

Appendix – Errata

Section 3: Operating Reserve, Page 69

Change: Replaced values in Table 3-30 and the sentence above it with the updated values in the text and table shown below:

“For example, the RTO deviations rate would have been reduced by ~~57.8~~ 57.9 percent.”

Table 0-1 Up-to Congestion Transactions Impact on the Operating Reserve Rates: January through March 2012 (See 2011 SOM, Table 3-44)

	Rates Including Up-To Congestion Transactions			
	Current Rates (\$/MWh)		Difference (\$/MWh)	Percentage Difference
Day-Ahead	0.0882	0.0790	(0.0092)	(10.4%)
RTO Deviations	0.7672	0.3237 0.3232	(0.4436) (0.4440)	(57.8%) (57.9%)
East Deviations	0.3015	0.1840 0.1835	(0.1176) (0.1181)	(39.0%) (39.2%)
West Deviations	0.0617	0.0185	(0.0434) (0.0432)	(70.0%)
Lost Opportunity Cost	0.6018	0.2539 0.2535	(0.3479) (0.3483)	(57.8%) (57.9%)
Canceled Resources	0.0671	0.0283	(0.0388) (0.0389)	(57.8%) (57.9%)

Section 8: Interchange Transactions, Page 137

Change: Reversed nomenclature of “a DEC bid” and “an INC offer” throughout paragraph:

An up-to congestion transaction is analogous to a matched set of incremental offers (INC) and decrement bids (DEC) that are evaluated together and approved or denied as a single transaction, subject to a limit on the cleared price difference. For import up-to congestion transactions, the import pricing point specified looks like ~~a DEC bid~~ an INC offer and the sink specified on the OASIS reservation looks like ~~an INC Offer~~ a DEC bid. For export transactions, the specified source on the OASIS reservation looks like ~~a DEC bid~~ an INC offer, and the export pricing point looks like ~~an INC Offer~~ a DEC bid. Similarly, for wheel through up-to congestion transactions, the import pricing point chosen looks like ~~a DEC bid~~ an INC offer, and the export pricing point specified looks like ~~an INC Offer~~ a DEC bid. In the Day-Ahead Energy Market, an up-to congestion import transaction is submitted and modeled as an injection at the interface and a withdrawal at a specific PJM node. Conversely, an up-to congestion export transaction is submitted and modeled as a withdrawal at the interface, and an injection at a specific PJM node. Wheel through up-to congestion transactions are modeled as an injection at the importing interface and a withdrawal at the exporting interface.

Section 12: Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights, Page 212

Change: Replaced Table 12-13 and Table 12-14 and the sentence above them with the updated values in the text and the updated tables shown below:

2012 Quarterly State of the Market Report for PJM: January through March

FTRs were not profitable overall, with -\$0.8 million in profits for physical entities, of which ~~\$117.3~~ \$40.8 million was from self scheduled FTRs, and -\$11.3 million for financial entities.

Table 12-13 FTR profits by organization type and FTR direction: January through March 2012 (See 2011 SOM, Table 12-24)

Organization Type	FTR Direction				All
	Prevailing Flow	Self Scheduled Prevailing Flow	Counter Flow	Self Scheduled Counter Flow	
Physical	(\$66,276,740)	\$40,787,177	\$24,660,450	\$19,487	(\$809,625)
Financial	(\$61,989,880)	NA	\$50,667,748	NA	(\$11,322,132)
Total	(\$128,266,619)	\$40,787,177	\$75,328,198	\$19,487	(\$12,131,757)

Table 12-14 Monthly FTR profits by organization type: January through March 2012 (See 2011 SOM, Table 12-25)

Month	Organization Type			Total
	Physical	Self Scheduled FTRs	Financial	
Jan	(\$15,741,321)	\$14,779,795	(\$1,887,863)	(\$2,849,389)
Feb	(\$14,797,921)	\$13,247,875	(\$795,248)	(\$2,345,293)
Mar	(\$11,077,047)	\$12,778,994	(\$8,639,021)	(\$6,937,074)
Total	(\$41,616,289)	\$40,806,664	(\$11,322,132)	(12,131,757)

Change: On page 200, also change the value from \$117.3 million to \$40.8 million.

Self scheduled FTRs were the source of ~~\$117.3~~ \$40.8 million of the FTR profits for physical entities.