

## 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.

## 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," the MMU recommends specific enhancements to existing market rules and implementation of new rules that are required for competitive results in PJM markets and for continued improvements in the functioning of PJM markets.<sup>6</sup>

In this *2020 State of the Market Report for PJM*, the MMU includes 26 new recommendations made for 2020, 8 of which are new in this 2020 annual report.<sup>7 8</sup>

1 OATT Attachment M § IV.D.

2 *Id.*

3 *Id.*

4 *Id.*

5 OATT Attachment M § VI.A.

6 18 CFR § 35.28(g)(3)(ii)(A); see also OATT Attachment M § IV.D.

7 New recommendations include all MMU recommendations that were reported for the first time in the *2020 State of the Market Report for PJM* or in any of the three quarterly state of the market reports that were published in 2020.

8 For a complete list of MMU recommendations, see the *2020 State of the Market Report for PJM*, Vol II, Section 2, Recommendations.

## New Recommendations from Section 3, Energy Market

- The MMU recommends that resources not be allowed to violate the ICAP must offer requirement. The MMU recommends that PJM enforce the ICAP must offer requirement by assigning a forced outage to any unit that is derated in the energy market below its committed ICAP without an outage that reflects the derate. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that storage and intermittent resources be subject to an enforceable ICAP must offer rule that reflects the limitations of these resources. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the temporary cost method be removed and that all units that submit nonzero cost-based offers be required to have an approved fuel cost policy. (Priority: Low. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the penalty exemption provision be removed and that all units that submit nonzero cost-based offers be required to follow their approved fuel cost policy. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that market participants be required to document the amount and cost of consumables used when operating in order to verify that the total operating cost is consistent with the total quantity used and the unit characteristics. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends, given that maintenance costs are currently allowed in cost-based offers, that market participants be permitted to include only variable maintenance costs, linked to verifiable operational events and that can be supported by clear and unambiguous documentation of the operational data (e.g. run hours, MWh, MMBtu) that support the maintenance cycle of the equipment being serviced/replaced. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends, in order to ensure effective market power mitigation when the TPS test is failed, that offer capping be applied to units that fail the TPS test in the real-time market that were not offer

capped at the time of commitment in the day-ahead market or at a prior time in the real-time market. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends eliminating up to congestion (UTC) bidding at pricing nodes that aggregate only small sections of transmission zones with few physical assets. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends eliminating INC, DEC, and UTC bidding at pricing nodes that allow market participants to profit from modeling issues. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM clarify, modify and document its process for dispatching reserves and energy when SCED indicates that supply is less than total demand including forecasted load and reserve requirements. The modifications should define: a SCED process to economically convert reserves to energy; a process for the recall of energy from capacity resources; and the minimum level of synchronized reserves that would trigger load shedding. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q1, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendation from Section 4, Energy Uplift

- The MMU recommends that PJM designate units whose offers are flagged for fixed generation in Markets Gateway as not eligible for uplift. Units that are flagged for fixed generation are not dispatchable. Following dispatch is an eligibility requirement for uplift compensation. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendation from Section 5, Capacity Market

- The MMU recommends that PJM update the values in the CRF table in the tariff when the components change. (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendation from Section 6, Demand Response

- The MMU recommends that all demand resources register as Pre-Emergency Load Response and that the Emergency Load Response Program be eliminated. (Priority: High. First reported Q1 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

## New Recommendations from Section 9, Interchange Transactions

- 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: High. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted, Q2 2020.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the NCMPAIMP and NCMPAEXP interface pricing points. It is not appropriate to have special pricing agreements between PJM and any external entity. The same market pricing should apply to all transactions. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2020. Status: Adopted Q4, 2020.)
- The MMU recommends that transactions sourcing in the Western Interconnection be priced at either the MISO interface pricing point or the SouthIMP/EXP interface pricing point based on the locational price impact of flows between the DC tie line point of connection with the Eastern Interconnection and PJM. (Priority: High. First reported Q1, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends changing the assignment of the Saskatchewan Power Company and Manitoba Hydro balancing authorities from the Northwest interface pricing point to the MISO interface pricing point and eliminating the Northwest interface pricing point from the day-ahead and real-time energy markets. (Priority: High. First reported Q1, 2020. Status: Adopted Q4, 2020.)

## New Recommendations from Section 10, Ancillary Services

- The MMU recommends that the details of VACAR Reserve Sharing Agreement (VRSA) be made public, including any responsibilities assigned to PJM and including the amount of reserves that Dominion commits to meet its obligations under the VRSA. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the VRSA be terminated and, if necessary, replaced by a reserve sharing agreement between PJM and VACAR South, similar to agreements between PJM and other bordering areas. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that Schedule 2 to OATT be revised to state explicitly that only generators that provide reactive capability to the transmission system that PJM operates and has responsibility for are eligible for reactive capability compensation. Specifically, such eligibility should be determined based on whether a generation facility's point of interconnection is on a transmission line that is a Monitored Transmission Facility as defined by PJM and is on a Reportable Transmission Facility as defined by PJM.<sup>9</sup> (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that new CRF rates for black start units, incorporating current tax code changes, be implemented immediately. The new CRF rates should apply to all black start units. The CRF rates for units going into service since the change in the tax code should incorporate applicable changes to depreciation treatment and tax rates. The CRF rates for units constructed prior to the new tax law and to which the new tax law depreciation rules did not apply should incorporate only the applicable changes to the tax rate. The black start units should be required to commit to providing black start service for the life of the unit. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

<sup>9</sup> See PJM Transmission Facilities (note that this requires you first log into a PJM Tools account. If you do not, then the link sends you to an Access Request page, <https://pjm.com/markets-and-operations/ops-analysis/transmission-facilities>).

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

- The MMU recommends that PJM modify the project proposal templates to include data necessary to perform a detailed project lifetime financial analysis. The required data includes, but is not limited to: capital expenditure; capital structure; return on equity; cost of debt; tax assumptions; ongoing capital expenditures; ongoing maintenance; and expected life. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends a comprehensive review of the ways in which the solution-based dfax is implemented. The goal for such a process would be to ensure that the most rational and efficient approach to implementing the solution-based dfax method is used in PJM. Such an approach should allocate costs consistent with benefits and appropriately calibrate the incentives for investment in new transmission capability. No replacement approach should be approved until all potential alternatives, including the status quo, are thoroughly reviewed. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that storage resources not be includable as transmission assets for any reason. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

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

- The MMU recommends that PJM enforce the FTR auction bid limits at the parent company level starting immediately. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Adopted 2021.)
- The MMU recommends a requirement that the details of all bilateral FTR transactions be reported to PJM. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2020. 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 326 recommendations in the State of the Market Reports. In 2014, the MMU began including a priority and status with each recommendation. In this 2020 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. The MMU uses additional 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;
- **Withdrawn (no longer relevant):** The MMU no longer makes the recommendation because it is no longer relevant; 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 2020. Over that time, 22 percent of all MMU recommendations have been adopted, 11 percent have been partially adopted,

and 60 percent are not adopted. Of the 93 high priority recommendations, 26 (28 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 2020**

Status	Priority High	Priority Medium	Priority Low	Total	Percent of Total
Adopted	26	22	25	73	22%
Partially Adopted - Stakeholder Process	0	0	0	0	0%
Partially Adopted - FERC	1	0	0	1	0%
Partially Adopted (Continued Recommendation)	9	14	6	29	9%
Partially Adopted (Recommendation Closed)	1	2	4	7	2%
Partially Adopted (Total)	11	16	10	37	11%
Not Adopted	51	92	41	184	56%
Not Adopted (Pending before FERC)	3	5	0	8	2%
Not Adopted (Stakeholder Process)	0	2	1	3	1%
Not Adopted (Total)	54	99	42	195	60%
Replaced by Newer Recommendation	1	8	3	12	4%
Withdrawn, No Longer Relevant	0	3	2	5	2%
Withdrawn	1	2	1	4	1%
Total	93	150	83	326	100%

Table 2-2 shows the number of recommendations associated with each of the sections in this report. The Energy Market, Capacity Market, and Ancillary Service Markets sections are the source of 51 percent of the recommendations.

**Table 2-2 MMU reported recommendations by section and priority: 1999 through 2020**

Current Section	Priority High	Priority Medium	Priority Low	Total	Percent of Total
Section 1, Introduction (General Recommendations)	2	0	0	2	1%
Section 3, Energy Market	10	44	16	70	21%
Section 4, Energy Uplift	10	19	3	32	10%
Section 5, Capacity Market	21	23	10	54	17%
Section 6, Demand Response	12	12	9	33	10%
Section 7, Net Revenue	0	1	0	1	0%
Section 8, Environmental and Renewables	3	2	1	6	2%
Section 9, Interchange Transactions	6	11	12	29	9%
Section 10, Ancillary Service Markets	8	21	12	41	13%
Section 11, Congestion and Marginal Losses	0	1	1	2	1%
Section 12, Generation and Transmission Planning	1	14	12	27	8%
Section 13, Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights	20	2	7	29	9%
Total	93	150	83	326	100%

Table 2-3 shows the total number of recommendations that were reported by the MMU by year. There were five years (2012, 2013, 2015, 2018, and 2020) in which the MMU reported ten or more high priority recommendations.

**Table 2-3 MMU reported recommendations by year first reported: 1999 through 2020**

Year First Reported	Priority High	Priority Medium	Priority Low	Total	Percent of Total
1999	3	3	0	6	2%
2000	1	0	0	1	0%
2001	0	0	1	1	0%
2002	1	1	1	3	1%
2003	1	3	1	5	2%
2004	0	0	0	0	0%
2005	0	1	0	1	0%
2006	2	0	0	2	1%
2007	0	0	0	0	0%
2008	1	0	0	1	0%
2009	5	5	13	23	7%
2010	3	10	6	19	6%
2011	3	1	4	8	2%
2012	10	16	14	40	12%
2013	11	16	16	43	13%
2014	5	10	3	18	6%
2015	11	13	7	31	10%
2016	3	18	3	24	7%
2017	5	7	2	14	4%
2018	10	18	7	35	11%
2019	7	14	4	25	8%
2020	11	14	1	26	8%
Total	93	150	83	326	100%

## Complete List of Current MMU Recommendations

The recommendations are explained in each section of the report.

### Section 3, Energy Market

#### Market Power

- The MMU recommends that the market rules explicitly require that offers in the 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.)

#### Fuel Cost Policies

- The MMU recommends that PJM require that all fuel cost policies be algorithmic, verifiable, and systematic, and accurately reflect short run marginal costs. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the tariff be changed to allow units to have fuel cost policies that do not include fuel procurement practices, including fuel contracts. Fuel procurement practices, including fuel contracts, may be used as the basis for fuel cost policies but should not be required. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Status: Adopted 2020.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM change the fuel cost policy requirement to apply only to units that will be offered with non-zero cost-based offers. The PJM market rules should require that the cost-based offers of units without an approved fuel cost policy be set to zero. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Status: Adopted 2020.)
- The MMU recommends that the temporary cost method be removed and that all units that submit nonzero cost-based offers be required to have an approved fuel cost policy. (Priority: Low. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the penalty exemption provision be removed and that all units that submit nonzero cost-based offers be required to follow their approved fuel cost policy. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

#### Cost-Based Offers

- The MMU recommends that Manual 15 (Cost Development Guidelines) 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 the removal of all maintenance costs from the Cost Development Guidelines. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that market participants be required to document the amount and cost of consumables used when operating in order to verify that the total operating cost is consistent with the total quantity used and the unit characteristics. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends, given that maintenance costs are currently allowed in cost-based offers, that market participants be permitted to include only variable maintenance costs, linked to verifiable operational events and that can be supported by clear and unambiguous documentation of the operational data (e.g. run hours, MWh, MMBtu) that support the maintenance cycle of the equipment being serviced/replaced. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends explicitly accounting for soak costs and changing the definition of the start heat input for combined cycles to include only the amount of fuel used from first fire to the first breaker close in the Cost Development Guidelines. (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: Low. 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: Adopted 2020.)

- The MMU recommends removing the catastrophic designation for force majeure fuel supply limitations in Schedule 2. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)

### Market Power: TPS Test and Offer Capping

- The MMU recommends that the rules governing the application of the TPS test be clarified and documented. The TPS test application in the day-ahead energy market is not documented. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM require every market participant to make available at least one cost schedule based on the same hourly fuel type(s) and parameters at least as flexible as their offered price schedule. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. 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. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends, in order to ensure effective market power mitigation when the TPS test is failed, that offer capping be applied to units that fail the TPS test in the real-time market that were not offer capped at the time of commitment in the day-ahead market or at a prior time in the real-time market. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends, in order to ensure effective market power mitigation when the TPS test is failed, and during high load conditions such as cold and hot weather alerts or more severe emergencies, that 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, in order to ensure effective market power mitigation, that PJM always enforce parameter limited values by committing units only

on parameter limited schedules, when the TPS test is failed or during high load conditions such as cold and hot weather alerts or more severe emergencies. (Priority: High. First reported 2019. 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, 2017.)
- The MMU recommends the elimination of FMU and AU adders. FMU and AU adders no longer serve the purpose for which they were created and interfere with the efficient operation of PJM markets. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Partially adopted, 2014.)

### Offer Behavior

- The MMU recommends that resources not be allowed to violate the ICAP must offer requirement. The MMU recommends that PJM enforce the ICAP must offer requirement by assigning a forced outage to any unit that is derated in the energy market below its committed ICAP without an outage that reflects the derate. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that storage and intermittent resources be subject to an enforceable ICAP must offer rule that reflects the limitations of these resources. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that capacity resources not be allowed to offer any portion of their capacity market obligation as maximum emergency energy. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)

### Capacity Performance Resources

- The MMU recommends that capacity performance resources 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 the parameters which determine nonperformance charges and the amounts of uplift payments should reflect the flexibility goals of the capacity performance construct. The operational parameters used by generation owners to indicate to PJM operators what a unit is capable of during the operating day should not determine capacity performance assessment or uplift payments. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM not include the balancing ratios calculated for localized Performance Assessment Intervals (PAIs) in the capacity market default offer cap, and only include those events that trigger emergencies at a defined zonal or higher level. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM clearly define the business rules that apply to the unit specific parameter adjustment process, including PJM's implementation of the tariff rules in the PJM manuals to ensure market sellers know the requirements for their resources. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM update the tariff to clarify that all generation resources are subject to unit specific parameter limits on their cost-based offers using the same standard and process as capacity performance capacity resources. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM institute rules to assess a penalty for resources that choose to submit real-time values that are less flexible than their unit specific parameter limits or approved parameter limit exceptions based on tariff defined reasons. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM not approve temporary exceptions that are based on pipeline tariff terms that are not routinely enforced, and based on inferior transportation service procured by the generator. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)

## Accurate System Modeling

- The MMU recommends that PJM approve one RT SCED case for each five minute interval to dispatch resources during that interval using a five minute ramp time, and that PJM calculate prices using LPC for that five minute interval using the same approved RT SCED case. (Priority: High. First reported 2019. 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: Partially adopted 2020.)
- 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 not use closed loop interface or surrogate constraints to artificially override nodal prices 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 CT price setting logic to modify transmission line limits 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 implement CT price setting logic, PJM first initiate a stakeholder process to determine whether such modification is appropriate. PJM should file any proposed changes with FERC

to ensure review. Any such changes should be incorporated in the PJM tariff. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Partially 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.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM include in the tariff or 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 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, even if the MW are settled to the generator. 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, even if the injection MW are settled to the load serving entity. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not 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.)
- 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 not allow nuclear generators which do not respond to prices or which only respond to manual instructions from the

<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> There is currently no PJM documentation in the tariff or manuals explaining how hubs are created and how their definitions are changed. The general definition of a hub can be found in the PJM. com Glossary <<http://www.pjm.com/Glossary.aspx>>.

operator to set the LMPs in the real-time market. (Priority: Low. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that PJM increase the coordination of outage and operational restrictions data submitted by market participants via eDART/eGADs and offer data submitted via Markets Gateway. (Priority: Low. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM model generators' operating transitions, including soak time for units with a steam turbine, configuration transitions for combined cycles, and peak operating modes. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM clarify, modify and document its process for dispatching reserves and energy when SCED indicates that supply is less than total demand including forecasted load and reserve requirements. The modifications should define: a SCED process to economically convert reserves to energy; a process for the recall of energy from capacity resources; and the minimum level of synchronized reserves that would trigger load shedding. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q1, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

## Transparency

- The MMU recommends that PJM market rules require the fuel type be identified for every price and cost schedule and PJM market rules 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: Adopted 2019.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM allow generators to report fuel type on an hourly basis in their offer schedules and to designate schedule availability on an hourly basis. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Partially adopted.)
- 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 clearly define the criteria for operator approval of RT SCED cases used to send dispatch signals to resources and for pricing, to minimize operator discretion and implement a rule based, scheduled approach. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)

## Virtual Bids and Offers

- The MMU recommends eliminating up to congestion (UTC) bidding at pricing nodes that aggregate only small sections of transmission zones with few physical assets. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends eliminating INC, DEC, and UTC bidding at pricing nodes that allow market participants to profit from modeling issues. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 4, Energy Uplift

- The MMU recommends that uplift be paid only based on operating parameters that reflect the flexibility of the benchmark new entrant unit (CONE unit) in the PJM Capacity Market. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM initiate an analysis of the reasons why a significant number of 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: Partially adopted, 2019.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM develop and implement an accurate metric to define when a unit is following dispatch to determine eligibility to receive balancing operating reserve credits and for assessing generator deviations. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM designate units whose offers are flagged for fixed generation in Markets Gateway as not eligible for uplift. Units that are flagged for fixed generation are not dispatchable. Following dispatch is an eligibility requirement for uplift compensation. (Priority: Medium. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends eliminating intraday segments from the calculation of uplift payments

and returning to calculating the need for uplift based on the entire 24 hour operating day. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends the elimination of day-ahead operating reserves 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.)
- The MMU recommends enhancing the current energy uplift allocation rules to reflect the recommended elimination of day-ahead operating reserves, the timing of commitment decisions and the commitment reasons. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted.)
- 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.)
- The MMU recommends that self scheduled units not be paid energy uplift 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 three modifications to the energy lost opportunity cost calculations:
  - The MMU recommends calculating LOC based on 24 hour daily periods 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 only flexible fast start units (startup plus notification times of 10 minutes or less) and units with 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: Partially adopted.)
- 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: Adopted 2018.<sup>12</sup>)
- 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 balancing operating reserve credit 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, in addition to real-time load. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- 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). The MMU recommends that PJM allow wind units to request 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.)

<sup>12</sup> As of November 1, 2018, internal bilateral transactions are no longer used for the calculation of deviations for purposes of allocating balancing operating reserve charges. See the *2018 State of the Market Report for PJM*, Volume 2, Section 3: "Energy Market" at "Internal Bilateral Transactions" for an analysis of the impact of this change on virtual bidding activity.

- 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: Partially adopted.)
- 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.<sup>13</sup>)
- The MMU recommends that PJM pay uplift based on the offer at the lower of the actual unit output or the dispatch signal MW. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the exemption for fast start resources (CTs and diesels) from the requirement to follow dispatch. The performance of these resources should be evaluated in a manner consistent with all other resources (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 5, Capacity Market

### 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>14 15</sup> (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that DR providers be required to have a signed contract with specific customers for specific facilities for specific levels of DR at least six months prior to any capacity auction in which the DR is offered. (Priority: High. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)

### 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>16 17</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.

<sup>13</sup> On September 7, 2018, PJM made a compliance filing for FERC Order No. 844 to publish unit specific uplift credits. The compliance filing was accepted by FERC on March 21, 2019. 166 FERC ¶ 61,210. PJM began posting unit specific uplift reports on May 1, 2019. 167 FERC ¶ 61,280 (2019).

<sup>14</sup> See also Comments of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket No. ER14-503-000 (December 20, 2013).

<sup>15</sup> See "Analysis of Replacement Capacity for RPM Commitments: June 1, 2007 to June 1, 2019," <[http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2019/IMM\\_Analysis\\_of\\_Replacement\\_Capacity\\_for\\_RPM\\_Commitments\\_June\\_1\\_2007\\_to\\_June\\_1\\_2019\\_20190913.pdf](http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/Reports/2019/IMM_Analysis_of_Replacement_Capacity_for_RPM_Commitments_June_1_2007_to_June_1_2019_20190913.pdf)> (September 13, 2019).

<sup>16</sup> See PJM Interconnection, LLC., Docket No. ER12-513-000 (December 1, 2011) ("Triennial Review").

<sup>17</sup> See the 2019 State of the Market Report for PJM, Volume 2, Section 7: Net Revenue.

(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. 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 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- 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 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the maximum price on the VRR curve be defined as net CONE. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the Fixed Resource Requirement (FRR) rules, including obligations and performance requirements, be reviewed. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)

## Offer Caps, Offer Floors, and Must Offer

- The MMU recommends use of the Sustainable Market Rule (SMR) in order to protect competition in the capacity market from nonmarket revenues.<sup>18</sup> (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 of modeling assumptions.<sup>19</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 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the offer cap for capacity resources be defined as the net avoidable cost rate (ACR) of each unit so that the clearing prices are a result of such net ACR offers, consistent with the fundamental economic logic for a competitive offer of a CP resource. (Priority: High. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM develop a process for calculating a forward looking estimate for the expected number of Performance Assessment Intervals (H) to use in calculating the Market Seller Offer Cap (MSOC). The MMU recommends that the Nonperformance Charge Rate be left at its current

<sup>18</sup> Brief of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM, Docket No. EL16-49, ER18-1314-000, -001; EL18-178 (October 2, 2018).

<sup>19</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).

level. The MMU recommends that PJM develop a forward looking estimate for the Balancing Ratio (B) during Performance Assessment Intervals (PAIs) to use in calculating the MSOC. Both H and B parameters should be included in the annual review of planning parameters for the Base Residual Auction, and should incorporate the actual observed reserve margins, and other assumptions consistent with the annual IRM study. (Priority: High. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that capacity market sellers be required to request the use of minimum MW quantities greater than 0 MW (inflexible sell offer segments) and that the requests should only be permitted for defined physical reasons. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM update the values in the CRF table in the tariff when the components change. (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## Performance Incentive Requirements of RPM

- The MMU recommends that any unit which is not capable of supplying energy consistent with its day-ahead offer which should equal its ICAP, reflect an appropriate outage. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2009. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that retroactive replacement transactions associated with a failure to perform during a PAI 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 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.)
- The MMU recommends that Capacity Performance resources be required to perform without excuses. Resources that do not perform should not be paid regardless of the reason for nonperformance. (Priority: High. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that the market data posting rules be modified to allow the disclosure of expected performance, actual performance, shortfall and bonus MW during a PAI by area without the requirement that more than three market participants' data be aggregated for posting. (Priority: Low. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)

## Capacity Imports and Exports

- 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. 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 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: Not 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. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 6, Demand Response

- 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. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the demand resources be treated as economic resources, 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 Interval. (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, if demand resources remain in the capacity market, a daily energy market must offer requirement apply to demand resources, comparable to the rule applicable to generation capacity resources.<sup>20</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 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 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

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

ensure that operators 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>21</sup> (Priority: Medium. First reported 2013. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends limited, extended summer and annual demand response event compliance be calculated on a five minute basis for all capacity performance resources and that the penalty structure reflect five minute compliance. (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 there be only one demand response product in the capacity market, with an obligation to respond when called for any hour of the delivery year. (Priority: High. First reported 2011. Status: Partially adopted.<sup>22</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. First reported 2017. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PRD be required to respond during a PAI to be consistent with all CP resources. (Priority: High. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the limits imposed on the pre-emergency and emergency demand response share of the synchronized reserve market be eliminated. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that 30 minute pre-emergency and emergency demand response be considered to be 30 minute reserves. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that energy efficiency MW not be included in the PJM Capacity Market and that PJM should ensure that the impact of EE measures on the load forecast is incorporated immediately rather than with the existing lag. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that demand reductions based entirely on behind the meter generation be capped at the lower of economic maximum or actual generation output. (Priority: High. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that all demand resources register as Pre-Emergency Load Response and that the Emergency Load Response Program be eliminated. (Priority: High. First reported Q1 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

<sup>21</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.

<sup>22</sup> PJM's Capacity Performance design requires resources to respond when called for any hour of the delivery year, but demand resources still have a limited mandatory compliance window.

## Section 7, Net Revenue

- The MMU recommends that the net revenue calculation used by PJM to calculate the net Cost of New Entry (CONE) and net ACR be based on a forward looking estimate of expected energy and ancillary services net revenues using forward prices for energy and fuel. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Adopted 2020.)

## Section 8, Environmental and Renewables

- 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.)
- The MMU recommends that the Commission reconsider its disclaimer of jurisdiction over REC markets because, given market changes since that decision, it is clear that RECs materially affect jurisdictional rates. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM provide a full analysis of the impact of carbon pricing on PJM generating units and carbon pricing revenues to the PJM states in order to permit the states to consider a potential agreement on the development of a multistate framework for carbon pricing and the distribution of carbon revenues. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that jurisdictions with a renewable portfolio standard make the price and quantity data on supply and demand more transparent. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that load and generation located at separate nodes be treated as separate resources in order to ensure that load and generation face consistent incentives throughout the markets. (Priority: High. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that emergency stationary RICE be prohibited from participation as DR either when registered individually or as part of a portfolio if it cannot meet the capacity market requirements

to be DR as a result of emissions standards that impose environmental run hour limitations. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. 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.)
- 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: High. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted, Q2 2020.)
- The MMU recommends that transactions sourcing in the Western Interconnection be priced at either the MISO interface pricing point or the SouthIMP/EXP interface pricing point based on the locational price impact of flows between the DC tie line point of connection with the Eastern Interconnection and PJM. (Priority: High. First reported Q1, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends changing the assignment of the Saskatchewan Power Company and Manitoba Hydro balancing authorities from the Northwest

interface pricing point to the MISO interface pricing point and eliminating the Northwest interface pricing point from the day-ahead and real-time energy markets. (Priority: High. First reported Q1, 2020. Status: Adopted Q4, 2020.)

- 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 eliminate the NCMPAIMP and NCMPAEXP interface pricing points. It is not appropriate to have special pricing agreements between PJM and any external entity. The same market pricing should apply to all transactions. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2020. Status: Adopted Q4, 2020.)
- 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 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 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 modifications to the FFE calculation to ensure that FFE calculations reflect the current capability of the transmission system as it evolves. The MMU recommends that the Commission set a deadline for PJM and MISO to resolve the FFE freeze date and related issues. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 10, Ancillary Services

- The MMU recommends that all data necessary to perform the regulation market three pivotal supplier test be saved by PJM so that the test can be replicated. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2016. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the total regulation (TReg) signal sent on a fleet wide basis be eliminated and replaced with individual regulation signals for each unit. (Priority: Low. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the ability to make dual offers (to make offers as both a RegA and a RegD resource in the same market hour) be removed from the regulation market. (Priority: High. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- 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. FERC rejected.<sup>23</sup>)

- 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.<sup>24</sup> FERC rejected.<sup>25</sup>)
- The MMU recommends that the lost opportunity cost 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: Not adopted. FERC rejected.<sup>26</sup>)
- 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. FERC rejected.<sup>27</sup>)
- The MMU recommends enhanced documentation of the implementation of the regulation market design. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Status: Not adopted. FERC rejected.<sup>28</sup>)
- 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 that PJM replace the static MidAtlantic/Dominion Reserve Subzone with a reserve zone structure consistent with the actual deliverability of reserves based on current transmission constraints. (Priority: High. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the \$7.50 margin be eliminated from the definition of the cost of tier 2 synchronized reserve because it is a markup and

not a cost. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that the variable operating and maintenance cost be eliminated from the definition of the cost of tier 2 synchronized reserve and that the calculation of synchronized reserve variable operations and maintenance costs be removed from Manual 15. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the components of the cost-based offers for providing regulation and synchronous condensing be defined in Schedule 2 of the Operating Agreement. (Priority: Low. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- 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 on a daily and hourly basis. 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: Adopted April 2019.)
- The MMU recommends that, for calculating the penalty for a tier 2 resource failing to meet its scheduled obligation during a spinning event, the definition of the IPI be changed from the average number of days between events to the actual number of days since the last event greater than

23 162 FERC ¶ 61,295 (2018), *reh'g denied*, 170 FERC ¶ 61,259 (2020).

24 This recommendation was adopted by PJM for the energy market. Lost opportunity costs in the energy market are calculated using the schedule on which the unit was scheduled to run. In the regulation market, this recommendation has not been adopted, as the LOC continues to be calculated based on the lower of price or cost in the energy market offer.

25 162 FERC ¶ 61,295 (2018), *reh'g denied*, 170 FERC ¶ 61,259 (2020).

26 *Id.*

27 *Id.*

28 *Id.*

- 10 minutes. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that aggregation not be permitted to offset unit specific penalties for failure to respond to a synchronized reserve event. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the use of Degree of Generator Performance (DGP) in the synchronized reserve market solution and improve the actual tier 1 estimate. If PJM continues to use DGP, DGP should be documented in PJM's manuals. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that the details of VACAR Reserve Sharing Agreement (VRSA) be made public, including any responsibilities assigned to PJM and including the amount of reserves that Dominion commits to meet its obligations under the VRSA. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that the VRSA be terminated and, if necessary, replaced by a reserve sharing agreement between PJM and VACAR South, similar to agreements between PJM and other bordering areas. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)
  - 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 offers in the DASR market be based on opportunity cost only in order to mitigate market power. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Modified, 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that all resources, new and existing, have a requirement to include and maintain equipment for primary frequency response capability as a condition of interconnection service. The PJM capacity and energy markets already compensate resources for frequency response capability and any marginal costs. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that new CRF rates for black start units, incorporating current tax code changes, be implemented immediately. The new CRF rates should apply to all black start units. The CRF rates for units going into service since the change in the tax code should incorporate applicable changes to depreciation treatment and tax rates. The CRF rates for units constructed prior to the new tax law and to which the new tax law depreciation rules did not apply should incorporate only the applicable changes to the tax rate. The black start units should be required to commit to providing black start service for the life of the unit. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends for oil tanks shared with other resources that 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 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that separate cost of service 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 payments for reactive capability, if continued, be based on the 0.90 power factor that PJM has determined is necessary. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that, if payments for reactive are continued, fleet wide cost of service rates used to compensate resources for reactive capability be eliminated and replaced with compensation based on unit specific costs. (Priority: Low. First reported 2019.<sup>29</sup> Status: Partially adopted.)
  - The MMU recommends that Schedule 2 to OATT be revised to state explicitly that only generators that provide reactive capability to the transmission system that PJM operates and has responsibility for are eligible for reactive capability compensation. Specifically, such eligibility should be determined based on whether a generation facility's point of

<sup>29</sup> The MMU has discussed this recommendation in state of the market reports since 2016 but Q3, 2019 was the first time it was reported as a formal MMU recommendation.

interconnection is on a transmission line that is a Monitored Transmission Facility as defined by PJM and is on a Reportable Transmission Facility as defined by PJM.<sup>30</sup> (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## Section 11, Congestion and Marginal Losses

There are no recommendations in this section.

## Section 12, Planning

### Generation Retirements

- The MMU recommends that the question of whether Capacity Interconnection Rights (CIRs) should persist after the retirement of a unit be addressed. The rules need to ensure that incumbents cannot exploit control of CIRs to block or postpone entry of competitors.<sup>31</sup> (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted, 2012.)
- The MMU recommends that rules be implemented to ensure that CIRs are terminated within one year if units cannot qualify to be capacity resources and, if requested, after one CP must offer exception to permit the issue of CP status to be addressed. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Status: Adopted, 2019.)

### Generation Queue

- 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 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 continuing 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 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.)

### Market Efficiency Process

- The MMU recommends that the market efficiency process be eliminated because it is not consistent with a competitive market design. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that, if the market efficiency process is retained, PJM modify the rules governing benefit/cost analysis, the evaluation process for selecting among competing market efficiency projects and cost allocation for economic projects in order to ensure that all costs, including increased congestion costs and the risk of project cost increases, in all zones are included in order to ensure that the correct metrics are used for defining benefits. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)

### Comparative Cost Framework

- The MMU recommends that PJM modify the project proposal templates to include data necessary to perform a detailed project lifetime financial analysis. The required data includes, but is not limited to: capital expenditure; capital structure; return on equity; cost of debt; tax assumptions; ongoing capital

<sup>30</sup> See PJM Transmission Facilities (note that this requires you first log into a PJM Tools account. If you do not, then the link sends you to an Access Request page, <https://pjm.com/markets-and-operations/ops-analysis/transmission-facilities>).

<sup>31</sup> See "Comments of the Independent Market Monitor for PJM," Docket No. ER12-1177-000 (March 12, 2012) <[http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/Filings/2012/IMM\\_Comments\\_ER12-1177-000\\_20120312.PDF](http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/Filings/2012/IMM_Comments_ER12-1177-000_20120312.PDF)>.

expenditures; ongoing maintenance; and expected life. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)

## Transmission Competition

- The MMU recommends, to increase the role of competition, that the exemption of supplemental projects from the Order No. 1000 competitive process be terminated and that the basis for all such exemptions be reviewed and modified to ensure that the supplemental project designation is not used to exempt transmission projects from a transparent, robust and clearly defined mechanism to permit competition to build such projects or to effectively replace the RTEP process. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted. Rejected by FERC.)
- The MMU recommends, to increase the role of competition, that the exemption of end of life projects from the Order No. 1000 competitive process be terminated and that end of life transmission projects be included in the RTEP process and should be subject to a transparent, robust and clearly defined mechanism to permit competition to build such projects. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted. Rejected by FERC.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM enhance the transparency and queue management process for nonincumbent 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 nonincumbent transmission providers. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- 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 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 nonincumbent transmission providers in the RTEP. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2014. 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: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Adopted 2020.)
- The MMU recommends that storage resources not be includable as transmission assets for any reason. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)

## Cost Allocation

- The MMU recommends a comprehensive review of the ways in which the solution-based dfax is implemented. The goal for such a process would be to ensure that the most rational and efficient approach to implementing the solution-based dfax method is used in PJM. Such an approach should allocate costs consistent with benefits and appropriately calibrate the incentives for investment in new transmission capability. No replacement approach should be approved until all potential alternatives, including the status quo, are thoroughly reviewed. (Priority: Medium. New recommendation. 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.<sup>32</sup> (Priority: Medium. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)

<sup>32</sup> See the 2015 State of the Market Report for PJM, Volume 2, Section 12: Generation and Transmission Planning, at p. 463, Cost Allocation Issues.

## Transmission Line Ratings

- The MMU recommends that all PJM transmission owners use the same methods to define line ratings, subject to NERC standards and guidelines, subject to review by NERC and approval by FERC. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Status: Not adopted.)

## Transmission Facility Outages

- 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.)
- 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.)

## Section 13, FTRs and ARRs

### Market Design

#### ARR

- 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 all historical generation to load paths be eliminated as a basis for assigning ARRs. The MMU recommends that the current design be replaced with a network design in which the rights to actual congestion are assigned directly to load by node. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Partially adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that, under the current FTR design, the rights to all congestion revenue be

allocated as ARRs prior to sale as FTRs. Reductions for outages and increased system capability should be reserved for ARRs rather than sold in the Long Term FTR Auction. (Priority: High. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted.)

- The MMU recommends that IARRs be eliminated from PJM's tariff, but that if IARRs are not eliminated, IARRs should be subject to the same proration rules that apply to all other ARR rights. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)

#### FTR

- The MMU recommends that FTR funding be based on total congestion, including day-ahead and balancing congestion. (Priority: High. First reported 2017. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM enforce the FTR auction bid limits at the parent company level starting immediately. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2020. Status: Adopted 2021.)
- The MMU recommends a requirement that the details of all bilateral FTR transactions be reported to PJM. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2020. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM continue to evaluate the bilateral indemnification rules and any asymmetries they may create. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM reduce FTR sales on paths with persistent overallocation of FTRs, including a clear definition of persistent overallocation and how the reduction will be applied. (Priority: High. First reported 2013. Status: Partially adopted, 2014/2015 planning period.)
- MMU recommends that PJM eliminate generation to generation paths and all other paths that do not represent the delivery of power to load. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that the Long Term FTR product be eliminated. If the Long Term FTR product is not eliminated, the Long Term FTR Market should be modified so that the supply of prevailing flow FTRs in the Long Term FTR Market is based solely on counter flow offers in the Long Term FTR Market. (Priority: High. First reported 2017. 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 the forfeiture amount from the FTR forfeiture rule be based on the correct hourly cost of an FTR, rather than a simple daily price divided by 24. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Adopted 2019.)

### Surplus

- The MMU recommends that all FTR auction revenue be distributed to ARR holders monthly, regardless of FTR funding levels. (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that, under the current FTR design, all congestion revenue in excess of FTR target allocations be distributed to ARR holders on a monthly basis. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)
- The MMU recommends that FTR auction revenues not be used by PJM to buy counter flow FTRs for the purpose of improving FTR payout ratios.<sup>33</sup> (Priority: High. First reported 2015. Status: Not adopted.)

### FTR Subsidies

- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate portfolio netting to eliminate cross subsidies among FTR market participants. (Priority: High. First reported 2012. Status: Not adopted. Rejected by FERC.)
- 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 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.)

### FTR Liquidation

- The MMU recommends that the FTR portfolio of a defaulted member be canceled rather than liquidated or allowed to settle as a default cost on the membership. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Status: Not adopted.)

## 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, date of last report, and the section in the State of the Market Report in which the recommendation was made.

### Adopted 2021

- The MMU recommends that PJM enforce the FTR auction bid limits at the parent company level starting immediately. (Priority: High. First reported Q3, 2020. Last reported 2020. Section 13, Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights.)

### Adopted 2020

- The MMU recommends incorporating startup and notification times as additional parameters subject to limits in order to ensure the reliability of the grid, as well as to deter market manipulation by offering artificially lengthy startup and notification time parameters to withhold generation from the market. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2010. Last reported 2010, Section 3, Energy Market.)
- 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. Last reported 2018, Section 3, Energy Market.)
- The MMU recommends that the tariff be changed to allow units to have fuel cost policies that do not include fuel procurement practices, including fuel contracts. Fuel procurement practices, including fuel contracts, may be used as the basis for fuel cost policies but should not be required. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Last reported 2020, Section 3, Energy Market.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM change the fuel cost policy requirement to apply only to units that

<sup>33</sup> See "PJM Manual 6: Financial Transmission Rights," Rev. 26 (Jan. 27, 2021).

will be offered with non-zero cost-based offers. The PJM market rules should require that the cost-based offers of units without an approved fuel cost policy be set to zero. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Last reported 2020, Section 3, Energy Market.)

- The MMU recommends that the net revenue calculation used by PJM to calculate the net Cost of New Entry (CONE) and net ACR be based on a forward looking estimate of expected energy and ancillary services net revenues using forward prices for energy and fuel. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2019. Last reported 2020, Section 7, Net Revenue.)
- The MMU recommends changing the assignment of the Saskatchewan Power Company and Manitoba Hydro balancing authorities from the Northwest interface pricing point to the MISO interface pricing point and eliminating the Northwest interface pricing point from the day-ahead and real-time energy markets. (Priority: High. First reported Q1, 2020. Last reported 2020, Section 9, Interchange Transactions.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM eliminate the NCMPAIMP and NCMPAEXP interface pricing points. It is not appropriate to have special pricing agreements between PJM and any external entity. The same market pricing should apply to all transactions. (Priority: High. First reported Q2, 2020. Last reported 2020, Section 9, Interchange Transactions.)
- 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: Medium. First reported 2015. Last reported 2020, Section 12, Generation and Transmission Planning.)

## Adopted 2019

- The MMU recommends that PJM market rules require the fuel type be identified for every price and cost schedule and PJM market rules 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. Last reported 2019, Section 3, Energy Market.)
- The MMU recommends that dispatchers classify the reasons for unit deselection and document all unit

deselections. (Priority: Low. First reported 2009. Last reported 2009, Section 6, Ancillary Service Markets.)

- 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. Last reported 2019, Section 9, Interchange Transactions.)
- The MMU recommends that rules be implemented to ensure that CIRs are terminated within one year if units cannot qualify to be capacity resources and, if requested, after one CP must offer exception to permit the issue of CP status to be addressed. (Priority: Low. First reported 2018. Last reported 2020, Section 12, Generation and Transmission Planning.)
- The MMU recommends that the forfeiture amount from the FTR forfeiture rule be based on the correct hourly cost of an FTR, rather than a simple daily price divided by 24. (Priority: High. First reported 2018. Last reported 2020, Section 13, FTRs and ARRs. Pending at FERC.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM perform a comprehensive evaluation of the up-to congestion product in coordination with the MMU and provide a joint report to PJM stakeholders to ensure that all market participants are aware of how these transactions impact the charges and credits to market participants in all other areas of the PJM Energy Market. (Priority: High. First reported 2009. Last reported 2012, Section 3, Operating Reserve.)
- 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. Last reported 2020, Section 10 Ancillary Service Markets.)

## Adopted 2018

- 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. Last reported Q3, 2018, Section 4, Energy Uplift.)

- 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. Last reported 2018, Section 4, Energy Uplift.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM revise Manual 11 attachment C consistent with the tariff to limit uplift 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. Last reported 2018, Section 4, Energy Uplift.<sup>34</sup>)

## 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 2018 Q3, 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 2018 Q3, 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: 2018 Q3, Section 13, Financial Transmission and Auction Revenue Rights.)

- 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. Last reported: 2018 Q3, Section 10, Ancillary Service Markets)

## 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: 2018 Q3 Section 4, Energy Uplift.)
- 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: 2018 Q3 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: 2018 Q3 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: 2018 Q3 Section 5, Capacity Market.)

<sup>34</sup> Although this recommendation has not been adopted exactly as recommended by the MMU, the implementation of hourly offers by PJM has effectively adopted this recommendation.

- 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 4, 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: 2018 Q3 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: 2018 Q3 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 Market.)
- 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: 2018 Q3 Section 5 Capacity Market.)
- 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. Last reported: 2018 Q3 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 imports have firm transmission to the PJM border prior to offering in an RPM auction. (Priority: High. First reported 2014. Last reported: 2018 Q3 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: 2017 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: 2018 Q3 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: 2018 Q3 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.)

### 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: 2018 Q1 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 technology type (load drop method) is designated

as “Other” explicitly record the technology type. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Last reported: 2018 Q3 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 synchronized reserve 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. Last reported: 2018 Q3 Section 10, Ancillary Service Markets.)

## Adopted 2013

- The PJM Tariff defines offer capped units as those units capped to maintain system reliability as a result of limits on transmission capability. Offer capping for providing black start service does not meet this criterion. The MMU recommends that black start units not be given FMU status under the current rules. (Priority: Low. First reported 2013. Last reported: 2014 Q1, Section 3, Energy Market.)
- 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 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 2018 Q3, Section 3, Energy Market.)
- 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. Last reported 2018 Q3, Section 10, Ancillary Service Markets.)

### 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.)
- 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 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.)

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Load reduction in response to price must be clearly defined in the business rules and verified in a transparent daily settlement screen.

## 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. Last reported: 2000 Section Summary.)
- Reevaluation of the criteria used to determine whether generating units qualify for capacity resource status. (Priority: Medium. First reported 1999. Last reported: 1999 Section Summary.)