have been reconciled, and operators would have taken actions to avoid the situation that was encountered in the simulated environment. Because the market exercise simulation was not staffed to the extent that production is, these scheduling and operator tasks were not executed (SREs, manual commitments, etc.). A benefit of this exercise however, was a good demonstration of Demand Curve activations.	Open Issue
152.	10/28/2004 Exercises 3+	Prices	Day-Ahead prices for some buses, e.g., RAVENSWOOD___1, WATERSIDE___6 8 9, NYPA_VERNON_____GT2, and RAVENSWOOD_GT_1, show uncharacteristically low prices relative to similar 138 kV buses during four of the market trials. What is the cause?	LECG working on response to this issue.	Open Issue

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
159.	11/08/2004 Go Live	Prices	In reviewing the price sensitive bids information the ISO provided we have a couple of questions: 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. 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.	NYISO staff is reviewing this issue.	Open Issue

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
157.	11/05/2004 Go Live	Training	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. 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.	NYISO Operations Staff to discuss at Nov. 19 MSWG meeting.	Open Issue
141.	10/26/2004 Exercise #7	Billing	MP concerned that the zonal LBMP calculation changes under SMD-2 may result in TCC revenue inadequacy even though lines are in service and transmission capacity has not been derated. The MP requests that the SMD2 Market Trials bills be reviewed in order to ensure TCC revenue adequacy. While market trials will in no way indicate the exact magnitude of the problem simply because it's a very small sample of what system configuration, dispatch, load levels, and load bus weights could be, it may offer some insight on the potential level of shortfall.	Issue was discussed at the 11/04/04 MSWG meeting.	Pending Closed

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
156.	11/8/2004 Exercise 4	Commitment	At the next MSWG we would like the ISO to discuss the situation that arose in Market Trial 4 and the activation of the Reserve Demand Curves. When Andrew went over the subject in August he said that non synchronized reserves weren't converted to spinning reserves because the startup and min. gen. bids were too high. He suggested that mitigating those bids might be the answer. When we raised the question at the October 29 MSWG meeting we got the impression he might be backing away from that analysis and had something else in mind. *Follow-up question recorded as issue #164	Reply from Andrew Hartshorn of LECG: 1. For periods of the MT IV results all demand curves were activated. 2. Some GTs had startup and minimum generation costs that dramatically exceeded any demand curve costs and resulted in those GTs maintaining non-synchronous reserves forcing synchronized reserves to be dispatched up to meet the energy. 3. The RT mitigation did not mitigate the startup and min gen costs because even after mitigating those costs the resulting prices did not decrease as all reserve demand curves were still violated. 4. At the first presentation we indicated that we wanted to look at the RT mitigation process to see what was happening. At the subsequent meeting what I did say in response to that was: A. The simulation of suddenly and persistently being completely devoid of reserves is not the condition that the system will find itself in. We don't go immediately from more than 2000 MW of reserves and regulation down to nearly no reserves. B. The process is more gradual that allows the mitigation of the GTs to occur as we are passing through intermediate shortage conditions which gets the resources online The model couldn't get itself out of the extreme shortage conditions that existed in the simulation. In real world operations the operators would not have let the system get to the point it was at and it was so extreme that the mitigation and non-commitment of GTs could not be avoided. C. In the particular circumstance observed in the Market trial IV the operators would have committed the GTs manually had the model not done it and this would not have impacted the prices at all. Also the operators would likely have been cutting exports in these circumstances all of which would have moved the market solution in a direction where once again the commitment of the GTs would have occurred through the RT mitigation process. Because it was a market trial of software and processes these actions by the operators (either starting the GTs or curtailing the exports) did not occur and the condition	Pending Closed

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
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.	Pending Closed
154.	11/01/2004 Go Live	Data	The Transmission Owners believe there are at least four data major process involved with billing. 1. SCADA which drive PTS 2. PTS 3. the logged MWh energy measurements for subzone ties and generators 4. The TOL files whereby TO's submit actual LSE load requirements It is not clear to the Transmission how there processes were tested during the bid-to-bill market trials. We think the SCADA is new as part of the new ABB EMS. We know PTS is a crucial part of billing and PTS gets data from SCADA. We don't think item #3 and item #4 change as a result of SMD-2, although we do know how or if SMD-2 billing will change how it interacts with item #3 and item #4. The Transmission Owners would like to formally request that the, "Testing of PTS as it interacts with the new SCADA and the testing of the actual subzone load calculation from the PTS" be completed.	NYISO IT/Settlements Staff discussed this topic in the October 29 MSWG meeting.	Pending Closed

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
161.	11/09/2004 Go Live	Data	Assuming a 30 minute GT is on line. What is the timeline for RTC to shut the unit down? For example its 0800 and the GT is online, RTC00 posts that at 0830 GT's scheduled energy is 0 MW. Is it a binding scheduled? Does RTC ramp the GT down such that RTC00 would post at 0815 the GT is at 1/2 load and at 0830 the GT is at 0 MW? Or is RTC00 advisory for shutting a GT down at 0830 and its RTC15 posting for 0830 which has the binding schedule?. The purpose of the question is to provide the operator with notification of shutting down a 30 minute unit. You've explained the binding is provided 30 minutes prior to startup a 30 minute GT. MP would like confirmation if shutting the GT down is similar with a binding schedule 30 minutes prior to shutdown.	Unit shutdown decisions are not binding until the RTC immediately before the scheduled shutdown. For example, RTC15 may indicate that a unit will shutdown at 45 minutes after the hour, but this would be advisory only. The shut down would not be binding until the RTC 30 schedules the shutdown for 45 minutes after the hour. There is a request from CDAS about adding a "shut down" flag to ICCP communications for this purpose. The "shut down" flag will be discussed as a post-deployment enhancement.	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.	Pending Closed

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
120.	10/12/2004 Exercise #7	Bidding	MP is attempting to submit a Self Committed Fixed DAM bid for a generator and keeps getting a validation failed error. The error message returned is "Minimum Generation Cost is required in Self Committed DAM" bid. However, the Min Gen Cost field is a grayed out (disabled) in the web form when the self-committed fixed commitment type is selected. Contradictory validation rule encountered during Gen bidding: 10/12/2004 03:11:12 PM - Minimum Generation Cost is required in Self-Committed DAM bid. This differs from a validation message returned at a previous market trials: 07/19/2004 02:05:11 PM - Self Committed DAM bid cannot have Minimum Generation Cost The two messages are contradictory. MP was only able to successfully validate the bid after including Min Gen costs in U/D bid submittal.	The "10/12/2004 03:11:12 PM - Minimum Generation Cost is required in Self-Committed DAM bid." validation rule is correct. The Web form for generator bidding has been modified to accept a min gen cost, has passed QA testing, and has been deployed to SMD production. MP has provided bids that will be entered into SMD2 production environment to validate web form modification. Bids used in 11/05/04 SCUC & RTS test runs to validate RTC postings.	Closed

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
165.	10/25/2004 Go Live	Billing	MP looked at the sample SMD2 data file for Billing data 8/21/2004. Comparing the file to Data Dictionary V19, the following discrepancies were noticed: 1. Hourly File Section VII Field 2020 Emergency Demand Reduction $ does not exist in the data file. Is this field going to be in the final files or not? 2. Daily File Section I Field 315 Daily Schedule 1 Charge $ does not exist in the data file. Is this field going to be in the final files or not? 3. Daily File Section IV Field 816 Emergency Demand Reduction $ does not exist in the data file. Is this field going to be in the final files or not? 4.Daily File Section VII Field 2021 Emergency Demand Reduction $ does not exist in the data file. Is this field going to be in the final files or not?	These bill codes have yet not been implemented within the billing system. Settlements associated with EDRP and the allocation of Schedule 1 charges to generators is included in the Con Invoice as manual adjustments. They are not included on the current ("Legacy") hourly and daily csv files either. These bill codes will not be a part of the final SMD2 hourly or daily csv files. Going forward, when these settlements are coded into BAS/ConInvoice, the data will be available through the DSS.	Closed
166.	11/12/2004 Go Live	Billing	MP would like to confirm that Penalties for poor Operating Reserves (OR) performance would go away under SMD2 (being that all dispatchable units will be considered for OR).	The formal penalties do go away. They are effectively replaced by the two-settlement system for reserves. The idea is that, if you were selected for reserves you were economic. If you are not available another unit, presumably a unit higher up the supply curve, will be called upon and you will be on the hook to buy out of your position at a higher price. Therefore the need for an "incentive to perform" penalty goes away because the second settlement will serve as that incentive.	Closed

NYISO SMD2 Market Exercises
Reported Market Participant Open & Updated Issues Summary
Updated 11/18/2004

Num	Date First Received	Issue Type	Issue	Resolution/Explanation	Issue Status
168.	11/17/2004 Go Live	Commitment	In reviewing the RTC timeline, we want to clarify when RTC will be committing 10 Minute GT's. We understand with RTC15, the NYISO will be posting at t=15 and issuing binding commitments for t=30 and t=45 (with schedules as far out as t=165). 1. Under this schedule, would the 10 minute unit receive a binding commitment for t=30? 2. Can we expect for each RTC execution and its 15 minute posting a base point will follow for 15 minutes later for all 10 minute units.	1. All units in RTC will receive binding startup notifications consistent with startup time included in their real-time bids. Units that submit a 10 to 15-minute start-up time will receive a binding startup notification from the RTC that posts its results 15 minutes before the scheduled start of the unit. 2. Yes.	Closed
162.	11/10/2004 Go Live	Data	In comparing the SMD2 Upload/Download Documentation from the NYISO Market Participant User's Guide to a sample Generator Bids and Schedules Response file from the SMD2 test system and the number of fields from page 8-34 did not match the number of fields in the response file. The response has 62 fields and the documentation has 40. Can you please send me an updated version of the documentation? I need to know which field is the scheduled energy field.	MP did not realize that the Dispatch Curve MW's and Dispatch Curve $/MW each have 12 points (1-12). There are actually 62 data points in the GEN_SCH response. The documentation is correct. MP was sent a response download template to illustrate this.	Closed
160.	11/08/2004 Exercise 7	Prices	Could NYISO explain once more the reasons for the divergence in pricing from RTD to RTC especially RTC 's for 9:45, 10:00, 10:15 and 10:30.	The answer boils down to missing units in RTD within the simulated environment. For example, we looked at RTC for 13:45 GMT (9:45 EDT) and compared it to the RTD for 13:45. In this instance, there was 885 MW that RTC was dispatching that wasn't there in RTD (at 0 MW in RTD). RTD was trying to turn the units on, but they were not responding, which is because of the simulator environment. Similarly, I checked 14:15 GMT (10:15 EDT), and compared the schedules from RTC and RTD. There were 1,138 MW that were in RTC that were set to 0 in RTD. That's what caused RTD to have to dispatch up other units and increased prices in RTD compared to RTC.	Closed

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