| Section # | CAISO’s Reply to Stakeholder comments on BPM for Generator Management 6/28/2019 | Stakeholder’s Reply 7/16/2019 | CAISO’s Response 7/30/2019 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6.1.4 | “Substantial change” is used to describe repowers allowable under 25.1.2 of the tariff, so we will not use it in this section of the BPM in order to avoid confusion. All changes after the time in queue are subject to commercial viability, except those items designated below as insubstantial.  FERC approved CAISO’s proposed usage of “insubstantial change” to describe the changes that are not subject to commercial viability (page 12 of their February 19, 2019 order accepting the 2018 IPE changes). The use of “insubstantial change” to describe exceptions does not predicate that we must term all other changes “substantial”. | Referring to the CAISO response above: Really, you are saying that changes that are not insubstantial are not necessarily substantial? What else would they be?  In any case, using your terminology, see if this will work. The language should include something about the “exceptions,” whatever you call them. | The “exceptions” are detailed in the sentence that follows the one with the Stakeholder’s proposed edit. It would be redundant to address the exceptions in both sentences. |
| 6.1.4.4 | Add “where required” to describe requirements for annual review to confirm commercial viability criteria is maintained. | Consistent with your modification above. | There are no conditions that would eliminate the requirement for an annual review that commercial viability criteria is maintained. Even if a project is in the one year exception period associated with not having a PPA, the annual review for verification that all other criteria continues to be met is still applicable. |
| 10.4 | This requirement was included in the proposal and the FERC filing. Please see page 14 of the transmittal letter and Article 5.16 of the LGIA. Updated the language to provide clarification that the intent is to allow for the execution of the amendment prior to the end of suspension but not require it.  If the GIA is not executed by suspension’s end, the parties will evaluate whether they are likely to finish negotiations soon, or an unexecuted filing is prudent. They can continue to negotiate after the suspension’s end if they think it would be shorter than an unexecuted proceeding. | OK, but please consider these clarifications and additions. Your explanation is helpful, and this language would add those details. | Omitted “try” and reverted to “negotiate such that the amended LGIA can be executed prior to the suspension’s end.” Removed the final sentence, as the added sentence is already implied in the CAISO Tariff. |

All other proposed edits from Stakeholders were accepted.