

## Recommendations

In order to perform its role in PJM market design, the MMU evaluates existing and proposed PJM Market Rules and the design of the PJM Markets.<sup>1</sup> The MMU initiates and proposes changes to the design of the markets and the PJM Market Rules in stakeholder and regulatory proceedings.<sup>2</sup> In support of this function, the MMU engages in discussions with stakeholders, State Commissions, PJM management, and the PJM Board; participates in PJM stakeholder meetings and working groups regarding market design matters; publishes proposals, reports and studies on market design issues; and makes filings with the Commission on market design issues.<sup>3</sup> The MMU also recommends changes to the PJM Market Rules to the staff of the Commission's Office of Energy Market Regulation, State Commissions, and the PJM Board.<sup>4</sup> The MMU may provide in its annual, quarterly and other reports "recommendations regarding any matter within its purview."<sup>5</sup>

Priority rankings are relative. The creation of rankings recognizes that there are limited resources available to address market issues and that problems must be ranked in order to determine the order in which to address them. It does not mean that all the problems should not be addressed. Priority rankings are dynamic and as new issues are identified, priority rankings will change. The rankings reflect a number of factors including the significance of the issue for efficient markets, the difficulty of completion and the degree to which items are already in progress. A low ranking does not necessarily mean that an issue is not important, but could mean that the issue would be easy to resolve.

There are three priority rankings: High, Medium and Low. High priority indicates that the recommendation requires action because it addresses a market design issue that creates significant market inefficiencies and/or long lasting negative market effects. Medium priority indicates that the recommendation addresses a market design issue that creates intermediate market inefficiencies and/or near term negative market effects. Low priority indicates that the recommendation addresses a market design issue that creates smaller

market inefficiencies and/or more limited market effects or that it could be easily resolved.

The MMU is also tracking PJM's progress in addressing these recommendations. The MMU recognizes that part of the process of addressing recommendations may include discussions in the stakeholder process, FERC decisions and court decisions and those elements are included in the tracking. The MMU recognizes that PJM does not have the unilateral authority to implement changes to the tariff but PJM has a significant role in the issues PJM focuses on, in proposed changes to the PJM manuals, and in the recommendations PJM makes to the stakeholders and to FERC. Each recommendation includes a status. The status categories are:

- **Adopted:** PJM has implemented the recommendation made by the MMU.
- **Partially adopted:** PJM has implemented part of the recommendation made by the MMU.
- **Not adopted:** PJM does not plan to implement the recommendation made by the MMU, or has not yet implemented any part of the recommendation made by the MMU. Where the subject of the recommendation is pending stakeholder, FERC, or court action, that status is noted.

This section of the report presents:

- **New Recommendations:** recommendations reported for the first time in 2017;<sup>6</sup>
- **History of MMU Recommendations:** summary status of all MMU recommendations from 1999 through 2017;
- **Current MMU Recommendations:** all current MMU recommendations;
- **Adopted Recommendations:** recommendations which have been adopted by PJM.

## New Recommendations

Consistent with its core function to "[e]valuate existing and proposed market rules, tariff provisions and market design elements and recommend proposed rule and tariff changes,"<sup>7</sup> the MMU recommends specific enhancements to existing market rules and implementation of new rules

<sup>1</sup> OATT Attachment M § IV.D.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> OATT Attachment M § VI.A.

<sup>6</sup> New recommendations include all MMU recommendations that were reported for the first time in the 2017 *State of the Market Report for PJM* or in any of the three quarterly state of the market reports that were published in 2017.

<sup>7</sup> 18 CFR § 35.28(g)(3)(ii)(A); see also OATT Attachment M § IV.D.

that are required for competitive results in PJM markets and for continued improvements in the functioning of PJM markets.

In this *2017 State of the Market Report for PJM*, the MMU includes 15 new recommendations made in 2017.<sup>8</sup>

## New Recommendation from Section 3, Energy Market

- The MMU recommends that PJM increase the interaction of outage and operational restrictions data submitted by Market Participants via eDART/eGADs and offer data submitted via Markets Gateway. (Priority: Low. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendations from Section 5, Capacity Market

- The MMU recommends that PJM offer to sell back capacity in incremental auctions only at the BRA clearing price for the relevant delivery year. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q1, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM clear the capacity market based on nodal capacity resource locations and the characteristics of the transmission system consistent with the actual electrical facts of the grid. The current nested LDA structure used in the capacity market does not adequately represent all the capacity transfers that are feasible among LDAs. Absent a fully nodal capacity market clearing process, the MMU recommends that PJM use a nonnested model for all LDAs and specify a VRR curve for each LDA separately. Each LDA requirement should be met with the capacity resources located within the LDA and exchanges from neighboring LDAs up to the transmission limit. LDAs should price separate if that is the result of the LDA supply curves and the transmission constraints. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the RPM market power mitigation rule be modified to apply offer caps in all cases when the three pivotal supplier test is failed and the sell offer is greater than the offer

cap. This will ensure that market power does not result in an increase in make whole payments. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that PJM develop a forward looking estimate for the expected number of Performance Assessment Hours (H) to use in calculating the Non-Performance Charge Rate. The MMU recommends that PJM develop a forward looking estimate for the Balancing Ratio (B) during Performance Assessment Hours to use in calculating the default offer cap. Both H and B parameters should be included in the annual review of planning parameters for the Base Residual Auction. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that when expected H and B are not the same as the assumed levels used to calculate the default market seller offer cap of Net CONE\*B, the offer cap be recalculated for each BRA using the fundamental economic logic for a competitive offer of a CP resource. (Priority: High. New Recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends elimination of the cost of service recovery rate in OATT Section 119, and that RMR service should be provided under the deactivation avoidable cost rate in Part V. The MMU also recommends specific improvements to the DACR provisions. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendations from Section 6, Demand Response

- The MMU recommends that the maximum offer for demand resources be the same as the maximum offer for generation resources. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends the Relative Root Mean Squared Test be required for all demand resources with a CBL. (Priority: Low. New recommendation. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PRD be required to respond during a PAH to be consistent with all CP resources. (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

<sup>8</sup> New recommendations include all MMU recommendations that were reported for the first time in the *2017 State of the Market Report for PJM* or in any of the three quarterly state of the market reports that were published in 2017.

## New Recommendations from Section 10, Ancillary Services

- The MMU recommends that for oil tanks that are shared with other resources, only a proportionate share of the minimum tank suction level (MTSL) be allocated to black start service. The MMU further recommends that the PJM tariff be updated to clearly state how the MTSL will be calculated for black start units sharing oil tanks. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that capability to operate under the proposed deadband (+/- 0.036 HZ) and droop (5 percent) settings be mandated as a condition of interconnection and that such capability be required of both new and existing resources. The MMU recommends that no additional compensation be provided as the current PJM market design provides adequate compensation. (Priority: Low. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendation from Section 12, Generation and Transmission Planning

- The MMU recommends that PJM limit the scope of supplemental projects that can obtain exceptions to the Order No. 1000 process to ensure maximum competition. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendations from Section 13, Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights

- The MMU recommends that Long Term FTRs be modified to include only a one year ahead FTR. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the full transmission capacity of the system be allocated as ARRs prior to sale as FTRs. (The MMU recommends that all requested ARR rights for each delivery year be reserved for ARR holders during the Long Term FTR Auction.) (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## History of MMU Recommendations

The MMU began making recommendations to PJM in the 1999 State of the Market Report. Since that time, the MMU has made 240 recommendations in the State of the Market Reports. In 2014, the MMU began including a priority and status with each recommendation. In this *2017 State of the Market Report for PJM*, the MMU has reviewed all past recommendations, assigned priority and determined their current status.

For the review of past recommendations, the MMU has refined the status assigned to each recommendation. In addition to the definitions of Adopted, Partially Adopted, and Not Adopted described above, the MMU includes the following definitions:

- **Partially Adopted (Continued Recommendation):** PJM has implemented part of the recommendation made by the MMU, and the MMU continues to recommend total adoption of the recommendation. These recommendations continue to be included in the main sections of this report;
- **Partially Adopted (Recommendation Closed):** PJM has implemented part of the recommendation made by the MMU, and the MMU has chosen to discontinue making the recommendation going forward. These recommendations are no longer included in the main sections of this report;
- **Not Adopted (Pending before FERC):** PJM has not yet implemented any part of the recommendation made by the MMU, but the subject of the recommendation is pending FERC action;
- **Not Adopted (Stakeholder Process):** PJM has not yet implemented any part of the recommendation made by the MMU, but the subject of the recommendation is pending stakeholder action;
- **Replaced by Newer Recommendation:** a recommendation that was discontinued when the MMU modified the recommendation; and
- **Withdrawn:** The MMU no longer makes the recommendation.

Table 2-1 shows the status of all recommendations reported by the MMU from 1999 through 2017. Over that time, 23 percent of all MMU recommendations have been adopted, 35 percent have been adopted or partially adopted, and 61 percent are not adopted. Of the 66 high

priority recommendations, 20 (30 percent) have been adopted. Table 2-1 includes past recommendations that are no longer included in this report.

**Table 2-1 Status of MMU reported recommendations: 1999 through 2017**

Status	Priority	Priority	Priority	Total	Percent of Total
	High	Medium	Low		
Adopted	20	15	19	54	22.5%
Partially Adopted (Continued Recommendation)	5	7	6	18	7.5%
Partially Adopted (Recommendation Closed)	2	4	5	11	4.6%
Partially Adopted (Total)	7	11	11	29	12.1%
Not Adopted	32	63	35	130	54.2%
Not Adopted (Pending before FERC)	4	2	0	6	2.5%
Not Adopted (Stakeholder Process)	2	6	2	10	4.2%
Not Adopted (Total)	38	71	37	146	60.8%
Replaced by Newer Recommendation	1	5	2	8	3.3%
Withdrawn	0	1	2	3	1.3%
Total	66	103	71	240	100.0%

## Complete List of Current MMU Recommendations

The recommendations are explained in each section of the report.

### Section 3, Energy Market

- The MMU recommends that the market rules should explicitly require that offers into the Day-Ahead Energy Market be competitive, where competitive is defined to be the short run marginal cost of the units. The short run marginal cost should reflect opportunity cost when and where appropriate. The MMU recommends that the level of incremental costs includable in cost-based offers not exceed the short run marginal cost of the unit. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2009. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM require every market participant to make available at least one cost schedule with the same fuel type and parameters as that of their offered price schedule. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM require that all fuel cost policies be algorithmic, verifiable, and systematic. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that Manual 15 be replaced with a straightforward description of the components of cost-based offers based on short run marginal costs and the correct calculation of cost-based offers. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends removal of all use of FERC System of Accounts in the Cost Development Guidelines. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends the removal of all use of cyclic starting and peaking factors from the Cost Development Guidelines. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends the removal of all labor costs from the Cost Development Guidelines. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends changing the definition of the start heat input for combined cycles to include only the amount of fuel used from firing each combustion turbine in the combined cycle to the breaker close of each combustion turbine. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends the removal of nuclear fuel and nonfuel operations and maintenance costs that are not short run marginal costs from the Cost Development Guidelines. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends revising the pumped hydro fuel cost calculation to include day-ahead and real-time power purchases. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends revisions to the calculation of energy market opportunity costs to incorporate all time based offer parameters and all limitations that impact the opportunity cost of generating unit output. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends removing the catastrophic designation for force majeure fuel supply limitations in Schedule 2. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the rules governing the application of the TPS test be clarified and documented. (Priority: High. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends, in order to ensure effective market power mitigation when the TPS test is failed, that markup be constant across the full MWh range of price and cost-based offers, and that there be at least one cost-based offer using the same fuel as the available price-based offer. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that in order to ensure effective market power mitigation when the TPS test is failed, the operating parameters in the cost-based offer and the price-based parameter limited schedule (PLS) offer be at least as flexible as the operating parameters in the available price-based non-PLS offer, and that the price-MW pairs in the price-based PLS offer be exactly equal to the price-based non-PLS offer. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that capacity performance resources and base capacity resources (during the June through September period) be held to the OEM operating parameters of the capacity market CONE reference resource for performance assessment and energy uplift payments and that this standard be applied to all technologies on a uniform basis. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that under the capacity performance construct, PJM recognize the difference between operational parameters that indicate to PJM dispatchers what a unit is capable of during the operating day and the parameters that are used for capacity performance assessment as well as uplift payments. The parameters which determine nonperformance charges and the amount of uplift payments to those generators should reflect the flexibility goals of the capacity performance construct. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM retain the \$1,000 per MWh offer cap in the PJM energy market except when cost-based offers exceed \$1,000 per MWh, and retain other existing rules that limit incentives to exercise market power. (Priority: High. First reported 1999. Status: Partially adopted, 1999.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM not allow nuclear generators which do not respond to prices or which only respond to manual instructions from the dispatcher to set the LMPs in the real-time market. (Priority: Low. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM document how LMPs are calculated when demand response is marginal. (Priority: Low. First reported 2014. Status: Not Adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM explicitly state its policy on the use of transmission penalty factors including: the level of the penalty factors; the triggers for the use of the penalty factors; the appropriate line ratings to trigger the use of penalty factors; the allowed duration of the violation; the use of constraint relaxation logic; and when the transmission penalty factors will be used to set the shadow price. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends that Market Sellers not be allowed to designate any portion of an available Capacity Resource's ICAP equivalent of cleared UCAP capacity commitment as a Maximum Emergency offer at any time during the delivery year.<sup>9</sup> (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM update the outage impact studies, the reliability analyses used in RPM for capacity deliverability and the reliability analyses used in RTEP for transmission upgrades to be consistent with the more conservative emergency operations (post contingency load dump limit exceedance analysis) in the energy market that were implemented in June 2013. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)

<sup>9</sup> This recommendation was accepted by PJM and filed with FERC in 2014 as part of the capacity performance updates to the RPM. See Schedule 1, Section 1.10.1A(d), Revisions to the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff and PJM Operating Agreement (Marked/Redline Format), EL15-29-000 (December 12, 2014). FERC rejected the proposed change in Order 151FERC 61,208 at 476 (June 9, 2015).

- The MMU recommends that the roles of PJM and the transmission owners in the decision making process to control for local contingencies be clarified, that PJM's role be strengthened and that the process be made transparent. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM include in the appropriate manual an explanation of the initial creation of hubs, the process for modifying hub definitions and a description of how hub definitions have changed.<sup>10</sup> There is currently no PJM documentation in the tariff or manuals explaining how hubs are created and how their definitions are changed.<sup>11</sup> (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that all buses with a net withdrawal be treated as load for purposes of calculating load and load-weighted LMP. The MMU recommends that during hours when a load bus shows a net injection, the energy injection be treated as generation, not negative load, for purposes of calculating generation and load-weighted LMP. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM remove nonspecific fuel types such as other or co-fire other from the list of fuel types available for market participants to identify the fuel type associated with their price and cost schedules. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM routinely review all transmission facility ratings and any changes to those ratings to ensure that the normal, emergency and load dump ratings used in modeling the transmission system are accurate and reflect standard ratings practice. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM identify and collect data on available behind the meter generation resources, including nodal location information and relevant operating parameters. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted.)

<sup>10</sup> According to minutes from the first meeting of the Energy Market Committee (EMC) on January 28, 1998, the EMC unanimously agreed to be responsible for approving additions, deletions and changes to the hub definitions to be published and modeled by PJM. Since the EMC has become the Market Implementation Committee (MIC), the MIC now appears to be responsible for such changes.

<sup>11</sup> The general definition of a hub can be found in the PJM.com Glossary <<http://www.pjm.com/Glossary.aspx>>.

- The MMU recommends that PJM continue to enhance its posting of market data to promote market efficiency. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2005. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM require all generating units to identify the fuel type associated with each of their offered schedules. (Priority: Low. First reported 2014. Status: Adopted 2014.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM increase the interaction of outage and operational restrictions data submitted by Market Participants via eDART/eGADs and offer data submitted via Markets Gateway. (Priority: Low. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 4, Energy Uplift

The MMU recognizes that many of the issues addressed in the recommendations are being discussed in PJM stakeholder processes. Until new rules are in place, the MMU's recommendations and the reported status of those recommendations are based on the existing market rules.

- The MMU recommends that PJM not use closed loop interface constraints to artificially override the nodal prices that are based on fundamental LMP logic in order to: accommodate rather than resolve the inadequacies of the demand side resource capacity product; address the inability of the power flow model to incorporate the need for reactive power; accommodate rather than resolve the flaws in PJM's approach to scarcity pricing; or for any other reason. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM not use price setting logic to artificially override the nodal prices that are based on fundamental LMP logic in order to reduce uplift. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that if PJM believes it appropriate to modify the LMP price setting logic, PJM initiate a stakeholder process to create transparent and consistent modifications to the rules and incorporate the modifications in the PJM tariff. (Priority: Medium. First Reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that PJM initiate an analysis of the reasons why some combustion turbines and diesels scheduled in the Day-Ahead Energy Market are not called in real time when they are economic. (Priority: Medium. First Reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends the elimination of the day-ahead operating reserve category to ensure that units receive an energy uplift payment based on their real-time output and not their day-ahead scheduled output. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends reincorporating the use of net regulation revenues as an offset in the calculation of balancing operating reserve credits. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2009. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends not compensating self-scheduled units for their startup cost when the units are scheduled by PJM to start before the self-scheduled hours. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends four additional modifications to the energy lost opportunity cost calculations:
- The MMU recommends calculating LOC based on 24-hour daily periods or multi-hour segments of hours for combustion turbines and diesels scheduled in the Day-Ahead Energy Market, but not committed in real time. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that units scheduled in the Day-Ahead Energy Market and not committed in real time should be compensated for LOC based on their real-time desired and achievable output, not their scheduled day-ahead output. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that units scheduled in the Day-Ahead Energy Market and not committed in real time be compensated for LOC incurred within an hour. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that only flexible fast start units (startup plus notification times of 30 minutes or less) and short minimum run times (one hour or less) be eligible by default for the LOC compensation to units scheduled in the Day-Ahead Energy Market and not committed in real time. Other units should be eligible for LOC compensation only if PJM explicitly cancels their day-ahead commitment. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that up to congestion transactions be required to pay energy uplift charges for both the injection and the withdrawal sides of the UTC. (Priority: High. First reported 2011. Status: Not adopted. Pending before FERC.)
- The MMU recommends eliminating the use of internal bilateral transactions (IBTs) in the calculation of deviations used to allocate balancing operating reserve charges. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted. Pending before FERC.)
- The MMU recommends allocating the energy uplift payments to units scheduled as must run in the Day-Ahead Energy Market for reasons other than voltage/reactive or black start services as a reliability charge to real-time load, real-time exports and real-time wheels. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends that the total cost of providing reactive support be categorized and allocated as reactive services. Reactive services credits should be calculated consistent with the operating reserve credits calculation. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends including real-time exports and real-time wheels in the allocation of the cost of providing reactive support to the 500 kV system or above, which is currently allocated solely to real-time RTO load. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends enhancing the current energy uplift allocation rules to reflect the elimination of day-ahead operating reserves, the timing of commitment decisions and the commitment reasons. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends modifications to the calculation of lost opportunity costs credits paid to wind units. The lost opportunity costs credits paid to wind units should be based on the lesser of the

desired output, the estimated output based on actual wind conditions and the capacity interconnection rights (CIRs). In addition, the MMU recommends that PJM allow and wind units submit CIRs that reflect the maximum output wind units want to inject into the transmission system at any time. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that PJM revise Manual 11 attachment C consistent with the tariff to limit compensation to offered costs. The Manual 11 attachment C procedure should describe the steps market participants must take to change the availability of cost-based energy offers that have been submitted day ahead. The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the Manual 11 attachment C procedure with the implementation of hourly offers (ER16-372-000). (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM clearly identify and classify all reasons for incurring operating reserves in the Day-Ahead and the Real-Time Energy Markets and the associated operating reserve charges in order to make all market participants aware of the reasons for these costs and to help ensure a long term solution to the issue of how to allocate the costs of operating reserves. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2011. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM revise the current operating reserve confidentiality rules in order to allow the disclosure of complete information about the level of operating reserve charges by unit and the detailed reasons for the level of operating reserve credits by unit in the PJM region. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the lost opportunity cost in the energy market be calculated using the schedule on which the unit was scheduled to run in the energy market. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends including no load and startup costs as part of the total avoided costs in the calculation of lost opportunity cost credits paid to combustion turbines and diesels scheduled in the Day-Ahead Energy Market but not committed in real time. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Adopted 2015.)

- The MMU recommends using the entire offer curve and not a single point on the offer curve to calculate energy lost opportunity cost. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Adopted 2015.)

## Section 5, Capacity Market

The MMU recognizes that PJM has implemented the Capacity Performance Construct to replace some of the existing core market rules and to address fundamental performance incentive issues. The MMU recognizes that the Capacity Performance Construct addresses many of the MMU's recommendations. The MMU's recommendations are based on the existing capacity market rules. The status is reported as adopted if the recommendation was included in FERC's order approving PJM's Capacity Performance filing.<sup>12</sup>

### Definition of Capacity

- The MMU recommends the enforcement of a consistent definition of capacity resource. The MMU recommends that the requirement to be a physical resource be enforced and enhanced. The requirement to be a physical resource should apply at the time of auctions and should also constitute a commitment to be physical in the relevant Delivery Year. The requirement to be a physical resource should be applied to all resource types, including planned generation, demand resources and imports.<sup>13 14</sup> (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted. Pending before FERC.)
- The MMU recommends that the definition of demand side resources be modified to ensure that such resources be fully substitutable for other generation capacity resources. Both the Limited and the Extended Summer DR products should be eliminated in order to ensure that the DR product has the same unlimited obligation to provide capacity year round as generation capacity resources. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Adopted 2015.)

<sup>12</sup> 151 FERC ¶ 61,208 (June 9, 2015).

<sup>13</sup> See also Comments of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket No. ER14-503-000 (December 20, 2013).

<sup>14</sup> See "Analysis of Replacement Capacity for RPM Commitments: June 1, 2007 to June 1, 2016," <[http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2016/IMM\\_Analysis\\_of\\_Replacement\\_Capacity\\_for\\_RPM\\_Commitments\\_06012007\\_to\\_06012016\\_20161227.pdf](http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2016/IMM_Analysis_of_Replacement_Capacity_for_RPM_Commitments_06012007_to_06012016_20161227.pdf)> (December 27, 2016).

## Market Design and Parameters

- The MMU recommends that the test for determining modeled Locational Deliverability Areas (LDAs) in RPM be redefined. A detailed reliability analysis of all at risk units should be included in the redefined model. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the net revenue calculation used by PJM to calculate the net Cost of New Entry (CONE) VRR parameter reflect the actual flexibility of units in responding to price signals rather than using assumed fixed operating blocks that are not a result of actual unit limitations.<sup>15</sup>  
<sup>16</sup> The result of reflecting the actual flexibility is higher net revenues, which affect the parameters of the RPM demand curve and market outcomes. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that energy efficiency resources (EE) not be included on the supply side of the capacity market, because PJM's load forecasts now account for future EE, unlike the situation when EE was first added to the capacity market. However, the MMU recommends that the PJM load forecast method should be modified so that EE impacts immediately affect the forecast without the long lag times incorporated in the current forecast method. If EE is not included on the supply side, there is no reason to have an add back mechanism. If EE remains on the supply side, the implementation of the EE add back mechanism should be modified to ensure that market clearing prices are not affected. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM reduce the number of incremental auctions to a single incremental auction held three months prior to the start of the delivery year and reevaluate the triggers for holding conditional incremental auctions. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Modified Q1 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM offer to sell back capacity in incremental auctions only at the BRA clearing price for the relevant delivery year.

(Priority: Medium. First reported Q1, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that the use of the 2.5 percent demand adjustment (Short Term Resource Procurement Target) be terminated immediately. The 2.5 percent should be added back to the overall market demand curve. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends changing the RPM solution method to explicitly incorporate the cost of make whole payments in the objective function. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM clear the capacity market based on nodal capacity resource locations and the characteristics of the transmission system consistent with the actual electrical facts of the grid. The current nested LDA structure used in the capacity market does not adequately represent all the capacity transfers that are feasible among LDAs. Absent a fully nodal capacity market clearing process, the MMU recommends that PJM use a nonnested model for all LDAs and specify a VRR curve for each LDA separately. Each LDA requirement should be met with the capacity resources located within the LDA and exchanges from neighboring LDAs up to the transmission limit. LDAs should price separate if that is the result of the LDA supply curves and the transmission constraints. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)

## Offer Caps and Offer Floors

- The MMU recommends the extension of the minimum offer price rule (MOPR) to all existing and proposed units (MOPR-Ex) in order to protect competition in the capacity market from external subsidies. (Priority: High. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that, as part of the MOPR unit specific standard of review, all projects be required to use the same basic modeling assumptions. That is the only way to ensure that projects compete on the basis of actual costs rather than on the basis

<sup>15</sup> See PJM Interconnection, LLC, Docket No. ER12-513-000 (December 1, 2011) ("Triennial Review").

<sup>16</sup> See the 2012 State of the Market Report for PJM, Volume 2, Section 6: Net Revenue.

of modeling assumptions.<sup>17</sup> (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that modifications to existing resources not be treated as new resources for purposes of market power related offer caps or MOPR offer floors. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the RPM market power mitigation rule be modified to apply offer caps in all cases when the three pivotal supplier test is failed and the sell offer is greater than the offer cap. This will ensure that market power does not result in an increase in make whole payments. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM develop a forward looking estimate for the expected number of Performance Assessment Hours (H) to use in calculating the Non-Performance Charge Rate. The MMU recommends that PJM develop a forward looking estimate for the Balancing Ratio (B) during Performance Assessment Hours to use in calculating the default offer cap. Both H and B parameters should be included in the annual review of planning parameters for the Base Residual Auction. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that when expected H and B are not the same as the assumed levels used to calculate the default market seller offer cap of Net CONE\*B, the offer cap be recalculated for each BRA using the fundamental economic logic for a competitive offer of a CP resource. (Priority: High. New Recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

### Performance Incentive Requirements of RPM

- The MMU recommends that a unit which is not capable of supplying energy consistent with its day-ahead offer reflect an appropriate outage. (Priority:

Medium. First reported 2009. Status: Not adopted. Pending before FERC.)

- The Market Monitor recommends that retroactive replacement transactions associated with a failure to perform during a PAH not be allowed and that, more generally, retroactive replacement capacity transactions not be permitted. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that Generation Capacity Resources be paid on the basis of whether they produce energy when called upon during any of the hours defined as critical. One hundred percent of capacity market revenue should be at risk rather than only fifty percent. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Adopted 2015.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate all OMC outages from the calculation of forced outage rates used for any purpose in the PJM Capacity Market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Adopted 2015.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the broad exception related to lack of gas during the winter period for single-fuel, natural gas-fired units.<sup>18</sup> (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends that there be an explicit requirement that capacity resource offers in the Day-Ahead Energy Market be competitive, where competitive is defined to be the short run marginal cost of the units. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)

### Capacity Imports and Exports

- The MMU recommends that all capacity imports be required to be pseudo tied prior to the relevant Delivery Year in order to ensure that imports are full substitutes for internal, physical capacity resources. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends that all capacity imports be required to be deliverable to PJM load prior to the relevant delivery year to ensure that they are full substitutes for internal, physical capacity resources.

<sup>17</sup> See 143 FERC ¶ 61,090 (2013) (“We encourage PJM and its stakeholders to consider, for example, whether the unit-specific review process would be more effective if PJM requires the use of common modeling assumptions for establishing unit-specific offer floors while, at the same time, allowing sellers to provide support for objective, individual cost advantages. Moreover, we encourage PJM and its stakeholders to consider these modifications to the unit-specific review process together with possible enhancements to the calculation of Net CONE.”); see also, Comments of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket No. ER13-535-001 (March 25, 2013); Complaint of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM v. Unnamed Participant, Docket No. EL12-63-000 (May 1, 2012); Motion for Clarification of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket No. ER11-2875-000, et al. (February 17, 2012); Protest of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket No. ER11-2875-002 (June 2, 2011); Comments of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket Nos. EL11-20 and ER11-2875 (March 4, 2011).

<sup>18</sup> See OATT Attachment DD § 10(e). For more on this issue and related incentive issues, see the MMU’s White Paper included in: Monitoring Analytics, LLC and PJM Interconnection, LLC, joint report, “Capacity in the PJM Market,” (August 20, 2012). <[http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2012/JMM\\_And\\_PJM\\_Capacity\\_White\\_Papers\\_On\\_OPSI\\_Issues\\_20120820.pdf](http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2012/JMM_And_PJM_Capacity_White_Papers_On_OPSI_Issues_20120820.pdf)>.

Pseudo ties alone are not adequate to ensure deliverability. (Priority: High. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that all costs incurred as a result of a pseudo tied unit be borne by the unit itself and included as appropriate in unit offers in the capacity market. (Priority: High. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that all capacity imports have firm transmission to the PJM border prior to offering in an RPM auction. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends that all resources importing capacity into PJM accept a must offer requirement. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends clear, explicit and detailed rules that define the conditions under which PJM will and will not recall energy from PJM capacity resources and prohibit new energy exports from PJM capacity resources. The MMU recommends that those rules define the conditions under which PJM will purchase emergency energy while at the same time not recalling energy exports from PJM capacity resources. PJM has modified these rules, but the rules need additional clarification and operational details. (Priority: Low. First reported 2010. Status: Partially adopted.)

### Deactivations/Retirements

- The MMU recommends that the notification requirement for deactivations be extended from 90 days prior to the date of deactivation to 12 months prior to the date of deactivation and that PJM and the MMU be provided 60 days rather than 30 days to complete their reliability and market power analyses. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that RMR units recover all and only the incremental costs, including incremental investment costs, required by the RMR service that the unit owner would not have incurred if the unit owner had deactivated its unit as it proposed. Customers should bear no responsibility for paying previously incurred costs, including a return on or of prior investments. (Priority: Low. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends elimination of the cost of service recovery rate in OATT Section 119, and that RMR service should be provided under the deactivation avoidable cost rate in Part V. The MMU also recommends specific improvements to the DACR provisions. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

### Section 6, Demand Response

The MMU recognizes that PJM incorporated some of the recommendations related to Demand Response in the Capacity Performance filing. The status of each recommendation reflects the status at December 31, 2017.

- The MMU recommends, as a preferred alternative to including demand resources as supply in the capacity market, that demand resources be on the demand side of the markets, that customers be able to avoid capacity and energy charges by not using capacity and energy at their discretion, that customer payments be determined only by metered load, and that PJM forecasts immediately incorporate the impacts of demand side behavior. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the option to specify a minimum dispatch price (strike price) for demand resources be eliminated and that participating resources receive the hourly real-time LMP less any generation component of their retail rate. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the maximum offer for demand resources be the same as the maximum offer for generation resources. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the demand resources be treated as an economic resource, responding to economic price signals like other capacity resources. The MMU recommends that demand resources not be treated as emergency resources, not trigger a PJM emergency and not trigger a Performance Assessment Hour. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the Emergency Program Energy Only option be eliminated because the opportunity to receive the appropriate energy market incentive is already provided in the economic

program. (Priority: Low. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that a daily energy market must offer requirement apply to demand resources, comparable to the rule applicable to generation capacity resources.<sup>19</sup> (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that demand resources be required to provide their nodal location, comparable to generation resources. (Priority: High. First reported 2011. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM require nodal dispatch of demand resources with no advance notice required or, if nodal location is not required, subzonal dispatch of demand resources with no advance notice required. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the measurement of compliance across zones within a compliance aggregation area (CAA). The multiple zone approach is less locational than the zonal and subzonal approach and creates larger mismatches between the locational need for the resources and the actual response. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that measurement and verification methods for demand resources be modified to reflect compliance more accurately. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2009. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that compliance rules be revised to include submittal of all necessary hourly load data, and that negative values be included when calculating event compliance across hours and registrations. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM adopt the ISO-NE five-minute metering requirements in order to ensure that dispatchers have the necessary information for reliability and that market payments to demand resources be calculated based on interval

meter data at the site of the demand reductions.<sup>20</sup> (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that demand response event compliance be calculated for each hour and the penalty structure reflect hourly compliance for the base and capacity performance products. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that load management testing be initiated by PJM with limited warning to CSPs in order to more accurately represent the conditions of an emergency event. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that shutdown cost be defined as the cost to curtail load for a given period that does not vary with the measured reduction or, for behind the meter generators, be the start cost defined in Manual 15 for generators. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the Net Benefits Test be eliminated and that demand response resources be paid LMP less any generation component of the applicable retail rate. (Priority: Low. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the tariff rules for demand response clarify that a resource and its CSP, if any, must notify PJM of material changes affecting the capability of the resource to perform as registered and must terminate or modify registrations that are no longer capable of responding to PJM dispatch directives at defined levels because load has been reduced or eliminated, as in the case of bankrupt and/or out of service facilities. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM not remove any defined subzones and maintain a public record of all created and removed subzones. (Priority: Low. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that there be only one demand response product in the capacity market, with an obligation to respond when called for all

<sup>19</sup> See "Complaint and Motion to Consolidate of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM," Docket No. EL14-20-000 (January 27, 2014) at 1.

<sup>20</sup> See ISO-NE Tariff, Section III, Market Rule 1, Appendix E1 and Appendix E2, "Demand Response," <[http://www.iso-ne.com/regulatory/tariff/sect\\_3/mr1\\_append-e.pdf](http://www.iso-ne.com/regulatory/tariff/sect_3/mr1_append-e.pdf)>. (Accessed October 17, 2017) ISO-NE requires that DR have an interval meter with five-minute data reported to the ISO and each behind the meter generator is required to have a separate interval meter. After June 1, 2017, demand response resources in ISO-NE must also be registered at a single node.

hours of the year. (Priority: High. First reported 2011. Status: Partially adopted.<sup>21</sup>)

- The MMU recommends that the lead times for demand resources be shortened to 30 minutes with an hour minimum dispatch for all resources. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends setting the baseline for measuring capacity compliance under winter compliance at the customers' PLC, similar to GLD, to avoid double counting. (Priority: High. First reported 2010. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends the Relative Root Mean Squared Test be required for all demand resources with a CBL. (Priority: Low. New recommendation. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PRD be required to respond during a PAH to be consistent with all CP resources. (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends capping the baseline for measuring compliance under GLD, for the limited summer product, at the customers' PLC. (Priority: High. First reported 2010. Status: Adopted 2015.)
- The MMU recommends that demand resources whose technology type (load drop method) is designated as "Other" explicitly record the technology type. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Adopted, 2014.)

## Section 7, Net Revenue

There are no recommendations in this section.

## Section 8, Environmental

- The MMU recommends that renewable energy credit markets based on state renewable portfolio standards be brought into PJM markets as they are an increasingly important component of the wholesale energy market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 9, Interchange Transactions

- The MMU recommends that PJM implement rules to prevent sham scheduling. The MMU recommends that PJM apply after the fact market settlement adjustments to identified sham scheduling segments to ensure that market participants cannot benefit from sham scheduling. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted. Stakeholder process.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM implement a validation method for submitted transactions that would prohibit market participants from breaking transactions into smaller segments to defeat the interface pricing rule by concealing the true source or sink of the transaction. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM implement a validation method for submitted transactions that would require market participants to submit transactions on paths that reflect the expected actual power flow in order to reduce unscheduled loop flows. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM end the practice of maintaining outdated definitions of interface pricing points, eliminate the NIPSCO, Southeast and Southwest interface pricing points from the Day-Ahead and Real-Time Energy Markets and, with VACAR, assign the transactions created under the reserve sharing agreement to the SouthIMP/EXP pricing point. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the IMO interface pricing point, and assign the transactions that originate or sink in the IESO balancing authority to the MISO interface pricing point. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM monitor, and adjust as necessary, the weights applied to the components of the interfaces to ensure that the interface prices reflect ongoing changes in system conditions. The MMU also recommends that PJM review the mappings of external balancing authorities to individual interface pricing points to reflect changes to the impact of the external power source on PJM tie lines as a result of system topology changes. The MMU recommends that this review occur at least

<sup>21</sup> PJM's Capacity Performance proposal includes this change. See "Reforms to the Reliability Pricing Market ("RPM") and Related Rules in the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff ("Tariff") and Reliability Assurance Agreement Among Load Serving Entities ("RAA")," Docket No. ER15-632-000 and "PJM Interconnection, L.L.C." Docket No. EL15-29-000.

- annually. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that, in order to permit a complete analysis of loop flow, FERC and NERC ensure that the identified data are made available to market monitors as well as other industry entities determined appropriate by FERC. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2003. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM explore an interchange optimization solution with its neighboring balancing authorities that would remove the need for market participants to schedule physical transactions across seams. Such a solution would include an optimized, but limited, joint dispatch approach that uses supply curves and treats seams between balancing authorities as constraints, similar to other constraints within an LMP market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM permit unlimited spot market imports as well as unlimited nonfirm point-to-point willing to pay congestion imports and exports at all PJM interfaces in order to improve the efficiency of the market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM immediately provide the required 12-month notice to Duke Energy Progress (DEP) to unilaterally terminate the Joint Operating Agreement. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJMSettlement Inc. immediately request a credit evaluation from all companies that engaged in up to congestion transactions between September 8, 2014, and December 31, 2015. If PJM has the authority, PJM should ensure that the potential exposure to uplift for that period be included as a contingency in the companies' calculations for credit levels and/or collateral requirements. If PJM does not have the authority to take such steps, PJM should request guidance from FERC. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that the emergency interchange cap be replaced with a market based solution. (Priority: Low. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that the submission deadline for real-time dispatchable transactions be modified from 1800 on the day prior, to three hours prior to the requested start time, and that the minimum duration be modified from one hour to 15 minutes. These changes would give PJM a more flexible product that could be used to meet load in the most economic manner. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. Status: Partially adopted, 2015.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM and MISO work together to align interface pricing definitions, using the same number of external buses and selecting buses in close proximity on either side of the border with comparable bus weights. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Adopted 2017.)

## Section 10, Ancillary Services

- The MMU recommends that the Regulation Market be modified to incorporate a consistent application of the marginal benefit factor (MBF) throughout the optimization, assignment and settlement process. The MBF should be defined as the Marginal Rate of Technical Substitution (MRTS) between RegA and RegD. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted. Pending before FERC.)
- The MMU recommends that the lost opportunity cost in the ancillary services markets be calculated using the schedule on which the unit was scheduled to run in the energy market. (Priority: High. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted. Pending before FERC.)
- The MMU recommends that the LOC calculation used in the Regulation Market be based on the resource's dispatched energy offer schedule, not the lower of its price or cost offer schedule. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Status: Pending before FERC.)
- The MMU recommends that all data necessary to perform the Regulation Market three pivotal supplier test be saved so that the test can be replicated. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that, to prevent gaming, there be a penalty enforced in the Regulation Market as a reduction in performance score and/or a forfeiture of revenues when resource owners elect to deassign assigned regulation resources within the

- hour. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted. Pending before FERC.)
- The MMU recommends the use of a single five minute clearing price based on actual five minute LMP and lost opportunity cost to improve the performance of the Regulation Market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Status: Adopted in 2012.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM be required to save data elements necessary for verifying the performance of the Regulation Market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends enhanced documentation of the implementation of the Regulation Market design. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Status: Pending before FERC.)
  - The MMU recommends that the rule requiring that tier 1 synchronized reserve resources are paid the tier 2 price when the nonsynchronized reserve price is above zero be eliminated immediately and that, under the current rule, tier 1 synchronized reserve resources not be paid the tier 2 price when they do not respond. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that the tier 2 synchronized reserve must offer requirement be enforced. The MMU recommends that PJM define a set of acceptable reasons why a unit can be made unavailable daily or hourly and require unit owners to select a reason in Markets Gateway whenever making a unit unavailable either daily or hourly or setting the offer MW to 0 MW. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM be more explicit and transparent about why tier 1 biasing is used in defining demand in the Tier 2 Synchronized Reserve Market. The MMU recommends that PJM define rules for estimating tier 1 MW, define rules for the use and amount of tier 1 biasing and identify the rule based reasons for each instance of biasing. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that the single clearing price for synchronized reserves be determined based on the actual five minute LMP and actual LOC and not the forecast LMP. (Priority: Low. First reported 2010. Status: Adopted, 2016.)
  - The MMU recommends that no payments be made to tier 1 resources if they are deselected in the PJM market solution. The MMU also recommends that documentation of the Tier 1 synchronized reserve deselection process be published. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Status: Adopted, 2014.)
  - The MMU recommends that a reason code be attached to every hour in which PJM market operations adds additional DASR MW. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM modify the DASR Market to ensure that all resources cleared incur a real-time performance obligation. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that the three pivotal supplier test and market power mitigation be incorporated in the DASR Market. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that separate payments for reactive capability be eliminated and the cost of reactive capability be recovered in the capacity market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that for oil tanks which are shared with other resources only a proportionate share of the minimum tank suction level (MTSL) be allocated to black start service. The MMU further recommends that the PJM tariff be updated to clearly state how the MTSL will be calculated for black start units sharing oil tanks. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that capability to operate under the proposed deadband (+/- 0.036 HZ) and droop (5 percent) settings be mandated as a condition of interconnection and that such capability be required of both new and existing resources. The MMU recommends that no additional compensation be provided as the current PJM market design provides adequate compensation. (Priority: Low. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 11, Congestion and Marginal Losses

There are no recommendations in this section.

## Section 12, Planning

- The MMU recommends that PJM continue to incorporate the principle that the goal of transmission planning should be the incorporation of transmission investment decisions into market driven processes as much as possible. (Priority: Low. First reported 2001. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends the creation of a mechanism to permit a direct comparison, or competition, between transmission and generation alternatives, including which alternative is less costly and who bears the risks associated with each alternative. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that rules be implemented to permit competition to provide financing for transmission projects. This competition could reduce the cost of capital for transmission projects and significantly reduce total costs to customers. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that rules be implemented to require that project cost caps on new transmission projects be part of the evaluation of competing projects. (Priority: Low. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that barriers to entry be addressed in a timely manner in order to help ensure that the capacity market will result in the entry of new capacity to meet the needs of PJM market participants and reflect the uncertainty and resultant risks in the cost of new entry used to establish the capacity market demand curve in RPM. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the question of whether Capacity Injection Rights (CIRs) should persist after the retirement of a unit be addressed. Even if the treatment of CIRs remains unchanged, the rules need to ensure that incumbents cannot exploit control of CIRs to block or postpone entry of competitors.<sup>22</sup> (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends outsourcing interconnection studies to an independent party to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Currently, these studies are performed by incumbent transmission owners under PJM's direction. This creates potential conflicts of interest, particularly when transmission owners are vertically integrated and the owner of transmission also owns generation. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM establish fair terms of access to rights of way and property, such as at substations, in order to remove any barriers to entry and permit competition between incumbent transmission providers and merchant transmission providers in the RTEP. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM enhance the transparency and queue management process for merchant transmission investment. Issues related to data access and complete explanations of cost impacts should be addressed. The goal should be to remove barriers to competition from merchant transmission. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends consideration of changing the minimum distribution factor in the allocation from 0.01 to 0.00 and adding a threshold minimum usage impact on the line. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM reevaluate all transmission outage tickets as on time or late as if they were new requests when an outage is rescheduled and apply the standard rules for late submissions to any such outages. (Priority: Low. First reported 2014. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM draft a clear definition of the congestion analysis required for transmission outage requests to include in Manual 3 after appropriate review. (Priority: Low. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM modify the rules to reduce or eliminate the approval of late outage requests submitted or rescheduled after the FTR auction bidding opening date. (Priority: Low. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)

<sup>22</sup> See "Comments of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM," Docket No. ER12-1177-000 <[http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2012/IMM\\_Comments\\_ER12-1177-000\\_20120312.pdf](http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2012/IMM_Comments_ER12-1177-000_20120312.pdf)>.

- The MMU recommends that PJM not permit transmission owners to divide long duration outages into smaller segments to avoid complying with the requirements for long duration outages. (Priority: Low. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends improvements in queue management including that PJM establish a review process to ensure that projects are removed from the queue if they are not viable, as well as a process to allow commercially viable projects to advance in the queue ahead of projects which have failed to make progress, subject to rules to prevent gaming. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends an analysis of the study phase of PJM's transmission planning to reduce the need for postponements of study results, to decrease study completion times, and to improve the likelihood that a project at a given phase in the study process will successfully go into service. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM limit the scope of supplemental projects that can obtain exceptions to the Order No. 1000 process, to ensure maximum competition. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

### Section 13, FTRs and ARRs

- The MMU recommends that the ARR/FTR design be modified to ensure that the rights to all congestion revenues are assigned to load. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that Long Term FTRs be modified to include only a one year ahead FTR. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the full transmission capacity of the system be allocated as ARRs prior to sale as FTRs. (The MMU recommends that all requested ARR rights for each delivery year be reserved for ARR holders during the Long Term FTR Auction.) (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that all FTR auction revenue, including auction revenue from the sale of Long Term FTRs, be distributed to ARR holders. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that FTR auction revenues not be used to buy counter flow FTRs for the purpose of improving FTR payout ratios.<sup>23</sup> (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that all historical generation to load paths be eliminated as a basis for allocating ARRs. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that counter flow FTRs be eliminated. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate portfolio netting to eliminate cross subsidies among FTR market participants. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate subsidies to counter flow FTRs by applying the payout ratio to counter flow FTRs in the same way the payout ratio is applied to prevailing flow FTRs. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate geographic cross subsidies. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM apply the FTR forfeiture rule to up to congestion transactions consistent with the application of the FTR forfeiture rule to increment offers and decrement bids. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Adopted 2017)
- The MMU recommends that PJM examine the mechanism by which self scheduled FTRs are allocated when load switching among LSEs occurs throughout the planning period. (Priority: Low. First reported 2011. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM improve transmission outage modeling in the FTR auction models, including the use of probabilistic outage modeling. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM reduce FTR sales on paths with persistent overallocation of FTRs including clear rules for what defines persistent

<sup>23</sup> See "PJM Manual 6: Financial Transmission Rights," Rev. 18 (Sep. 1, 2017) at 55.

overall allocation and how the reduction will be applied. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted, 2014/2015 planning period.)

- The MMU recommends that PJM report correct monthly payout ratios to reduce understatement of payout ratios on a monthly basis. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Status: Adopted 2016.)

## Adopted Recommendations

The following is the complete list of all MMU recommendations that have been adopted by PJM, including the priority, date of first report, and the section in the State of the Market Report in which the recommendation was made.

### Adopted 2017

- The MMU recommends that PJM and MISO work together to align interface pricing definitions, using the same number of external buses and selecting buses in close proximity on either side of the border with comparable bus weights. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Last reported 2017, Section 9, Interchange Transactions.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM apply the FTR forfeiture rule to up to congestion transactions consistent with the application of the FTR forfeiture rule to increment offers and decrement bids. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Last reported 2017, Section 13, Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights.)

### Adopted 2016

- The MMU recommends that PJM report correct monthly payout ratios to reduce understatement of payout ratios on a monthly basis. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2016 Section 13, Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights.)

### Adopted 2015

- The MMU recommends that the lost opportunity cost in the energy market be calculated using the schedule on which the unit was scheduled to run in the energy market. (Priority: High. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2016 Section 3, Energy Market.)

- The MMU recommends including no load and startup costs as part of the total avoided costs in the calculation of lost opportunity cost credits paid to combustion turbines and diesels scheduled in the Day-Ahead Energy Market but not committed in real time. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2016 Section 4, Energy Uplift.)
- The MMU recommends using the entire offer curve and not a single point on the offer curve to calculate energy lost opportunity cost. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2016 Section 4, Energy Uplift.)
- The MMU recommends that all generation types face the same performance incentives. (Priority: High. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2012 Section 4, Capacity Market.)
- The existence of a capacity market that links payments for capacity to the level of unforced capacity and therefore to the forced outage rate creates an incentive to improve forced outage rates. The performance incentives in the RPM Capacity Market design need to be strengthened. (Priority: High. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that the obligations of capacity resources be more clearly defined in the market rules. (Priority: High. First reported 2010. Last reported: 2011 Section 4, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate all OMC outages from the calculation of forced outage rates used for any purpose in the PJM Capacity Market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Last reported: 2016 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends immediate elimination of lack of fuel as an acceptable basis for an OMC outage. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2012 Section 4, Capacity Market.)
- PJM should scrutinize OMC outages for low Btu coal carefully. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2003. Last reported: 2009 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the broad exception related to lack of gas during the winter period for single-fuel, natural gas-fired units. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Last reported: 2016 Section 5, Capacity Market.)

- The MMU recommends that Generation Capacity Resources be paid on the basis of whether they produce energy when called upon during any of the hours defined as critical. One hundred percent of capacity market revenue should be at risk rather than only fifty percent. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2016 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends elimination of the exception related to a unit that runs less than 50 hours during the RPM peak period. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2012 Section 4, Capacity.)
- The MMU recommends that the use of the 2.5 percent demand adjustment (Short Term Resource Procurement Target) be terminated immediately. The 2.5 percent should be added back to the overall market demand curve. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2016 Section 5 Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that the definition of demand side resources be modified in order to ensure that such resources be fully substitutable for other generation capacity resources. Both the Limited and the Extended Summer DR products should be eliminated in order to ensure that the DR product has the same unlimited obligation to provide capacity year round as generation capacity resources. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2016 Section 5, capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM increase the Capacity Resource Deficiency Charge, which is a penalty charge. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Last reported: 2013 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that all capacity have firm transmission to the PJM border acquired prior to the offering in an RPM auction. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Last reported: 2016 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that all capacity imports be required to be pseudo tied prior to the relevant Delivery Year in order to ensure that imports are as close to full substitutes for internal, physical capacity resources as possible. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Last reported: 2016 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that all resources importing capacity into PJM accept a must offer requirement. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Last reported: 2016 Section 5, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends capping the baseline for measuring compliance under GLD, for the limited summer product, at the customers' PLC. (Priority: High. First reported 2010. Last reported: 2016 Section 6, Demand Response.)
- Continued development of appropriate credit protections for transactions in PJM markets that are consistent with those available to participants in bilateral transactions. (Priority: Low. First reported 2002. Last reported: 2002 Section: Recommendations.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM clearly identify and classify all reasons for incurring operating reserves in the Day-Ahead and the Real-Time Energy Markets and the associated operating reserve charges in order to make all market participants aware of the reasons for these costs and to help ensure a long term solution to the issue of how to allocate the costs of operating reserves. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2011. Last reported: 2017, Section 4, Uplift.)

### Adopted 2014

- The MMU recommends that PJM require all generating units to identify the fuel type associated with each of their offered schedules. (Priority: Low. First reported 2014. Last reported: 2016 Section 3, Energy Market.)
- Pending elimination of these DR products, the MMU recommends that PJM procure the maximum amount of Annual and Extended Summer capacity resources available during an RPM auction, without impacting the clearing price. Currently, PJM procures a minimum level of Extended Summer and Annual Resources, but could procure additional MW of these superior products without a change in the clearing price. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2012 Section 4, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends that demand resources whose load drop method is designated as "Other" explicitly record the method of load drop. (Priority:

Low. First reported 2013. Last reported: 2016 Section 6, Demand Response.)

- The MMU recommends that the Enhanced energy Scheduler (EES) application be modified to require that transactions be scheduled for a constant MW level over the entire 45 minutes as soon as possible. This business rule is currently in the PJM Manuals, but is not being enforced. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2011 Section 8, Interchange Transactions.)
- The MMU recommends that the rules for compliance with calls to respond to actual spinning events be reevaluated. (Priority: Low. First reported 2011. Last reported: 2012 Section 9, Ancillary Service Markets.)
- The MMU recommends that no payments be made to tier 1 resources if they are deselected in the PJM market solution. The MMU also recommends that documentation of the Tier 1 synchronized reserve deselection process be published. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Last reported: 2016 Section 10, Ancillary Service Markets.)

## Adopted 2013

- The MMU recommends that the notification requirement for deactivations be modified to include required notification of six to twelve months prior to an auction in which the unit will not be offered due to deactivation. The purpose of this deadline is to allow adequate time for potential Capacity Market Sellers to offer new capacity in the auction. (Priority: Low. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2012 Section 4, Capacity Market.)
- The MMU recommends modifying the evaluation criteria via a change to PJM's market software, to ensure that not willing to pay congestion transactions are not permitted to flow in the presence of congestion. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 4, Interchange Transactions.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM modify the not willing to pay congestion product to address the issues of uncollected congestion charges. The MMU recommends charging market participants for any congestion incurred while such transactions are loaded, regardless of their election of transmission service, and restricting the use of not willing to pay congestion transactions to transactions at

interfaces (wheeling transactions). (Priority: Low. First reported 2010. Last reported: 2011 Section 8, Interchange Transactions.)

- The MMU recommends that PJM, FERC, reliability authorities and state regulators reevaluate the way in which black start service is procured in order to ensure that procurement is done in a least cost manner for the entire PJM market. PJM should have responsibility to prepare the black start restoration plan for the region, with Members playing an advisory role. PJM should have the responsibility to procure required black start service on a least cost basis through a transparent process. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2011 Section 9, Ancillary Service Markets.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM document the reasons each time it changes the Tier 1 synchronized reserve transfer capability into the Mid-Atlantic subzone market because of the potential impacts on the market. (Priority: Low. First reported 2011. Last reported: 2011 Section 9, Ancillary Service Markets.)

## Adopted 2012

- The MMU recommends that PJM should, on an expedited basis, request that the tariff be modified to permit allocation of day-ahead operating reserve charges consistent with the prior allocation of these charges in real time. This would be a short term solution to the issue created by shifting operating reserve charges to the Day-Ahead Energy Market and therefore changing the allocation of those charges. In addition, PJM should start a stakeholder process to consider the market design and cost allocation issues in detail and propose a permanent tariff change that results from the process. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Last reported: 2012-Q3 Section 3, Operating Reserve.)
- The MMU recommends that the single clearing price for synchronized reserves be determined based on the actual LMP and not the forecast LMP. (Priority: Low. First reported 2010. Last reported: 2016 Section 6, Ancillary Service Markets.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM conduct a detailed review of the Day-Ahead Market software in order to address the issue of occasional anomalous loss factors and their effect on the day-ahead market results. (Priority: Low. First reported 2011. Last

reported: 2011 Section 10, Congestion and Marginal Losses.)

- The MMU recommends that the roles of PJM and the transmission owners in the decision making process to control for local contingencies be clarified, that PJM's role be strengthened and that the process be made transparent. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Last reported 2017 Section 3, Energy Market.)

### Adopted 2011

- The MMU recommends eliminating internal source and sink bus designations for external energy transactions in the Day-Ahead and Real-Time Energy Markets. (Priority: Low. First reported 2010. Last reported: 2011 Section 8, Interchange Transactions.)
- The MMU continues to recommend the complete elimination of unsecured credit, over an appropriate transition period, based on the MMU's view of PJM's role in evaluating the credit worthiness of complex corporate entities and due to a concern about inappropriate shifts of risks and costs among PJM members. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2010 Section 8, Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights.)

### Adopted 2010

- Implementation of rules governing the definition of final prices to ensure certainty for market participants. (Priority: High. First reported 2008. Last reported: 2009 Section 1, Introduction.)
- The MMU recommends the implementation of improved cost-based data submission to permit better monitoring and better analysis of markets. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2002. Last reported: 2009 Section 1, Introduction.)

### Adopted 2009

- Retention and application of enhancements to rules governing the payment of operating reserve credits to generators and the allocation of operating reserves charges among market participants that were implemented on December 1, 2008. The new operating reserve rules represent positive steps towards the goals of removing the ability to exercise market power and refining the allocation of operating reserves charges to better reflect causal

factors. (Priority: High. First reported 2006. Last reported: 2007 Section 1, Introduction.)

- The MMU recommends that the RPM market structure, definitions and rules be modified to improve the efficiency of market prices and to ensure that market prices reflect the forward locational marginal value of capacity. (Priority: High. First reported 2006. Last reported: 2011 Section 4, Capacity.)
- Retention and application of the improved market power mitigation rules in the Regulation Market to prevent the exercise of market power in the Regulation Market while ensuring appropriate economic signals when investment is required and an efficient market mechanism. The PJM Regulation Market continues to be characterized by structural market power. PJM's application of targeted, flexible real-time, market power mitigation in the Regulation Market addresses only the hours in which structural market power exists and therefore provides an incentive for the continued development of competition. (Priority: High. First reported 2006. Last reported: 2009 Section 1, Introduction.)

### Adopted 2008

- Consistent application of local market power rules to all constraints. (Priority: High. First reported 2006. Last reported: 2007 Section 1, Introduction.)
- Retention and application of the improved local market power mitigation rules to prevent the exercise of local market power in the Energy Market while ensuring appropriate economic signals when investment is required. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2003. Last reported: 2009 Section 1, Introduction.)
- Consistent application of local market power rules to all units, including those currently exempt from offer capping. (Priority: High. First reported 2006. Last reported: 2007 Section 1, Introduction.)

### Adopted 2006

- Modification of incentives in the capacity market to require all Load Serving Entities (LSEs) to meet their obligations to serve load on a longer-term basis and to require all capacity resources to be offered on a comparable longer term basis. (Priority: Medium. First reported 1999. 2000 Section: Summary.)

- Reevaluation of the criteria used to determine whether generating units qualify for capacity resource status. (Priority: Medium. First reported 1999. 1999 Section: Summary.)

## Adopted Date Not Determined

- Implementation of rules governing the definition of final prices to ensure certainty for market participants. (Priority: Low. First reported 2008. Last reported: 2009.)
- While it is reasonable to limit the authority of LSE/EDCs in the review of demand side settlements as the LSE/EDCs have economic incentives to deny settlements, LSE/EDCs should be able to initiate PJM settlement reviews. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 2, Energy Market, Part 1.)
- The MMU recommends two ways to further improve the Economic program by increasing the probability that payments are made only for economic and deliberate load reducing activities in response to price. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 2, Energy Market, Part 1.)
- Load reduction in response to price must be clearly defined in the business rules and verified in a transparent daily settlement screen. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 2, Energy Market, Part 1.)
- The four steps in the normal operations review should be routinely applied to all registrations from the beginning of participation. This would include the ongoing evaluation of whether CBL accurately represents customer load for each customer; analysis of settlements to determine responsiveness to price and; required submission of detailed description of load reduction activities on specific days. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 2, Energy Market, Part 1.)
- The definition of CBL should continue to be refined to ensure that it reflects the actual normal use of individual customers including normal daily and hourly fluctuations in usage and usage that is a function of measurable weather conditions. When used to determine compliance in Load Management testing for GLD customers, the CBL calculation should include adjustments for ambient conditions. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 2, Energy Market, Part 1.)
- If, for any settlement, the number of consecutive hours showing load reduction is beyond a reasonable window for load reducing actions in response to price, it should initiate a CBL review and warrant further substantiation from the customer and CSP. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 2, Energy Market, Part 1.)
- It is the MMU's recommendation that any settlement submitted with a consecutive 24 hour period of CBL greater than metered load should initiate a CBL review by PJM and that a customer should be required to provide documentation of load reduction actions taken prior to acceptance of such settlements. Further, in order for PJM or the MMU to assess the accuracy of the CBL for a particular customer or for the Program in general, more hourly load data is required than is currently captured by PJM. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported: 2009 Section 2, Energy Market, Part 1.)