



California ISO

**FERC Order No. 831 –
Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Revised Final Proposal**

September 10, 2020

Prepared by:
Danielle Tavel

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Background.....	6
3	Stakeholder Comments and Changes from the Draft Final Proposal	7
4	Proposal.....	12
4.1	Power Balance Constraint Relaxation Pricing and Constraint Penalty Prices 13	
4.2	Screening import and virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh	23
4.2.1	Application to Resource Adequacy Imports.....	24
4.2.2	Maximum Import Bid Price Calculation.....	26
5	Energy Imbalance Market Governing Body Advisory Role	32
6	Stakeholder engagement.....	34
7	Appendix A - Market constraint relaxation penalty parameters values	35

Revision History

Date	Revision
08/24/2020	Initial Release
09/10/2020	Updated Section 4.1 to include provisions to only apply the pricing run threshold value in the real-time market and to apply the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price in the real-time market if it is in place in the day-ahead market. Updated Section 4.2.1 to reflect change of reducing resource-adequacy import bids to the greater of the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price, the highest priced cost-verified bid for a resource-specific resource, or \$1,000/MWh.

1 Executive Summary

This initiative explores modifications related to the CAISO's compliance filing with Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Order No. 831. In its compliance filing, the CAISO revised its tariff to raise the energy bid cap from \$1,000/MWh to \$2,000/MWh. It also revised its tariff to require suppliers within the CAISO balancing authority area that submit energy bids above \$1,000/MWh to base bids on verifiable actual or expected costs.¹ This initiative addresses modifications to two topics related to the changes the CAISO proposed to comply with Order No. 831:²

- The “penalty prices” at which the CAISO markets will relax market constraints under the increased energy bid cap in order to comply with FERC Order No. 831. The CAISO market uses these penalty prices or market constraint relaxation price parameters, to relax constraints in the market and set prices if needed to reach a solution. This includes the power balance constraint that requires supply to equal demand, which sets the system marginal energy cost under such conditions.
- A price-screening methodology for import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh.

FERC Order No. 831 requires RTOs/ISOs to verify costs underlying cost-based bids above \$1,000/MWh before a bid is used in the market. The order additionally provides for after-the-fact make-whole payments to the extent an RTO/ISO cannot verify a resource's costs before the market runs. The order did not require verification of import or virtual bids above \$1,000/MWh. However, the Commission indicated that it would consider proposals by RTOs/ISOs to verify or otherwise review the costs of imports or exports and/or develop additional mitigation provisions for import and export transactions above \$1,000/MWh.³

Similarly, Order No. 831 did not specify how the RTO/ISO should set its market constraint relaxation prices (also referred to as penalty prices) to be consistent with the increased bid cap. However, it stated an RTO/ISO may file, pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Power Act, to propose modifications to shortage prices or other market elements that require revision in light of the offer cap.⁴ The CAISO intends to present its proposal to FERC in a separate filing, under section 205 of the Federal Power Act, consistent with FERC's direction.

¹ FERC Order No. 831 available at <https://cms.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/whats-new/comm-meet/2016/111716/E-2.pdf>

² Note that this document addresses these topics in different order than the revised straw proposal.

³ FERC Order No. 831 at p. 197 available at <https://cms.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/whats-new/comm-meet/2016/111716/E-2.pdf>

⁴ FERC Order No. 831 at p. 213 available at <https://cms.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/whats-new/comm-meet/2016/111716/E-2.pdf>

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

In the CAISO's proposed tariff changes to comply with FERC Order No. 831⁵, it did not propose to cost-verify non-resource specific import bids and proposed to allow suppliers to submit such import bids up to \$2,000/MWh.⁶ The CAISO also proposed to set the market constraint relaxation penalty prices relative to the new \$2,000/MWh bid cap in all market intervals. Subsequently, the CAISO initiated this policy initiative to explore alternative approaches to these topics. In January 2020, the CAISO notified FERC that it would extend implementation of its compliance with Order No. 831 to fall 2021 to allow more time for policy development and implementation resulting from this policy initiative.

The CAISO proposes to set the power balance penalty price used by the market to \$2,000/MWh, and scale related price parameters accordingly, only for those intervals in which verified energy costs are greater than \$1,000/MWh. Specifically, it will use these higher priced parameters only when (1) there is a submitted and cost-verified energy bid from a resource-specific resource greater than \$1,000/MWh or (2) a CAISO-calculated "maximum import bid price," used to screen the costs of imports, is greater than \$1,000/MWh. Resource-specific resources include CAISO generating units, EIM participating resources, and resource-specific import bids.⁷

When the market uses the penalty prices scaled to a \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price and must relax the power balance constraint, the CAISO proposes to set energy prices based on the amount of the shortfall in supply to meet demand. If the system wide shortfall is no more than a calculated threshold value based on the NERC BAL-001-2 BAAL_{Low} limit, then the market will set energy prices based on the price of the highest-priced cleared economic bid. Otherwise, the market will set prices based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price. This design reflects that small supply shortfalls do not represent actual shortages.

The CAISO proposes using a variation of the NERC BAL-001-2 BAAL_{Low} limit as the threshold value for each balancing authority area in the EIM. This objective threshold value represents the amount of supply that can be less than load while still maintaining system frequency within reliability criteria.⁸

⁵ Submitted in September 2019.

⁶ As part of the CAISO compliance to Order No. 831, the CAISO has already proposed to verify import bids from resource specific system resources' costs similarly to the cost-verification for internal resources' energy bids. See CAISO Order No. 831 Compliance Filing, transmittal letter at pp. 10-11. <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Sep52019-TariffAmendment-OrderNo831ComplianceFiling-ER19-2757.pdf>

⁷ A resource-specific system resource, a term used in the CAISO tariff, is a resource with specific generation design characteristics registered in Master File and modeled as either a generating unit or a system resource. A list of import tariff definitions can be found here: <http://www.caiso.com/InitiativeDocuments/ImportTariffMatrix-Feb042020.xlsx>

⁸ Appendix A discusses the calibrations necessary for all penalty prices or ancillary services scarcity prices that are tied to the maximum energy bid price as described in the tariff and BPMs. The CAISO proposes to scale ancillary services scarcity prices relative to \$2,000/MWh when there are bids greater than \$1,000/MWh. This is the same approach for when bids are below \$1,000/MWh.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

The CAISO proposes to calculate and publish the threshold values for each balancing authority area yearly as the NERC defined Frequency Bias Setting amounts for each balancing authority area are updated.

Regarding the second topic this policy initiative addresses, this final proposal presents a methodology to price screen non-resource specific import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh. This methodology differs from what the CAISO has recently filed with FERC for cost-verifying energy bids for resource-specific resources.⁹ Rather than verifying actual or expected operating costs, as the CAISO will do for resource-specific resources, the CAISO proposes to calculate a “maximum import bid price” that it will use to screen non-resource specific import bids. The CAISO will calculate this maximum import bid price based on published bilateral energy price indices. Under this approach, the CAISO market will only accept import bids priced higher than \$1,000/MWh in periods when the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is also greater than \$1,000/MWh.

The import bid price screening will apply differently to non-resource specific import bids providing resource adequacy capacity than it will to those not providing resource adequacy capacity. The CAISO market will reduce resource adequacy non-resource specific import bids priced higher than \$1,000/MWh to the greater of the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price, the highest-priced cost verified bid or \$1,000/MWh.

The CAISO market will not reduce the price of non-resource adequacy non-resource specific import bids higher than \$1,000/MWh. However, the CAISO will only accept these bids when the maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or there is a cost-verified resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. When either of these conditions exist, the market will accept non-resource adequacy non-resource specific import bids up to \$2,000/MWh.

Similarly, the CAISO market will only accept virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh in the event the maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or there is a cost-verified resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. This rule is necessary because as a result of the penalty pricing proposal, the CAISO market cannot accept import bids or virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh when the power balance penalty price is \$2,000/MWh. This will only be when the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or there is a cost-verified resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. The market will not clear bids greater than \$1,000/MWh when the power balance penalty price is set at \$1,000/MWh.

⁹ The cost-verification approach for resource-specific resources was developed in the *Commitment Cost and Default Energy Bid Enhancements* policy initiative and was recently submitted to the FERC in Docket ER20-2360, available at <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Jul9-2020-TariffAmendment-CommitmentCostsandDefaultEnergyBidEnhancementsCCDEBE-ER20-2360.pdf>.

2 Background

In 2016, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issued FERC Order No. 831 that required Independent System Operators and Regional Transmission Organizations (ISOs/RTOs) to revise their tariffs to raise the energy bid cap from \$1,000/MWh to \$2,000/MWh, and generally required suppliers that submit bids above \$1,000/MWh to base those bids on verifiable costs. The rule changes in Order No. 831 created a structure where internal supply offers above \$1,000/MWh are effectively automatically mitigated to an amount equal to a supplier's expected or actual costs.

Order No. 831 required that ISOs verify the costs underlying these cost-based offers above \$1,000/MWh before an offer could be used to calculate energy prices. If an ISO could not verify the costs underlying the offer before the market clearing process begins then that offer may not be used to calculate energy prices. However, the supplier may be eligible for an after-the-fact make-whole payment if the resource is dispatched and the resource's costs can be verified after-the-fact. Suppliers will also be eligible for make-whole payments if the ISO dispatches a resource and its verified cost-based incremental energy bid exceeds \$2,000/MWh. The order did not require verification of import or virtual bids above \$1,000/MWh. However, the Commission indicated that it would consider proposals by RTOs/ISOs to verify or otherwise review the costs of imports or exports and/or develop additional mitigation provisions for import and export transactions above \$1,000/MWh.¹⁰

Similarly, Order No. 831 did not specify how the RTO/ISO should set its penalty prices but indicated an RTO/ISO may file, pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Power Act, to propose modifications to shortage prices or other market elements that require revision in light of the offer cap.¹¹

The CAISO submitted its proposed tariff changes to comply with FERC Order No. 831 in September 2019 and proposed that they go into effect in fall 2020. In its proposed tariff changes,¹² the CAISO did not submit a separate filing requesting authority to cost-verify or price screen import bids above \$1,000/MWh. However, the CAISO decided to further address this topic in this initiative because of the CAISO balancing authority area's increasing dependence on imports.

In addition, a number of stakeholders objected to continuing to set the power balance penalty price at the hard energy bid cap, which under Order No. 831 increases from \$1,000/MWh to \$2,000/MWh. This would result in market prices being set to

¹⁰ FERC Order No. 831 at p. 197 available at <https://cms.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/whats-new/comm-meet/2016/111716/E-2.pdf>

¹¹ FERC Order No. 831 at p. 213 available at <https://cms.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/whats-new/comm-meet/2016/111716/E-2.pdf>

¹² Developed in the CAISO's Commitment Cost and Default Energy Bid Enhancements (CCDEBE) stakeholder initiative available at <http://www.caiso.com/StakeholderProcesses/Commitment-costs-and-default-energy-bid-enhancements>.

\$2,000/MWh if the market has to relax the power balance constraint. Consequently, this initiative also addresses this topic.

In January 2020, the CAISO notified FERC that it would likely extend implementation of its Order No. 831 compliance requirements to fall 2021 to allow more time for policy development and implementation resulting from this policy initiative.¹³

3 Stakeholder Comments and Changes from the Draft Final Proposal

The CAISO appreciates the written stakeholder comments received in response to this initiative's revised draft final proposal and the subsequent stakeholder call. The following summarizes these comments and the changes resulting from them.

Power Balance Constraint Relaxation Pricing Comments and Changes

In the revised draft final proposal, the CAISO proposed that the market would set energy prices based on the amount of shortfall in supply to meet demand when the market must relax the power balance constraint and there are energy costs greater than \$1,000/MWh. In this event, the market uses constraint penalty prices scaled to a \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price and would otherwise set prices based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price. The CAISO proposed to compare shortfall amounts to a threshold value based on operators' good utility practices of managing the real-time balancing of their respective balancing authority area.

Stakeholders generally supported the CAISO's proposal to scale penalty prices to the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price only during market intervals when verified energy costs are greater than \$1,000/MWh. However, some stakeholders opposed the CAISO's proposal to use threshold values based on each balancing authority area's good utility practice. They pointed out that this is a subjective value that has no significant reliability justification and would be difficult to validate.

EIM entities were supportive of the CAISO's proposal to avoid setting energy prices based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price when there are small shortages or infeasibilities; however, they maintained that the CAISO's characterization of shortages was not accurate. They noted that intervals in which shortages exist are associated with an inability to maintain operating reserves, rather than intervals in which operators need to take action. Further, they stated that when EIM balancing authority area operators need to take action to resolve shortfalls in supply to meet demand, they do so based on the NERC defined control performance criteria. Therefore, they recommended the CAISO implement a threshold value consistent with NERC reliability

¹³ See CAISO Motion for Leave to Answer and Supplemental Answer of the California Independent System Operator Corporation to Comments and Limited Protest, FERC Docket No. ER19-2757, at page 3-5 (January 31, 2020) (available at: <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Jan31-2020-SuppAnswer-to-Comments-Order831Compliance-ER19-2757.pdf>)

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

requirements that is indicative of true shortage conditions. They stated this would provide an objective threshold value based on each balancing authority area's characteristics.

A stakeholder urged the CAISO to simply scale penalty prices to the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price regardless of the size of the infeasibility. It advocated that the current practice of setting penalty prices to the current bid cap of \$1,000/MWh when the power balance constraint is relaxed is not based on the size of infeasibilities and, therefore, doing so would be inconsistent with the existing practice.

Additionally, a stakeholder recommended that penalty prices should be scaled relative to \$2,000/MWh in any interval when there is a power balance constraint infeasibility greater than the threshold, irrespective of there being verified energy costs greater than \$1,000/MWh. It contended that limiting penalty pricing based on the presence of verified energy costs being greater than \$1,000/MWh will lead to arbitrary price differences.

Market Surveillance Committee (MSC) members expressed the opinion that using the highest-priced cleared economic bid to set energy prices may not send an appropriate shortage price signal to the market. They pointed out that under the current market design, when the market has to relax the power balance constraint, it sets prices at \$1,000/MWh, which can be greater than the last economic bid. The MSC members advocated that shortage price signals provide incentives for flexible resources and will help ensure that imports are delivered.

Based on consideration of all of these comments, in this final proposal the CAISO proposes to only scale the market constraint penalty prices in the relative to a \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price used for the pricing run during intervals when verified energy costs are greater than \$1,000/MWh. When penalty prices are scaled to a \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price and there is a power balance constraint infeasibility, the CAISO proposes to set energy prices in the pricing run based on the amount of shortfall in supply to meet demand. For each balancing authority area the market will compare shortfall amounts to a threshold value based the BAL-001-2 BAAL_{Low} limit, which incorporates an annually updated frequency bias term unique to each balancing authority area.

This proposed threshold value represents the amount of supply that can be less than load while still maintaining system frequency within reliability criteria. Frequency is related to the balance of supply and load. System frequency is maintained by matching supply to demand. However, small mismatches and resulting differences in frequency from the desired 60 Hz are acceptable. Consequently, this threshold value is intended to account for small supply shortfalls for which it is not appropriate to send the strong shortage pricing signal that setting prices based on \$2,000/MWh would. These small

apparent shortfalls may not actually represent actual shortfalls because of forecast and modeling inaccuracies.

The CAISO continues to assert that \$2,000/MWh is far greater than prices and the bid cap under typical conditions and it is appropriate that there be additional measures to ensure a supply shortfall is real and significant before setting prices based on \$2,000/MWh. This is aligned with the FERC Order No. 831 policy direction that established additional measures for bids above \$1,000/MWh as such costs would not be expected under most conditions.

The CAISO proposes to maintain its approach to relax the power balance constraint before pricing the power balance penalty price at \$2,000/MWh. If the system wide shortfall is, for example, no more than the calculated threshold value of 233.7 MW, then the market will set energy prices based on the price of the highest-priced cleared economic bid. Otherwise, the market will set prices based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price.

This proposal also addresses an unintended consequence under a previous approach that did not have a threshold value for setting prices at the highest-priced cleared bid. This unintended consequence was that it may have set the energy price in the pricing run at a value less than the current \$1,000/MWh power balance penalty price when market constraint penalty prices are scaled to \$2,000/MWh.

Finally, multiple stakeholders recommend the CAISO focus its efforts on accurately reflecting scarcity pricing conditions in the market. They suggest the CAISO prioritize a separate scarcity pricing stakeholder effort to adopt scarcity pricing market design mechanisms.

The CAISO acknowledges the concerns stakeholders have regarding scarcity pricing, and is addressing these as part of the Flexible Ramping Product (FRP) Refinements initiative. Additionally, concerns will be addressed in Bundle 3 of the Extended Day-Ahead Market (EDAM) initiative or in a separate stakeholder initiative.¹⁴ Within the FRP refinements initiative, the CAISO is proposing to make the flexible ramping product nodal-based, which will increase the utilization and deployment of this product. This will ensure the power balance constraint is not triggered prior to the flexible ramping product constraints being fully relaxed, because it will ensure the resources awarded flexible ramping product are accessible. When the flexible ramping product requirements are relaxed, the demand curve price gradually increases the energy price above the marginal energy offer. As the requirement relaxation increases, the energy price increases to higher levels prior to relaxing the power balance constraint. The power

¹⁴ Information on the CAISO's Flexible Ramping Product Refinements initiative is available at: <http://www.caiso.com/StakeholderProcesses/Flexible-ramping-product-refinements>.
Information on the CAISO's Extended Day-Ahead Market initiative is available at: <http://www.caiso.com/StakeholderProcesses/Extended-day-ahead-market>

balance penalty price is only triggered after the full flexible ramping product requirement cannot be met.

In Bundle 3 of the EDAM initiative, which is scheduled to begin in Q2 2021, the CAISO will explore enhancing its market's scarcity pricing provisions. The scope of these enhancements will be defined at the onset of that part of the initiative.

Import Bid Cost Verification Requirements Comments and Changes

In this initiative's revised draft final proposal, the CAISO proposed to price-screen all import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh using a CAISO-calculated "maximum import bid price" based on published electrical price indices. The CAISO proposed to calculate a single maximum import bid price based on the maximum of the Mid-C and Palo Verde bilateral electrical hub prices that was shaped by a previous days day-ahead SMEC. Additionally, the CAISO proposed to not attempt to verify the actual costs behind an import. The revised draft final proposal also proposed to apply the maximum import bid price to non-resource specific import bids and reduce any offer greater than the maximum import bid price or \$1,000/MWh. Finally, the revised draft final proposal proposed to not provide after-the fact cost recovery for import bids that were reduced.

Stakeholders continue to support the CAISO's intent to screen import bid prices greater than \$1,000/MWh. However, stakeholders differed on the type of imports that should be subject to price screening. Some stakeholders maintain all import resources, regardless of resource adequacy status should be screened using the maximum import bid price. They stated that limiting the bid price of only resource adequacy imports constitutes discriminatory treatment. Further, they stated that all imports should be subject to the price screen because the CAISO's *System Market Power Mitigation* initiative does not propose to mitigate imports.¹⁵ They maintain that all resources are necessary to promote real-time liquidity. On the other side, some stakeholders continue to maintain that "voluntary" non-resource adequacy import supply should not be subject to price screening. They stated it is not practical to develop a methodology that would accurately determine imports' actual costs. This is because the CAISO market does not link import bids to specific generators for which the CAISO would have information to estimate costs. In addition, the costs include opportunity costs that can be very subjective.

The CAISO depends on resource adequacy imports to meet its load, it is appropriate to have the same safeguards that are in place for internal resource adequacy resources to protect against unjustified prices greater than \$1,000/MWh. Non-resource adequacy imports do not have the same requirement to offer to the market that resource adequacy imports do. Because of this, importers may not offer to the CAISO market if

¹⁵ Information on the CAISO's System Market Power Mitigation initiative is available at: <https://stakeholdercenter.caiso.com/StakeholderInitiatives/System-market-power-mitigation>

they were faced with the risk of having their bid reduced below actual costs with no provisions for after-the-market cost recovery.

Consequently, in this final proposal, the CAISO continues to propose to only reduce resource adequacy import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh to a CAISO calculated price. The CAISO proposes this price to be to the higher of the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price or the highest-priced cost verified bid for a resource-specific resource. The CAISO also maintains its proposal to not provide for after-the-fact cost recovery for import bids. This proposal will not have the effect of reducing the quantity of import supply because resource adequacy resources are required to offer these imports to the CAISO market. The CAISO does not believe this is discriminatory treatment because suppliers have the opportunity to take the potential to have an import bid reduced when negotiating resource adequacy contracts. Suppliers not providing resource adequacy capacity do not have this opportunity.

Although this proposal allows non-resource adequacy import bids not limited by the maximum import bid price to set prices, there are two factors to mitigate the risk that they will inappropriately inflate CAISO market prices. First, the market should be able to use only resource adequacy resources to meet CAISO balancing authority area demand. Limiting non-resource adequacy bids to a maximum import bid price would have the adverse effect of potentially discouraging non-resource adequacy imports that can supplement resource adequacy imports during very tight conditions. Second, the CAISO will only accept non-resource adequacy bids when the maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or there is a cost-verified resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. When either of these conditions do not exist, the market will only accept non-resource adequacy non-resource specific import bids up to \$1,000/MWh.

Stakeholders also suggested modifications to the proposed maximum import bid price calculation. A stakeholder recommended the CAISO revert to the previous proposal of calculating two separate maximum import bid prices for the north and south interties, rather than calculating a single maximum import bid price to screen import and virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh. They maintained that when supply conditions are tight and bids are justified to be greater than \$1,000/MWh, importers cannot simply choose between importing from the north or south. They contend in these instances, importers cannot access transmission to choose where they import from.

Further, a stakeholder recommended the CAISO modify their proposal to use the day-ahead net load forecast to shape bilateral hub prices, instead of using a previous days day-ahead SMEC. They suggested the day-ahead net load forecast provides a more relevant depiction of prices and can be a more accurate indication of competitive conditions. Alternatively, this stakeholder suggested if using the day-ahead net load forecast is not an option for the CAISO, then using an average of the previous five days of day-ahead SMEC would provide a better indication of load conditions changing from

day to day rather than using a single day to shape bilateral prices. The CAISO notes that it had previously revised its approach to use SMEC rather than load based on suggestions that SMEC is a more direct indication of prices than load.

Market Surveillance Committee (MSC) members expressed the opinion that hourly price patterns are different on high price days (i.e. days when prices are greater than \$200/MWh). They suggested using previous high price days to shape the bilateral hub prices. The CAISO proposes to adopt this approach. Section 4.2.2 reflects these changes.

Based on consideration of these comments, in this final proposal the CAISO proposes to maintain the proposal to calculate a single maximum import bid price to screen import and virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh. The use of bilateral price indices and the shaping factor provide an approximate indication of hourly prices. The CAISO proposes to use the higher bilateral hub price to ensure it does not overly constrain import bids.

4 Proposal

This section describes the CAISO's proposal for setting market prices when the market must relax the power balance constraint, as well as associated rules for setting market constraint relaxation price parameters, in the context of the \$2,000/MWh hard energy bid cap. It also describes the CAISO's proposal for price screening import bids priced greater than \$1,000/MWh.

The CAISO proposes to set the power balance penalty price used by the market in its pricing to \$2,000/MWh, and scale related price parameters accordingly, only during periods when energy costs are greater than \$1,000/MWh.

When the market uses the penalty prices scaled to a \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price and must relax the power balance constraint, the CAISO proposes to set energy prices based on the amount of the shortfall in supply to meet demand. The CAISO proposes using a variation of the NERC defined BAL-001-2 BAAL_{Low} limit as an appropriate threshold for each balancing authority area. This objective value represents the amount that supply can be less than load while still maintaining system frequency within reliability criteria.

The CAISO proposes to price screen import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh to determine the bids used by the CAISO market. The CAISO proposes to calculate a "maximum import bid price" that it will use to screen import bids, calculated based on published bilateral energy price indices.

The CAISO market will only accept import bids priced greater than \$1,000/MWh in periods in which the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or a cost-verified energy bid for a resource-specific resource is greater

than \$1,000/MWh. In this event, the market will reduce resource adequacy import bids above \$1,000/MWh to the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price, the highest-priced cost verified bid for a resource-specific resource or to \$1,000/MWh, whichever is higher. In this event, the market will accept non-resource adequacy import bids and virtual bids up to \$2,000/MWh.¹⁶

4.1 Power Balance Constraint Relaxation Pricing and Constraint Penalty Prices

The CAISO tariff specifies the relevant scheduling and pricing parameters that apply when the CAISO market must relax a constraint to reach a feasible solution.¹⁷

The power balance constraint ensures that the sum of generation and imports equals the sum of demand, including exports and transmission losses.¹⁸ The shadow price of the power balance constraint establishes the system marginal energy cost, which the market uses to determine locational marginal prices. Today, this constraint is set to the maximum energy bid price (the “hard” bid cap) of \$1,000/MWh in the pricing run. This allows for bids to clear up to the hard bid cap.

The tariff also specifies the scheduling and pricing parameters for relaxing transmission constraints,¹⁹ the pricing parameters when there is insufficient supply to meet demand (power balance constraint),²⁰ ancillary services scarcity pricing,²¹ and for protecting existing contracts and transmission ownership rights.²² These parameters, included in Appendix A, are established based on the existing \$1,000/MWh maximum bid price market participants can submit to the CAISO markets. The Market Operations Business Practice Manual (BPM) documents the full set of scheduling and pricing parameters used in the various markets that are calibrated based on the values set in the CAISO tariff.²³

The additional pricing parameters outlined in the BPM and included in Appendix A, are associated with constraints in the optimization and govern the conditions under which constraints may be relaxed and the setting of market prices when any constraints are

¹⁶ Likewise, the CAISO will only accept physical demand and export bids above \$1,000/MWh when one of these conditions is met.

¹⁷ See Section 27.4.3 of the CAISO tariff available at <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section27-CAISOMarkets-Processes-asof-Aug12-2019.pdf>.

¹⁸ See Appendix C Part B of the CASIO tariff available at <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/AppendixC-LocationalMarginalPrice-asof-Aug1-2019.pdf#search=power%20balance%20constraint>.

¹⁹ See Sections 27.4.3.1 and 27.4.3.2 of the CAISO tariff available at <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section27-CAISOMarkets-Processes-asof-Aug12-2019.pdf>.

²⁰ See Sections 27.4.3.3 and 27.4.3.4 of the CAISO tariff available at <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section27-CAISOMarkets-Processes-asof-Aug12-2019.pdf>.

²¹ See Section 27.1.2 and its subsections of the CAISO tariff available at http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section27_CAISOMarkets_Processes_Jan28-2020.pdf.

²² See Section 27.4.3.5 of the CAISO tariff available at <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section27-CAISOMarkets-Processes-asof-Aug12-2019.pdf>.

²³ Additional information is available in the Business Practice Manual for Market Operations available at https://bpmcm.caiso.com/BPM%20Document%20Library/Market%20Operations/BPM_for_Market%20Operations_V63_redline.pdf

relaxed. Importantly, the magnitude of the penalty price values in the tables for each market reflect the hierarchical priority order in which the associated constraint may be relaxed in that market by the market software.²⁴

The power balance constraint needs to be at least as high as the highest submitted energy bid price. Otherwise, the optimization will relax the constraint rather than clear bids priced above its value.

The CAISO market utilizes both a scheduling and pricing run to produce awards (dispatches) and prices. In the scheduling run, the market optimizes all submitted bids and clears awards based on the most effective economic solution. In the event a solution cannot be achieved, the market will adjust non-priced parameters (*i.e.*, uneconomic adjustments) or relax constraints to attain a solution. The awards and resulting prices of this solution are passed to the pricing run. The pricing run information of the potential uneconomic adjustments and/or constraint relaxation is retained because after solving the scheduling run, the amounts of the adjustments and relaxations are known. These instances are modeled in the pricing run with slack variables with a small range beyond the solution of the scheduling run in order to have room in the optimization of the pricing run to find a solution and produce binding prices. In the event uneconomic adjustments are made or constraints are relaxed, the relevant penalty prices are applied.

The CAISO proposes that the power balance penalty price in the market's pricing run remain at \$1,000/MWh under routine conditions and all other market constraint penalty prices will remain scaled to \$1,000/MWh. The CAISO proposes to set the power balance penalty price to a \$2,000/MWh pricing run price, and scale the rest of the market constraint penalty prices relative to \$2,000/MWh, only under specific conditions. Consequently, this assumes that under normal market conditions the shortage price signal sent by the power balance constraint relaxation price should be based on the \$1,000/MWh soft energy bid cap.

Specifically, under this proposal, the CAISO market would utilize two sets of pricing parameters²⁵:

1. Pricing parameters will be scaled to a \$1,000/MWh power balance penalty price when both of the following conditions exist in any interval of the market horizon:
 - i. Resource-specific resources²⁶ have not submitted a cost-verified energy bid greater than \$1,000/MWh.

²⁴ Additional information is available in the Business Practice Manual for Market Operations available at https://bpmcm.aiso.com/BPM%20Document%20Library/Market%20Operations/BPM_for_Market%20Operations_V63_redline.pdf

²⁵ The two sets of market constraint pricing parameters are outlined in Appendix A.

²⁶ See Footnote 7.

- ii. The CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh.
2. Pricing parameters will be scaled to a \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price when either of the following conditions exist in any interval of the market horizon:
 - i. Resource-specific resources have submitted a cost-verified energy bid greater than \$1,000/MWh.
 - ii. The CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh.

The CAISO proposes that if the conditions are satisfied to set the pricing parameter for the power balance constraint to \$2,000/MWh and the market must relax the power balance constraint, the market would set energy prices in the pricing run based on the amount of infeasibility from the scheduling run. The amount of infeasibility in the scheduling run will be compared to a small threshold value. If the infeasibility is less than the threshold value, the market would set prices based on the price of the highest-priced cleared bid. If the infeasibility is more than the threshold value, prices will be set based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price. The CAISO proposes to only apply this pricing threshold to the real-time market.

The threshold value is intended to account for small supply shortfalls for which it is not appropriate to send the strong shortage pricing signal that setting prices based on \$2,000/MWh would. These small apparent shortfalls may not actually represent actual shortfalls because of forecast and modeling inaccuracies. In addition, in balancing authority areas other than the CAISO in the EIM, they may not represent actual shortfalls because of other resources these balancing authority areas have that are not in the market.

This approach is different than when energy costs are below \$1,000/MWh and the power balance penalty price is set at \$1,000/MWh. In that case there is no threshold value and prices are set based on the \$1,000/MWh penalty price for any amount of supply shortfall. This difference is appropriate because \$2,000/MWh is far greater than prices and the bid cap under typical conditions. It is appropriate that there be additional measures to ensure a supply shortfall is real and significant before setting prices based on \$2,000/MWh. This is aligned with the FERC Order No. 831 policy direction that established additional measures for bids above \$1,000/MWh as such costs would not be expected under most conditions.

The CAISO proposes to establish this threshold value for each balancing authority area in the EIM based on the NERC BAL-001-2 Requirement R2.²⁷ The requirement aims to

²⁷Information on the NERC Standard BAL-001-2 – Real Power Balancing Control Performance Requirement R2 is available at: <https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Reliability%20Standards/BAL-001-2.pdf>

maintain reliability by controlling interconnection frequency within defined limits. This is accomplished by ensuring Balancing Authority Area Control Error (ACE) is kept between predefined limits (BAAL).²⁸ These BAAL limits (BAAL_{Low} and BAAL_{High}) are defined individually for each balancing authority area.

The CAISO proposes to utilize the BAAL_{Low} limit to define the threshold value for each balancing authority area in the EIM. This value can be used to represent the amount of supply that can be less than load while still maintaining system frequency within acceptable reliability criteria. Frequency is related to the balance of supply and load. System frequency is maintained by matching supply to demand. However, small mismatches and resulting differences in frequency from the desired 60 Hz are acceptable.

The BAAL_{Low} limit, as defined by NERC is the following²⁹:

$$BAAL_{Low} = (-10B_i \times (FTL_{Low} - F_s)) \times \frac{(FTL_{Low} - F_s)}{(F_A - F_s)}$$

Where:

- $BAAL_{Low}$ is the Low Balancing Authority ACE Limit (MW)
- 10 is a constant to convert the Frequency Bias Setting from MW/0.1 Hz to MW/Hz
- B_i is the Frequency Bias Setting for a Balancing Authority (expressed as MW/0.1 Hz)
- F_A is the measured frequency in Hz.
- F_s is the scheduled frequency in Hz.
- FTL_{Low} is the Low Frequency Trigger Limit (calculated as $F_s - 3\epsilon_{11}$ Hz)
- Where ϵ_{11} is the constant derived from a targeted frequency bound for each Interconnection.
 - Western Interconnection $\epsilon_{11} = 0.0228$ Hz

For establishing the threshold value, the CAISO proposes to assume the Western Interconnection is balanced and the scheduled frequency is 60 Hz. Therefore, the CAISO proposes to not apply the following term from the BAAL_{Low} limit equation in the calculation of the threshold values: $\frac{(FTL_{Low} - F_s)}{(F_A - F_s)}$. This part of the equation modifies the frequency limits based on actual frequency in real-time. Consequently, it is not possible

²⁸ Information on the background and rationale for NERC Standard BAL-001-2 – Real Power Balancing Control Performance Requirement R2 predefined Balancing Authority Area Control Error (ACE) Limits (BAAL) is available at: https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Project%202010141%20%20Phase%201%20of%20Balancing%20Authority%20Re/BAL-001-2_Background_%20Document-Clean-20130701.pdf#search=cps1

²⁹ See pages 8 and 9 for equations supporting the NERC Standard BAL-001-2 – Real Power Balancing Control Performance Requirement R2 available at: <https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Reliability%20Standards/BAL-001-2.pdf>

to incorporate this part of the equation to calculate set threshold limits in advance. It would not be practical to use limits that change for pricing purposes.

Consequently, the CAISO proposes to calculate the threshold value for each EIM balancing authority area and the CAISO using the first term of the BAAL_{Low} limit as follows:

$$Threshold = (-10B_i \times (FTL_{Low} - F_s)).$$

The CAISO proposes to calculate and publish the threshold values for each balancing authority area yearly as the NERC defined frequency bias setting amounts for each balancing authority area are updated.

Table 1 lists the applicable frequency bias setting values and the corresponding calculated threshold values for each participating EIM balancing authority area and the CAISO based on 2020 information.

Table 1 Frequency Bias Settings and Calculated Threshold Values

Balancing Authority Area	2020 Frequency Bias Setting (MW/0.1 Hz)³⁰	CAISO Calculated Threshold Values (MW)
AZPS	-99.1	67.8
BANC – total	-28.4	19.4
BCHA	-112.9	77.2
CAISO	-341.7	233.7
IPCO	-37.7	25.8
NEVP	-63.0	43.1
PACE	-89.9	61.5
PACW	-46.1	31.5
PGE	-39.5	27.0
PSEI	-35.1	24.0
SCL	-39.0	26.7
SRP	-56.7	38.8

The CAISO real-time market includes individual power balance constraints for each EIM balancing authority area and an overall power balance constraint for the market. The overall power balance constraint for the market applies to the CAISO balancing authority area as well. The CAISO will set all of these power balance constraints at \$2,000/MWh, and scale the other market constraints accordingly, when the conditions are met to set the power balance penalty price to \$2,000/MWh.

³⁰Published 2020 Frequency Bias Settings for each Balancing authority in each interconnection effective 6/2/2020 are available at: https://www.nerc.com/comm/OC/Documents/BAL-003_Frequency_Bias_Settings_02Jun2020.pdf

Additionally, it is important to note that if the conditions are met to set the power balance penalty price to \$2,000/MWh for any hour in the day-ahead market, the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price will apply for all trading hours of the day-ahead market and real-time market for the same trading day. If the conditions are not met to set the power balance penalty price to \$2,000/MWh in the day-ahead market, but the conditions apply to set the power balance penalty price to \$2,000/MWh in the real-time market, the real-time market will use the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price for all intervals of overlapping real-time market horizons. If the conditions to set the power balance penalty price to \$2,000/MWh in all intervals of a real-time market horizon are not met, a \$1,000/MWh power balance penalty price will be used in all intervals of that real-time market horizon. This is irrespective of the fact that a \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price may have been used for one or more of these intervals in a previous real-time market run. This approach is necessary so the market functions consistently across all intervals in its horizon.

Further, the CAISO proposes the threshold value will not be applied in the day-ahead market. The CAISO acknowledges it is inappropriate to apply the threshold value in the day-ahead market because in the day-ahead market the relaxation penalty prices for ancillary services are less than the power balance penalty price. In this market, the threshold would apply after the market has already foregone reserves and triggered scarcity pricing. Additionally, since the NERC BAL-001-2 Requirement R2 is a real-time operating standard, it does not make sense to apply the threshold value based on this standard to the day-ahead market. Applying the threshold value in the real-time market would be appropriate because the power balance constraint penalty price is relaxed prior to relaxing penalty prices for ancillary services and is consistent with the NERC real-time operating standard.³¹

The examples below illustrate the CAISO's overall proposed approach for establishing penalty prices and setting prices when the market relaxes the power balance constraint.

Example A:

The following example illustrates how penalty prices will remain set to the \$1,000/MWh power balance penalty price when the highest-priced submitted bid from a resource-specific resource is less than \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price is less than \$1,000/MWh.

Assume the following market inputs in the real-time market:

- Highest-priced bid from a resource-specific resource = \$900/MWh

³¹ The relaxation penalty prices for both the day-ahead and real-time markets are outlined in Appendix A.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

- CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price = \$200/MWh
- CAISO threshold value = 233.7 MW

Given the conditions listed above, in the power balance penalty price would be set to \$1,000/MWh to determine the dispatch and prices.

Assume the market must relax the power balance constraint. Energy prices would be set based on the \$1,000/MWh power balance penalty price.

Example B:

The following example illustrates how penalty prices will be set to the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price when the highest-priced submitted bid from a resource-specific resource is greater than \$1,000/MWh. This example also outlines how energy prices are determined in the pricing run based on the amount of infeasibility.

Assume the following market inputs in the real-time market:

- Highest-priced bid from a resource-specific resource = \$1,200/MWh
- CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price = \$700/MWh
- CAISO threshold value = 233.7 MW

The power balance penalty price would be set to \$2,000/MWh to determine the dispatch because there is a submitted and cost-verified energy bid from a resource-specific resource greater than \$1,000/MWh.

Assume the market must relax the power balance constraint and the highest-priced cleared economic bid is \$1,200/MWh. Energy prices in the pricing run would be set based on the following:

- If the scheduling run infeasibility \leq 233.7 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$1,200/MWh highest-priced cleared economic bid.
- If the scheduling run infeasibility $>$ 233.7 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price.

Example C:

The following example illustrates how penalty prices will be set to the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price when the CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

price is greater than \$1,000/MWh. This example also outlines how energy prices are determined in the pricing run based on the amount of infeasibility when there is no resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh.

Assume the following market inputs in the real-time market:

- Highest-priced bid from a resource-specific resource = \$900/MWh
- CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price = \$1,100/MWh
- CAISO threshold value = 233.7 MW

The power balance penalty price would be set to \$2,000/MWh to determine the dispatch because the CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price is \$1,100/MWh, which is greater than \$1,000/MWh.

Assume the market must relax the power balance constraint and the highest-priced submitted bid from a resource-specific resource is \$900/MWh. Energy prices in the pricing run would be set based on the following:

- If the scheduling run infeasibility ≤ 233.7 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$1,000/MWh because there is no resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh.
- If the scheduling run infeasibility > 233.7 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price.

Example D:

The following example illustrates how penalty prices will be set to the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price when the CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh. This example also outlines how a submitted resource-adequacy import bid will be reduced to the CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price. Further, this example highlights how energy prices are determined in the pricing run based on the amount of infeasibility.

Assume the following market inputs in the real-time market:

- Highest-priced bid from a resource-specific resource = \$900/MWh
- Highest-priced resource adequacy import bid = \$1,200/MWh
- CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price = \$1,100/MWh
- CAISO threshold value = 233.7 MW

The power balance penalty price would be set to \$2,000/MWh to determine the dispatch because the CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price is \$1,100/MWh, which is greater than \$1,000/MWh. The market reduces the submitted \$1,200/MWh resource adequacy import bid to the \$1,100/MWh maximum allowable import bid price.

Assume the market must relax the power balance constraint and the highest-priced cleared economic bid is the \$1,100/MWh import bid. Energy prices in the pricing run would be set based on the following:

- If the scheduling run infeasibility ≤ 233.7 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$1,100/MWh highest-priced cleared economic bid.
- If the scheduling run infeasibility > 233.7 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price.

Example E:

The following example illustrates how penalty prices will be set to the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price when the highest-priced submitted bid from a resource-specific resource is greater than \$1,000/MWh. This example also outlines how energy prices are determined in based on the amount of infeasibility for an EIM balancing authority area when it is import constrained and the market must relax the power balance constraint for that specific EIM balancing authority area.

Assume the following market inputs in the real-time market:

- Highest-priced bid from a resource-specific resource within an EIM balancing authority area = \$1,200/MWh
 - This EIM balancing authority area is import constrained.
- CAISO-calculated maximum allowable import bid price = \$900/MWh
- EIM balancing authority area's threshold value = 25 MW
- EIM balancing authority area's available balancing capacity supply = 20 MW @ \$100/MWh

Given the conditions listed above, the power balance penalty price would be set to \$2,000/MWh to determine the dispatch because there is a submitted and cost-verified energy bid from a resource-specific resource greater than \$1,000/MWh.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

This applies to all individual balancing authority area power balance constraints in the EIM area and the market power balance constraint for the EIM area as a whole.

Assume the market must relax the power balance constraint in the import constrained EIM balancing authority area. The highest-priced cleared economic bid within the balancing authority is the \$1,200/MWh bid. Energy prices in the pricing run would be set based on the following:

- If the scheduling run infeasibility ≤ 45 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$1,200/MWh highest-priced cleared economic bid.
- If the scheduling run infeasibility > 45 MW, energy prices in the pricing run will be based on the \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price.

The scheduling run infeasibility is compared to the sum of the EIM balancing authority area's threshold value and their available balancing capacity supply amount.

Since the market outside of this import constrained EIM balancing authority area can reach a feasible solution, the overall system's power balance constraint does not need to be relaxed in this example, and prices outside the constrained balancing authority area are produced using its normal process.

The "available balancing capacity" feature currently implemented in the EIM allows the market to recognize additional resources outside the market EIM participants use to meet their balancing authority area responsibilities.³² It includes bids for these resources in the market's bid stack, when the market must relax the power balance constraint for an EIM balancing authority area. This allows the marginal economic bid to set the energy price within the balancing authority area and not the power balance penalty price.

In the event the market would otherwise relax the power balance constraint for a balancing authority area in the EIM other than the CAISO, the available balancing capacity feature uses the capacity from the out-of-market available balancing capacity at penalty prices from \$1,050/MWh to \$1,200/MWh. This ensures that all available bids submitted up to the bid cap of \$1,000/MWh are scheduled prior to releasing available balancing capacity into the bid stack. The pricing run then produces prices incorporating bids from the available balancing capacity resources.

Under the approach described in this final proposal, the available balancing capacity will be released between \$2,100/MWh and \$2,400/MWh in the scheduling run when the

³² Additional information on the available balancing capacity feature is available in the Energy Imbalance Market Transition period Draft Final Proposal http://www.aiso.com/Documents/DraftFinalProposal_EIMTransitionPeriod.pdf.

\$2,000/MWh set of pricing parameters is used in the market. This will ensure the priority level of available balancing capacity is maintained in the bid stack in the scheduling run.

4.2 Screening import and virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh

This section describes the CAISO's proposal to price-screen import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh.

The CAISO proposes that its market will only accept import bids priced higher than \$1,000/MWh in periods in which a CAISO-calculated "maximum import bid" price is also greater than \$1,000/MWh or when the CAISO has cost-verified a resource-specific resource bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. Similarly, the CAISO market will only accept virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh under these conditions.

This import bid price screening will apply differently to imports providing resource adequacy capacity than it will to imports not providing resource adequacy capacity. The CAISO market will reduce resource adequacy import bids priced higher than \$1,000/MWh and higher than the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price to the greater of the CAISO-calculated maximum import price or the highest-priced cost verified bid for a resource-specific resource. When it does this, it will not reduce a bid to a price below \$1,000/MWh.

The CAISO market will not reduce the price of non-resource adequacy import bids higher than \$1,000/MWh. However, the CAISO will only accept these bids when the maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or when there is a cost-verified resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. When either of these conditions exist, the market will accept non-resource adequacy import bids up to \$2,000/MWh.

Because the CAISO also proposes to calibrate its penalty prices based on the availability of a cost-verified bid or the price of the maximum import bid price, the CAISO market can only accept import bids or virtual bids greater than \$1,000/MWh when the market's power balance penalty price is set at \$2,000/MWh. Under the approach presented in this final proposal, this is only when the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or when the CAISO has cost-verified a resource-specific resource bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. The market will not clear bids greater than \$1,000/MWh when the power balance penalty price is set at \$1,000/MWh, *i.e.*, when it has not received a cost-verified supply bid greater than \$1,000/MWh and when the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh.

The import bid price screening approach differs somewhat from the CAISO's approach for cost-verifying energy bids for resource-specific resources.³³ For bids for resource-specific resources (internal or external) greater than \$1,000/MWh, the CAISO will verify each resource's actual or expected costs based on the supplier's contemporaneously available information. In contrast, the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price represents prevailing energy prices based on published bilateral energy price indices. It is not representative of the source of a particular import's actual operating costs, although it may represent opportunity costs. The CAISO will not require suppliers to submit import bids based on actual or expected costs.

4.2.1 Application to Resource Adequacy Imports

As described above, the CAISO proposes to reduce the price of only resource adequacy import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh to the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price, the highest-priced cost verified bid for a resource-specific resource, or \$1,000/MWh, whichever is higher. It also proposes to not provide for after-the-fact cost recovery for import bids for which it reduced the price.

As described in Section 3, the CAISO agrees with stakeholders that provisions to reduce non-resource adequacy import bids to a maximum import bid price without cost recovery would discourage imports from bidding into the CAISO market. Suppliers would likely be reluctant to offer imports to the CAISO market if they would be at risk of having their bid reduced to a CAISO calculated price or the highest-priced cost verified bid without provisions for an after-the-fact make-whole payment if they could demonstrate that their bid represented actual costs. However, the CAISO does not believe there is a practical methodology for it to objectively determine import costs, which would be needed to provide importers with a make-whole after-the-fact payment.

However, reducing resource adequacy imports to the maximum import bid price or to the highest-priced cost verified bid will not reduce import supply. Resource adequacy resources are required to submit bids under the must-offer requirements as they apply to imports to the CAISO market. Although this may impose a small risk that a resource adequacy import bid may be reduced to a price below a supplier's cost, suppliers could presumably factor this risk into their bilateral resource adequacy contracting price. This proposed approach will allow non-resource adequacy import bids (and virtual bids) in the market above the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price and up to \$2,000/MWh during certain periods. However, two factors will mitigate the risk that this will result in excessive market prices. First, the market will not allow any energy bids

³³ These include supply resources within the CAISO balancing authority area and resources outside the CAISO modeled as resource-specific system resources. The cost-verification approach for resource-specific resources was developed in the *Commitment Cost and Default Energy Bid Enhancements* policy initiative and was recently submitted to the FERC in Docket ER20-2360, available at <http://www.aiso.com/Documents/Jul9-2020-TariffAmendment-CommitmentCostsandDefaultEnergyBidEnhancementsCCDEBE-ER20-2360.pdf>.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

greater than \$1,000/MWh unless the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh or there is a cost-verified resource-specific bid greater than \$1,000/MWh. Second, the market should be able to meet CAISO balancing authority area demand using only bids from resource adequacy resources. All resource adequacy bids are subject to either cost-verification rules or the maximum import bid price. This means bids priced higher than the highest-priced bid for a resource adequacy resource are unlikely to clear the market and set CAISO market prices.³⁴ The day-ahead market has the additional protection that energy supply clears against economic demand bids. Thus, demand can protect itself against unreasonably high prices through specifying a maximum price at which it wants to schedule demand.

The CAISO proposes to reduce resource adequacy imports to the higher of the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price or the price of the highest cost-verified bid for a resource-specific resource to be consistent with the rules for accepting import bids, including non-resource adequacy imports, priced above \$1,000/MWh. Import bids should not be reduced below the highest-priced cost-verified resource specific bid above \$1,000/MWh since the CAISO market will accept import bids above \$1,000/MWh in the situation in which there is a cost-verified resource specific bid above \$1,000/MWh but the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is below \$1,000/MWh. It would be inconsistent in this situation to reduce resource adequacy bids to \$1,000/MWh in this circumstance.

In addition, incorporating the price of cost-verified resource-specific bids provides for limiting bids for resource adequacy imports to a more current price in the real-time market. The CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is based on day-ahead prices that may be too low in the real-time market if natural gas prices increase overnight. A resource-specific bid submitted to the real-time market would presumably incorporate the current gas prices. As discussed above, the CAISO's approach for price-screening import bids differs based on whether the import bid is from a resource adequacy resource. In the *System Market Power Mitigation* initiative the CAISO proposes to treat both resource adequacy and non-resource adequacy imports the same - all import bids would not be subject to system-level market power mitigation. The respective approach the CAISO has proposed in the two initiatives is different because the two initiatives have different objectives.

The objective of CAISO's FERC Order No. 831 policy initiative is to ensure all supply needed to meet the ISO's load responsibility (resource adequacy resources) that provide bids priced above \$1,000/MWh represent verified costs. As discussed in FERC's Order No. 831, market power concerns are heightened when a resource's energy bid is greater than \$1,000/MWh. Although the Commission did not require

³⁴ The CAISO's market clears supply bids in price merit order.

verification of import bids as it did for internal resource bids greater than \$1,000/MWh, it recognized similar concerns could exist and each ISO/RTO could request measures necessary to address such issues.

In the CAISO's case, the CAISO has determined that its reliance on import energy makes it appropriate to also verify import bids represent actual costs. In contrast to mitigation the CAISO performs for local market power mitigation for all bids, including those below \$1,000/MWh, Order No. 831 recognizes that bids above \$1,000/MWh must be cost verified irrespective of whether the ISO/RTO has evaluated whether or not there exists the ability to exercise market power. In the case of bids above \$1,000/MWh, there is a presumption that such bids exceed what would typically be actual costs and therefore there is a need to validate those bids. In particular, the CAISO relies on resource adequacy requirements to ensure there is enough capacity to serve its load. Therefore, it relies on the resource adequacy import bids differently than it does for non-resource adequacy import bids.

That said, as discussed above, the CAISO is proposing that it would not allow an import bid above \$1,000/MWh from a non-resource adequacy import if it has not found that the maximum import bid price exceeds \$1,000/MWh or there is no cost verified resource-specific resource bid above \$1,000/MWh.

In contrast, in the system market power initiative, the CAISO is proposing rules to test whether there is a need to mitigate energy bids because of the potential that suppliers, through concentration of supply, may be able to exercise market power at the balancing authority area level. Based on its approach for testing whether there exists such circumstances, the CAISO has determined that import bids, whether resource adequacy or not, would not be subject to mitigation because imports are most likely not pivotal supply. Therefore, there would be no basis for mitigating import resources, similar to the CAISO's proposal to not mitigate internal resources that are not pivotal.

4.2.2 Maximum Import Bid Price Calculation

As described above, the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price would be used to screen import and virtual supply bids and is intended to represent prevailing energy prices. The CAISO proposes to calculate the maximum import bid price based on an energy price component that uses the maximum of two published bilateral electrical prices, Mid-C or Palo Verde.

The CAISO will calculate separate maximum import bid prices for the day-ahead and real-time markets.

Both the bilateral electric hub prices are published as multi-hour block rather than hourly prices. The energy price component methodology will convert these multi-hour block prices into hourly prices to reflect that hourly prices change throughout the day. This

reflects that CAISO prices vary by hour. The calculation will convert daily multi-hour block electrical prices from the published electric price indices into hourly prices by using a previous high priced day's day-ahead SMEC. This calculation will be performed separately for on and off-peak hours. The resulting price will be multiplied by 110 percent.

The CAISO would perform this calculation each day and use the resulting maximum import bid prices in the respective CAISO markets.

The CAISO proposes to calculate this maximum import bid price for each hour as follows:

$$\text{Maximum import bid price} = \text{Energy Price} \times 1.1$$

The maximum import bid price approximates the prevailing bilateral price of electricity as an hourly price. As described further below, the energy price component uses the maximum of two published bilateral electrical index prices from Mid-Columbia or Palo Verde.

Both of these prices are daily prices rather than hourly prices. The energy price component converts these daily prices into hourly prices.

The 110 percent multiplier is to account for differences in prices between published price indices and individual transactions. The published electrical price indices are based on the weighted average price of all electric transactions. Therefore, a supplier's opportunity costs for individual sales outside of the CAISO may be higher than the corresponding published electrical indices.

The following subsections describe the components of the maximum import bid price calculation.

Energy Price Component

As described above, the energy price component of the proposed maximum import bid price equation estimates the current prevailing hourly bilateral electricity price. It does this by converting daily published electric hub index prices into hourly prices.

The calculation must convert daily prices into hourly prices because electrical indices are daily multi-hour block prices, while CAISO prices are hourly prices in the day-ahead market. The electrical price indices are published as separate peak and off-peak hour prices for each day. The peak price represents the price for a 16-hour block of energy. Whereas, the CAISO market clears and sets prices hourly in the day-ahead market and clears and sets prices every 15-minutes in the real-time market.

The energy price component of the proposed maximum import bid price equation calculates an hourly energy price based on the daily electric hub index price. This

hourly energy price will be adjusted based on the historical relationship of each hour's SMEC in the day-ahead market to the average SMEC over the day. The energy price will increase the hourly maximum import bid price relative to the daily hub price in hours in which the SMEC is typically greater than the daily average, i.e. in the peak load hours. The maximum import bid price will decrease the price in hours that the SMEC is typically less than the daily average. The CAISO proposes to shape the price in each hour based on the ratio of the day-ahead system marginal energy cost to the average system marginal energy cost of a previous high priced day. It would do this using the day-ahead SMEC from a recent day in which the day-ahead SMEC prices were at least an established amount, such as \$200/MWh. The CAISO proposes to calculate these hourly SMEC ratios based on a recent high-priced day because prices are typically proportionally higher in the peak hours on high-priced days than they are on other days. This calculation would be performed separately for on and off-peak hours.

The energy price component of the maximum import bid price equation will be calculated hourly as follows:

Energy Price =

Electric Hub Price x Hourly Shaping Factor

Where, Hourly Shaping Factor is:

$$\left[1 + \frac{\text{CAISO Hourly DA SMEC} - \text{CAISO Average DA SMEC of on/off peak hrs}}{\text{CAISO Average DA SMEC of on/off peak hrs}}\right]$$

Electric Hub Price

The CAISO proposes to use the highest price for each on/off peak prices from either the Mid-Columbia or Palo Verde electric trading hub price indices. The CAISO proposes to use Mid-Columbia and Palo Verde because they are representative electrical prices for the bilateral market outside of the CAISO balancing authority area. This is the appropriate price to use to determine whether or not to allow virtual bids priced greater than \$1,000/MWh. It would result in market inefficiencies to not allow virtual bids up to \$2,000/MWh while allowing import bids up to \$2,000/MWh. Further, using the higher bilateral hub price ensures that the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price does not overly constrain import bids.

The CAISO market currently uses electric price hub indices to calculate hydro default energy bids. It uses next day electric prices published the previous day for both the day-ahead and the real-time markets that run on a particular day. This results in an appropriate price for the real-time market but results in a one-day old price used by the day-ahead market. This is because the final published next-day electric price is not

published until the end of the day, which is after the CAISO runs the day-ahead market for the applicable operating day.

The following example illustrates how the day-ahead market is currently using a one-day old electric price.

Example F:

Assume today is Wednesday, July 22, 2020.

The prior evening, July 21, the Intercontinental Exchange (ICE) published electric prices for trade-date July 22 at around 8 pm. At 9 pm on July 21, the CAISO uses the published electric price for trade-date July 22 to calculate real-time prices beginning with hour-ending 1.

On July 22, the CAISO is preparing to run the day-ahead market for July 23. However, the only published electric price information available at that time is for trade-date July 22, published the prior evening on July 21. Therefore, the CAISO is using a “day-old” electric price in the day-ahead market.

The CAISO understands using a day-old electric price in the day-ahead market is problematic. Consequently, the CAISO proposes to update day-ahead electric prices similar to its natural gas price procedure for the day-ahead market. The CAISO would use these updated electric prices for both the maximum import bid price and for the hydro default energy bid. The following example illustrates the CAISO’s proposal:

Example G:

Assume today is Wednesday, July 22, 2020. Electric bilateral trading is occurring for trade-date July 23.

At 8:30 am on July 22, the CAISO proposes to review trading on ICE for the next-day electric prices applicable for trade-date July 23. This is considered a “snap shot” of prices for July 23 until a final price is received by the CAISO around 8 PM later that evening. The CAISO would use this “snap shot” of prices in the day-ahead market that runs at 10 am on July 22 for trade-date July 23.

Meanwhile, the same July 23 product described above continues to trade during the remainder of July 22. The final electric price for trade-date July 23 is received by the CAISO around 8 pm on July 22 by ICE. This price is then used in the CAISO real-time market beginning with July 23 hour-ending 1.

The CAISO’s proposal allows for a more up-to-date electric price to be used in the day-ahead market. The updated electrical price based on next day trading that the CAISO

proposes to use above for the day-ahead market would not be appropriate to use in the real-time market because these prices are applicable to the following day.

Hourly Shaping Factor

The CAISO proposes to shape bilateral multi-hour block energy prices based on previous high priced days within the same season.³⁵ A Market Surveillance Committee (MSC) member suggested using high priced days to shape daily bilateral prices because prices on these days are proportionally much higher in peak load hours.³⁶ It was recommended to use \$200/MWh as an appropriate value to screen for the highest priced days.

Previously, the CAISO proposed to calculate the hourly shaping factor using a previous day's day-ahead SMEC rather than based on previous high priced days SMEC. This prior proposal assumed that the previous day was an indicator of expected hourly price variation for the current day.

However, this assumption is likely to not be true for the first day of a high priced series of days. Therefore, the CAISO proposes to use the most recent day in which prices were at least an established amount in the day-ahead market, such as \$200/MWh.³⁷ Therefore, if the previous day is not a high priced day, this methodology would look back to identify the most recent high priced day. However, because the shape of prices throughout the hours of the day varies based on seasonal conditions, the CAISO proposes to only look back to the beginning of the current season. If there are no high priced days in the current season, the CAISO would base the shaping methodology on representative high priced days from the same season in previous years.³⁸

The following example illustrates how the hourly shaping factor would be determined using the most recent day in which day-ahead market SMEC reached at least \$200/MWh:

Example H:

Assume the CAISO is calculating an energy price for trade date August 20, 2020, hour ending 11 on the evening of August 19, 2020. The CAISO would use the most recent day in which day-ahead SMEC was at least \$200/MWh.

³⁵ The CAISO proposes to retain the flexibility to define the seasons. They could be potentially calendar quarters or other groups of months. The CAISO would define these based on further analysis and potentially modify them in the future based on changes to system and market conditions.

³⁶ Data analysis supporting the Market Surveillance Committee suggestion is available at: http://www.aiso.com/Documents/FERC831Bushnell-Presentation-July30_2020.pdf

³⁷ The CAISO proposes to retain the flexibility to establish this threshold based on further analysis and potentially modify them based on changes to system and market conditions.

³⁸ The CAISO would define these representative high priced days based on further analysis and potentially modify them based on changes to system and market conditions.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

The CAISO determines based on historical data that the most recent day in which the day-ahead SMEC reached at least \$200/MWh was on August 19, 2020.

The Hourly Shaping Factor calculation would be as follows:

$$1 + \left[\frac{(\text{DA SMEC of Aug 20, 2020 HE 11}) - (\text{Avg DA SMEC of ON peak hrs of Aug 19, 2020})}{\text{Avg DA SMEC of ON peak hrs of Aug 19, 2020}} \right]$$

5 Energy Imbalance Market Governing Body Advisory Role

As described above this initiative considers two topics:

1. Methodology to establish market constraint relaxation penalty prices under a \$2,000/MWh hard energy bid cap.
2. Price screening methodology for import bids greater than \$1,000/MWh.

These two topics must be presented together for approval because they are linked. The CAISO believes the EIM Governing Body should have an advisory role in the approval of the proposed changes.

An initiative proposing to change rules of the real-time market falls within the primary authority of the EIM Governing Body if either the proposed new rule is EIM-specific in the sense that it applies uniquely or differently in the balancing authority areas of EIM Entities, as opposed to a generally applicable rule or, for proposed market rules that are generally applicable, if “an issue that is specific to the EIM balancing authority areas is the primary driver for the proposed change.”

The initiative does not satisfy the first test, because the market rules proposed to address the two topics described above are not EIM-specific. The screening of import bids is limited to imports into the CAISO balancing authority area and, moreover, all such imports are governed by a single set of rules that apply to all imports regardless of source or location. The market constraint relaxation penalty prices and proposed price mechanism when the power balance constraint must be relaxed is applicable to the entire CAISO market footprint, including other balancing authority areas participating in the EIM. Moreover, the primary driver for addressing these topics is not specific to the EIM balancing authority areas. The effects of any change to the market constraint penalty prices would be similar in the CAISO balancing authority area and EIM balancing authority areas. Accordingly, this initiative would fall entirely within the advisory role of the EIM Governing Body.

In comments on earlier papers, a group of EIM Entities objected to this proposed classification. Their objection was focused exclusively on the classification of the item involving penalty prices when a power balance constraint is relaxed, as opposed to the method for screening import bids. To gain a better understanding of their concerns, CAISO staff discussed the objections with representatives of some of the EIM Entities. These representatives agreed that the proposed market rule regarding penalty prices is generally applicable to the entire market, as opposed to EIM-specific. Their concern about the proposed classification involves the second test described above – whether “an issue that is specific to the EIM balancing authority areas is the primary driver for the proposed change.” They emphasized the fact that it was the EIM Entities who filed

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

the primary protest of the ISO's initial compliance filing at FERC, which would have resulted in penalty prices at the cap. Without this protest, they maintain, the CAISO would not have asked FERC for time to pursue this initiative.

CAISO appreciates the role that the EIM Entities played in pushing for a harder look at penalty prices through the protest they filed at FERC. Management continues to believe, however, that the penalty price item is properly classified as advisory, because the test is not which entity or set of entities complained. A generally applicable market rule, such as the proposed rule about penalty prices, falls within the primary authority of the Governing Body only if "an issue that is specific to the EIM balancing authorities" was the primary driver of the proposed change. Here, the issue is the level of penalty prices when a market constraint is relaxed, an issue that is not "specific to" EIM balancing authority areas to the exclusion of the CAISO balancing authority area. This is an issue for the entire market footprint. Accordingly, the primary driver test is not met, even if it is the EIM balancing authority areas that may arguably care more about the issue, or cared more at an early critical point. (Moreover, a rule that the determining factor is who protested first or loudest could create undesirable incentives.) In sum, the CAISO believes the initiative is properly classified.

With that said, stakeholders are encouraged to submit a response to the EIM classification of this initiative as described above in their written comments, particularly if they have concerns or questions.

6 Stakeholder engagement

The schedule for stakeholder engagement is provided below. The CAISO will present its proposal to the Energy Imbalance Market Governing Body at their September 16, 2020 meeting and to the Board of Governors' at their September 30 – October 01, 2020 meeting.

Date	Event
9/10/2020	Publish revised final proposal and draft tariff language
9/17/2020	Draft tariff language and stakeholder conference call
9/24/2020	Stakeholder comments on draft tariff language due
Sept 16, 2020	Energy Imbalance Market Governing Body meeting
Sept 30 – Oct 01, 2020	Board of Governors meeting
Fall 2021	Expected implementation, concurrent with FERC 831 compliance implementation

7 Appendix A - Market constraint relaxation penalty parameters values

This section provides the specific value settings for the set of CAISO market parameters that are used for adjusting non-priced quantities in the market optimizations.

The parameter values below are all of the market parameters that are based on the hard energy bid cap specifically documented in the CAISO tariff and in the Business Practice Manual (BPM) for Market Operations. This section includes two tables based on market process: the Integrated Forward Market (IFM) and the Real Time Market (RTM).

The magnitude of the penalty factor values in the following tables for each market reflect the hierarchical priority order in which the associated constraint may be relaxed in that market by the market software. These tables are organized by penalty price, scheduling run value, and pricing run value. Based on the proposal described in Section 4.1, there are two columns dedicated to each scheduling run and pricing run values depending on if the pricing parameters are scaled to a \$1,000/MWh or \$2,000/MWh power balance penalty price. Since the price floor of -\$150/MWh is not being adjusted, all existing negative pricing parameter values will remain the same as today even when the power balance penalty price is set to \$2,000/MWh.

All of the following parameter values will be specified in the BPM for Market Operations³⁹ and the CAISO Tariff Sections 27 and 30.⁴⁰

³⁹These parameter values will be specified in Section 6.6.5 of the Business Practice Manual for Market Operations available at [https://bpmcm.caiso.com/Pages/BPMDetails.aspx?BPM=Market Operations](https://bpmcm.caiso.com/Pages/BPMDetails.aspx?BPM=Market%20Operations)

⁴⁰ See Sections 27 and 30 of the CAISO tariff available at [http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section27-CAISO Markets-Processes-asof-Aug12-2019.pdf](http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section27-CAISO%20Markets-Processes-asof-Aug12-2019.pdf) and at [http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section30-Bid-Self-ScheduleSubmission-CAISO Markets-asof-Nov13-2019.pdf](http://www.caiso.com/Documents/Section30-Bid-Self-ScheduleSubmission-CAISO%20Markets-asof-Nov13-2019.pdf) respectively.

Integrated Forward Market (IFM) Parameter Values

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Power balance constraint <i>(Market energy balance)</i>	6,500	1,000	13,000	2,000	Market energy balance is the requirement that total supply equal the sum of total demand plus losses for the entire system. In the IFM energy balance reflects the clearing of bid-in supply and demand; in the MPM component of the DAM it reflects the scheduling of bid-in supply against the ISO demand forecast.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5 and Tariff Section 27.4.3.1	Transmission constraints: Intertie scheduling	5,000	1,000	10,000	2,000	Intertie scheduling constraints limit the total amount of energy and ancillary service capacity that can be scheduled at each scheduling point.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Legacy Reliability Must-Run	-6000	-150	-6,000	-150	The ISO considers transmission

⁴¹ Penalty values in the scheduling run are negatively valued for supply reduction and positively valued for demand reduction.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
	(LRMR) pre-dispatch curtailment (supply)					constraints when determining LRMR scheduling requirements. After the ISO has determined the LRMR scheduling requirements, the market optimization ensures that the designated capacity is scheduled in the market.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Pseudo-tie layoff energy	-4,000	-150	-4,000	-150	Pseudo-tie layoff energy is scheduled under contractual arrangements with the balancing authority in whose area a pseudo-tie generator is located.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5 and Tariff Section 27.4.3.1	Transmission constraints: branch, corridor, nomogram (base case and contingency analysis)	5,000	1,000	10,000	2,000	In the scheduling run, the market optimization enforces transmission constraints up to a point where the cost of enforcement (the "shadow price" of the constraint) reaches the parameter

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						value, at which point the constraint is relaxed.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Transmission Ownership Right (TOR) self schedule	5,900, -5,900	1,000, -150	11,800, -5,900	2,000,-150	A TOR Self-Schedule will be honored in the market scheduling in preference to enforcing transmission constraints.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Existing Transmission Contract (ETC) self schedule	5,100 to 5,900, -5,100 to -5,900	1,000, -150	10,200 to 11,800, -5,100 to -5,900	2,000,-150	An ETC Self-Schedule will be honored in the market scheduling in preference to enforcing transmission constraints. The typical value is set at \$5,500/MWh, but different values from \$5,100/MWh to \$5,900/MWh are possible if the instructions to the ISO establish differential priorities among ETC rights. For some ETC rights the ISO may use values below the stated scheduling run range if that is required for consistency

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						with the instructions provided to the ISO by the PTO.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Converted Right (CVR) self schedule	5,500, -5,500	1,000, -150	11,000, -5,500	2,000, -150	A CVR Self-Schedule is assigned the same priority as the typical value for ETC Self-Schedules.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Regulation-up and Regulation-down Minimum Requirements	2,500	250	5,000	500	In the event of bid insufficiency, AS minimum requirements will be met in preference to serving generic Self-Scheduled demand, but not at the cost of overloading transmission into AS regions.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Spin Minimum Requirements	2,250	250	4,500	500	Spinning reserve minimum requirement is enforced with priority lower than regulation up minimum requirement in scheduling run.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Non-Spin Minimum Requirements	2,000	250	4,000	500	Non-spin reserve minimum requirement is enforced with priority lower than spin minimum

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						requirement in scheduling run.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Maximum Limit on Upward Services	1,500	250	3,000	500	In the event of multiple AS regional requirements having bid insufficiency, it is undesirable to have multiple constraints produce AS prices equaling multiples of the AS bid cap. An alternative way to enforce sub-regional AS requirements is to enforce a maximum AS requirement on other AS regions, thereby reducing the AS prices in the other regions without causing excessive AS prices in the sub-region with bid insufficiency.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Self-scheduled CAISO demand and self-scheduled exports using identified non-RA supply resource	1,800	1,000	3,600	2,000	Pursuant to section 31.4, the uneconomic bid price for self-scheduled demand in the scheduling run exceeds the uneconomic bid price for self-scheduled

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						supply and self-scheduled exports not using identified non-RA supply resources.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Self-scheduled exports not using identified non-RA supply resource	1,150	1,000	2,300	2,000	The scheduling parameter for self-scheduled exports not using identified non-RA capacity is set below the parameter for generic self-schedules for demand.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Regulatory Must-Run and Must Take supply curtailment	-1,350	-150	-1,350	-150	Regulatory must-run and must-take supply receive priority over generic self-schedules for supply resources.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Price-taker supply bids	-400	-150	-400	-150	Generic self-schedules for supply receive higher priority than Economic Bids at the bid floor.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally qualified Regulation Up or Down self-provision	-405	NA	-405	NA	Conversion of AS self-schedules to Energy pursuant to section 31.3.1.3 received higher priority to maintaining the availability of regulation, over

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						spinning and non-spinning reserve.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally qualified Spin self-provision	-400	NA	-400	NA	Conversion of AS self-schedules to Energy pursuant to section 31.3.1.3 receives higher priority to maintaining the availability of spinning reserve, over non-spinning reserve.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally qualified Non-Spin self-provision	-395	NA	-395	NA	This penalty price for conversion of self-provided non-spinning reserves balances the maintenance of AS self-schedules with ensuring that the conversion to energy occurs before transmission constraints are relaxed.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally unqualified Reg Up or Down self-provision	-195	NA	-195	NA	In instances where AS self-provision is not qualified pursuant to the MRTU tariff, the capacity can still be considered as an AS bid, along with

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						regular AS bids. The price used for considering unqualified AS self-provision is lower than the AS bid cap, to allow it to be considered as an Economic Bid.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally unqualified Spin self-provision	-170	NA	-170	NA	Same as above.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally unqualified Non-Spin self-provision	-155	NA	-155	NA	Same as above.
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.1	Regulation Down Pricing – Insufficient Supply	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	N/A
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.2	Non-Spinning Reserve Pricing – Insufficient Supply	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	N/A

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴¹ when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.3	Spinning Reserve Pricing – Insufficient Supply	Price set as 10% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 10% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 10% of \$2,000/MWh.	Price set as 10% of \$2,000/MWh.	N/A
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.4	Regulation Up Pricing – Insufficient Supply	Price set as 20% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 20% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 20% of \$2,000/MWh.	Price set as 20% of \$2,000/MWh.	N/A
Tariff Section 27.4.3.3	Insufficient Supply to Meet Self-Schedule Demand in IFM	NA	1000	NA	2000	Pricing run parameter set at hard energy bid cap.
Tariff Section 27.4.3.5	Protection of TOR, ETC and Converted Rights Self-Schedules in the IFM	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	Penalty prices must be set higher than values specified in section 27.4.3.1.

Real Time Market Parameters

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Energy balance/Load curtailment and Self-Scheduled exports utilizing non-RA capacity	1,450	1,000	2,900	2,000	Scheduling run penalty price is set high to achieve high priority in serving forecast load and exports that utilize non-RA capacity. Energy bid cap as pricing run parameter reflects energy supply shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5 and Tariff Section 27.4.3.1	Transmission constraints: Intertie scheduling	1,500	1,000	3,000	2,000	The highest among all constraints in scheduling run, penalty price reflects its priority over load serving. Energy bid cap as pricing run parameter reflects energy supply shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Legacy Reliability Must-Run (LRMR) pre-dispatch curtailment (supply), and Exceptional Dispatch Supply	-6,000	-150	-6,000	-150	LRMR scheduling requirement is protected with higher priority over enforcement of internal transmission constraint in scheduling run. Energy bid floor is used as the pricing run

⁴² Penalty values in the scheduling run are negatively valued for supply reduction and positively valued for demand reduction.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						parameter for any type of energy self-schedule.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Pseudo-tie layoff energy	-1,500	-150	-1,500	-150	Energy bid floor is used as the pricing run parameter for any type of energy self-schedule.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5 and Tariff Section 27.4.3.1	Transmission constraints: branch, corridor, nomogram (base case and contingency analysis)	1,500	1,000	3,000	2,000	Scheduling run penalty price will enforce internal transmission constraints up to a re-dispatch cost of \$ of congestion relief in \$1,500/MWh or \$3,000/MWh. Energy bid cap as pricing run parameter consistent with the value for energy balance relaxation under a global energy supply shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Real Time TOR Supply Self Schedule	-5,900	-150	-5,900	-150	In RTM, TOR self-schedule scheduling run penalty price is much higher in magnitude than generic self-schedule but lower than transmission constraint. Energy bid floor

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						is used as the pricing run parameter as any type of energy self-schedule.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Real Time ETC Supply Self Schedule	-5,100 to -5,900	-150	-5,100 to -5,900	-150	In RTM the range of penalty prices for different ETCs supply self-schedules are much higher in magnitude than generic supply self-schedules but lower than TOR. Energy bid floor is the pricing parameter for all energy supply self-schedules.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Reg-Up and Reg-Down Minimum Requirements	1,450	250	2,900	500	Scheduling run penalty price is below the one for transmission constraint. Pricing run parameter is set to the AS market bid cap to reflect AS supply shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Spin Minimum Requirements	1,400	250	2,800	500	Scheduling run penalty price is lower than the one for regulation-up minimum requirement. Pricing run

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						parameter is set to the AS market bid cap to reflect AS supply shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Non-Spin Minimum Requirements	1,350	250	2,700	500	Scheduling run penalty price is lower than the one for spin minimum requirement. Pricing parameter is set to the AS market bid cap to reflect AS supply shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Ancillary Service Region Maximum Limit on Upward Services	1,200	250	2,400	500	Scheduling run penalty price is lower than those for minimum requirements to avoid otherwise system-wide shortage by allowing sub-regional relaxation of the maximum requirement. AS market bid cap as pricing run to reflect the otherwise system-wide shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Self-scheduled exports not using identified non-RA supply resource	1,150	1,000	2,300	2,000	Scheduling run penalty price reflects relatively low priority in protection as compared to

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						other demand categories. Energy bid cap as pricing run parameter to reflect energy supply shortage.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Final IFM Supply Schedule	-750	-150	-750	-150	Scheduling run penalty price is much higher in magnitude than supply generic self-schedule but lower than ETCs. Energy bid floor is the pricing parameter for all energy supply self-schedules.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Regulatory Must-Run and Must Take supply curtailment	-1,400	-150	-1,400	-150	Scheduling run penalty price reflects the higher priority of regulatory must-run and must-take supply received over generic self-schedules for supply resources. Energy bid floor is the pricing parameter for all energy supply self-schedules.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Price-taker supply bids	-400	-150	-400	-150	Energy bid floor is the pricing parameter for all energy supply self-schedules.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Qualified Load Following self-provision Up or Down	-8,500	0	-8,500	0	Scheduling run penalty price reflects the highest priority among all categories of AS self-provision. AS bid floor is used as the pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Day ahead conditionally qualified Reg Up or Down Award	-7,750	0	-7,750	0	Scheduling run penalty price is higher than the penalty price for energy balance constraint to reflect higher in priority over energy. AS bid floor is pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Day ahead conditionally qualified Spin Award	-7,700	0	-7,700	0	Scheduling run penalty price is lower than the one for Reg-up. AS bid floor is pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Day ahead conditionally qualified Non-spin Award	-7,650	0	-7,650	0	Scheduling run penalty price is lower than the one for Spin. AS bid floor is pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally qualified Reg Up or Down Real Time self-provision (RTUC only)	-405	0	-405	0	Scheduling run penalty price allows the conversion of AS self-schedules to energy to prevent LMP of local area from rising so high as to trigger transmission constraint relaxation. AS bid floor is pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally qualified Real Time Spin self-provision (RTUC only)	-400	0	-400	0	Scheduling run penalty price is below the one for regulating-up. AS bid floor is pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally qualified Real Time Non-Spin self-provision (RTUC only)	-395	0	-395	0	Scheduling run penalty price is below the one for spin. AS bid floor is pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally unqualified Reg Up or Down Real Time self-provision (RTUC only)	-195	0	-195	0	In scheduling run, AS self-provision not qualified in pre-processing can still be considered as an AS bid with higher priority in the

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						energy/AS co-optimization along with regular AS bids. AS bid floor is pricing parameter for any type of AS self-provision.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally unqualified Spin Real Time self-provision (RTUC only)	-170	0	-170	0	Same as above.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Conditionally unqualified Non-Spin Real Time self-provision (RTUC only)	-155	0	-155	0	Same as above.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	System power balance constraint	1,100, -155	1,000, -155	2,200, -155	2,000, -155	To reflect the role regulation plays in balancing the system for undersupply conditions when economic bids are exhausted, the ISO allows the system power balance constraint to relax by as much as the seasonal regulation requirement. For over-supply conditions, when economic bids are exhausted, the ISO allows the system power

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						balance constraint to relax to about 10% of the seasonal regulation requirement. The prices are selected to allow for coordinated dispatch of bids that may exist at or near the bid cap, or at or near the bid floor.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Power Balance constraint for individual EIM areas	1,100, -750	1,000, -150	2,200, -750	2,000, -150	Subject to the FERC order granting waiver of tariff sections 27.4.3.2 and 27.4.3.4, and consistent with Section 10.1.6 of the BPM for Energy Imbalance Market, which implement the price discovery mechanism overriding the pricing parameters and yielding the last economic signal under constraint relaxation. The scheduling run parameter is set to -750 for the individual EIM areas to

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						coordinate the relaxation of the EIM power balance constraint during over-generation conditions relative to congestion on non-EIM constraints.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	EIM Upward Available Balancing Capacity Range	1,200 through 1,050	Bid in Prices Range for EIM Participating resource and DEB for EIM Non-Participating	2,400 through 2,100	Bid in Prices Range for EIM Participating resource and DEB for EIM Non-Participating	The Penalty Price Range used for the Available Capacity Range prices to maintain the economic merit order reflected in the energy bid prices of the allocated energy bid portions
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	EIM Downward Available Balancing Capacity	-250 through -350	Bid in Prices Range for EIM Participating resource and DEB for EIM Non-Participating	-250 through -350	Bid in Prices Range for EIM Participating resource and DEB for EIM Non-Participating	The Penalty Price Range used for the Available Capacity Range prices to maintain the economic merit order reflected in the energy bid prices of the allocated energy bid portions
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	EIM Transfer Constraint	1,500	1,000	3,000	2,000	Penalty price and pricing parameter consistent with the

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
						transmission constraint;
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	EIM Entitlement Rate of Change Constraint (RTD Only)	1,500	0	3,000	0	Penalty price aligned with EIM transfer constraint is currently applicable to RTD 5 minute rate of change.
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Administrative Flexible Ramp Down Price Floor	-152	-152	-152	-152	Downward Demand Curve Price Cap
BPM for Market Operations Section 6.6.5	Administrative Flexible Ramp Up Price Ceiling	247	247	494	494	Upward Demand Curve Price Cap
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.1	Regulation Down Pricing – Insufficient Supply	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Regulation Down requirement.	N/A
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.2	Non-Spinning Reserve Pricing – Insufficient Supply	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$1,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	Price set as percentage of \$2,000/MWh, depending on the amount the CAISO market is short of supply needed to meet the Non-Spinning Reserve requirement.	N/A
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.3	Spinning Reserve Pricing –	Price set as 10% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 10% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 10% of \$2,000/MWh.	Price set as 10% of \$2,000/MWh.	N/A

FERC Order No. 831 - Import Bidding and Market Parameters
Final Proposal

Described in BPM for Market Operations or Tariff Section	Penalty Price Description	Scheduling Run Value ⁴² when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are below \$1,000/MWh and the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is not greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Scheduling Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Pricing Run Value when submitted and cost-verified bids are greater than \$1,000/MWh or the CAISO-calculated maximum import bid price is greater than \$1,000/MWh (\$/MWh)	Comment
	Insufficient Supply					
Tariff Section 27.1.2.3.4	Regulation Up Pricing – Insufficient Supply	Price set as 20% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 20% of \$1,000/MWh.	Price set as 20% of \$2,000/MWh.	Price set as 20% of \$2,000/MWh.	N/A
Tariff Section 27.4.3.4	Insufficient Supply to Meet CAISO Forecast of CAISO Demand in the RTM	1,000	1,000	2,000	2,000	Pricing run parameter set at hard energy bid cap.
Tariff Section 30.6.2.1.2.1	Marginal Real-Time Dispatch Option	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	Penalty prices set as a percentage of the hard energy bid set forth in Section 39.6.1.1.
Tariff Section 30.6.2.1.2.2	Discrete Real-Time Dispatch Option	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	To be calculated according detail in comment.	Penalty prices set as a percentage of the hard energy bid set forth in Section 39.6.1.1.