

PJM INTERCONNECTION STATE OF THE MARKET REPORT 2000

Energy Market Committee June 6, 2001 Revised Joseph E. Bowring Manager PJM Market Monitoring Unit



Energy Markets

- Basic tests of competition:
 - Net revenue
 - Price-cost mark up
 - HHI
 - Prices



Net Revenue





- CC at \$30/MWh
 - 2000: \$64,000/MW-year from energy market
 - 2000: \$23,000/MW-year from capacity market
 - 2000: \$6,000/MW-year from ancillary services and operating reserves
 - 2000 Total: \$93,000/MW-year
- CT at \$50/MWh
 - 2000: \$27,000/MW-year from energy market
 - 2000: \$23,000/MW-year from capacity market
 - 2000: \$6,000/MW-year from ancillary services and operating reserves
 - 2000 Total: \$57,000/MW-year



Net Revenues

- Conclusion
 - 1999 net revenues from energy market alone adequate to cover annual fixed costs of peaker
 - 1999 net revenues from all sources greater than adequate to cover annual fixed costs of peaker
 - 2000 net revenues from energy market alone not adequate to cover annual fixed costs of peaker
 - 2000 net revenues from all sources almost adequate to cover annual costs of peaker
 - Overall: net revenue results consistent with finding that there was no systematic exercise of market power in 2000



Mark up





Mark up by unit type





Mark-Up Index

- Conclusion
 - Mark up index calculations consistent with conclusion that energy market was reasonably competitive in 2000
 - Concern regarding increased mark ups by mid merit units
 - Complexities: opportunity cost
 - Complexities: scarcity rent



- FERC/DOJ HHI merger guidelines:
 - 0 < HHI < 1000 : Unconcentrated
 - 1000 < HHI < 1800 : Moderately concentrated
 - 1800 < HHI : Highly concentrated

Table 2: PJM HHIs in 2000			
	Hourly	Annual	
Maximum	2067	1390	
Average	1544	1270	
Minimum	1022	1150	



Market Structure

- Conclusion
 - HHI results are that PJM energy markets are moderately concentrated
 - As shown in 1999, these HHI results do not give reason for confidence during times of high demand
 - HHI levels indicate highly concentrated markets in areas defined by specific transmission constraints
 - No explicit evidence of market power during 2000

Average prices

	1998	1999	2000
Average LMP	21.72	28.32	28.14
Median LMP	16.60	17.88	19.11
Standard Deviation	31.45	72.41	25.69
	% Increase 98	% Increase 99	% Increase 98
	% Increase 98 to 99	% Increase 99 to 00	% Increase 98 to 00
Average LMP	% Increase 98 to 99 30.4	% Increase 99 to 00 -0.6	% Increase 98 to 00 29.6
Average LMP Median LMP	% Increase 98 to 99 30.4 7.7 7.7	% Increase 99 to 00 -0.6 6.98 -0.98	% Increase 98 to 00 29.6 15.1

Load Weighted Average Prices

	1998	1999	2000
Average LMP	24.16	34.06	30.72
Median LMP	17.60	19.02	20.51
Standard Deviation	39.29	91.49	28.38
	% Increase 98 to 99	% Increase 99 to 00	% Increase 98 to 00
Average LMP	% Increase 98 to 99 41.0	% Increase 99 to 00 -9.8	% Increase 98 to 00 27.2
Average LMP Median LMP	% Increase 98 to 99 41.0 8.1 8.1	% Increase 99 to 00 -9.8 7.8	% Increase 98 to 00 27.2 16.5 16.5

Fuel Cost Adjusted Average Prices

	1999	2000	% Increase
Average LMP	34.06	25.10	-26.1
Median LMP	19.02	17.16	-9.8
Standard Deviation	91.49	22.33	-75.6

Day Ahead/Real Time Average Prices

	Day	Real	Average	% over Real
	Ahead	Time	Difference	Time
Average LMP	31.97	30.36	-1.61	5.3
Median LMP	24.44	20.15	-4.29	21.3
Standard Deviation	21.33	26.16	4.83	-18.5

- Conclusion
 - Prices are a good general indicator of competitive conditions
 - Energy prices in 2000 consistent with a competitive energy market
 - Pattern of prices across hours illustrates potential for demand side price response

Capacity Markets

- Basic tests of competition:
 - Prices
 - Market structure
 - Outage rate performance

Capacity Markets

Capacity Markets

Forced Outage Rates

- Conclusion
 - Capacity markets were reasonably competitive in 2000
 - Potential exercise of market power is a concern
 - Market design issues a concern

- Basic tests of competition:
 - Price
 - Market structure
 - Availability
 - CPS1 and CPS2 performance

- Conclusion
 - Regulation market was competitive in 2000
 - Concentration levels between 1700 and 1800
 - Supply substantially greater than demand
 - Prices were moderate
 - Performance improved

- Basic tests of competition:
 - Activity levels
 - Prices

- Conclusion
 - FTR auction market was competitive in 2000
 - Increased access to FTRs
 - Issues addressed in 2000:
 - FTR allocation
 - Creating congestion
 - Transmission outage notification

Summary

- Markets conclusions:
 - Energy market reasonably competitive in 2000
 - Capacity market reasonably competitive in 2000
 - Regulation market competitive in 2000
 - FTR auction market competitive in 2000
- Recommendations
 - Retain energy offer cap
 - Retain regulation offer cap
 - Develop demand side responsiveness initiatives
 - ICAP design changes

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS

Contact the PJM Market Monitoring Unit

- (610) 666-4536
- (610) 666-4762
- bowrij@pjm.com
- www.pjm.com

- Phone
- FAX
- Email
- Internet