Defining the Reserve Requirement and the Penalty Factor

SPWG October 15, 2009 Howard J. Haas



Defining the Reserve Requirement: Preconditions to Implementation

- Accurate and dependable measurement of the reserves available on a 5 minute basis
 - Primary reserves (150% of largest contingency)
 - Primary Reserves (150% of first contingency) is currently not actively controlled for
 - Sync, Non-Sync, DR (as Tier 2) can contribute
 - o Currently not measured or known on a 5 minute basis
 - o Not part of SPREGO optimization
- Need to resolve measurement issue in all reserves prior to any implementation



- The ORDC/RCPFC should represent the willingness to "go short" primary reserves
 - Reserve requirement under consideration is the Primary Reserve Requirement (150% of first contingency):
 - Primary Reserves (150% of first contingency) is currently not actively controlled for
 - Sync, Non-Sync, DR (as Tier 2) can contribute
 - Sync Reserve Requirement (100% of first contingency) is actively controlled for
 - Sync (including DR as Tier 2) can contribute



- The ORDC/RCPFC represents the willingness to "go short" primary reserves
 - Theoretically, primary reserves (150% Requirement) can be met via sync reserves (including DR)
 - Where Primary = Sync + DR + Non Sync
 - A minimum amount of Sync (Tier 1 and Tier 2) required (100% of largest contingency)
 - Current restriction on max DR contribution towards Sync target (100% Requirement) is 25% (can only be Tier 2)
 - Remainder of Primary Reserve target is currently "met" via <u>Non-sync quick start</u> and excess Tier 1

- "Remainder" not part of the SPREGO optimization



- The ORDC/RCPFC represents the willingness to "go short" primary reserves
 - Optimization should find the least cost combination of resources to meet the requirement given the "characteristic" constraints

5

o One penalty factor for violating the target



- Sync Requirement Component of Primary Reserve Target
- Under current rules Tier 2 assignment is made in the prior hour based on expectations of system conditions and expected available Tier 1 reserves in the coming hour
 - Tier 2 assignment = Sync reserve requirement expected Tier 1
 - Could change to Tier 2 Assignment = Primary reserve requirement – expected Tier 1 – expected Non-Sync
 - Tier 2 assignments locked for the coming hour
 - Tier 2 is a combination of Sync and DR



©2009

- Under this methodology, "cooptimization" within the hour would see Tier 2 as a "given"
 - Contributing towards the Primary Reserve Target (150% Target)
- Remainder of requirement can be via a combination of "Tier 1" Sync and Non-sync (observing minimum total Sync requirement)
 - One reserve requirement/target
 - One penalty factor in play



- Subsequent redispatch (if any) to maintain reserves would be done with within-hour resources
 - Any shortage would be determined relative to Reserve Requirement net of Tier 2 carried into the hour
 - Single reserve requirement being maintained: Primary Reserves
 - One penalty factor: No nesting within zone





- The ORDC/RCPFC should represent the willingness to "go short" Sync Reserves
 - Reserve requirement under consideration is the Sync Reserve Requirement (100% of first contingency):
 - Primary Reserves (150% of first contingency) is currently not actively controlled for
 - Sync, Non-Sync, DR (as Tier 2) can contribute
 - Sync Reserve Requirement (100% of first contingency) is actively controlled for
 - Sync (including DR as Tier 2) can contribute



Defining the Reserve Requirement:

- The ORDC/RCPFC represents the willingness to "go short" Sync reserves
 - Where Sync = Tier 1 + Tier 2
 - Combination of Sync (Tier 1 and Tier 2) required (100% of largest contingency)
 - Current restriction on max DR contribution towards Sync target (100% Requirement) is 25% (can only be Tier 2)
 - **。** Currently part of the SPREGO optimization

- The ORDC/RCPFC represents the willingness to "go short" Sync reserves
 - Optimization should find the least cost combination of resources to meet the requirement given the "characteristic" constraints

11

o One penalty factor for violating the target

- Under current rules Tier 2 assignment is made in the prior hour based on expectations of system conditions and expected available Tier 1 reserves in the coming hour
 - Tier 2 assignment = Sync reserve requirement expected Tier 1
 - Tier 2 assignments locked for the coming hour
 - Tier 2 is a combination of sync and DR



- Under this methodology, "cooptimization" within the hour would see Tier 2 as a "given"
 - Contributing towards the Sync Reserve Target (100% Target)
 - Remainder of requirement can be via a combination of "Tier 1" Sync
 - One reserve requirement/target
 - One penalty factor in play



Monitoring Analytics

- Subsequent redispatch (if any) to maintain reserves would be done with within-hour resources
 - Any shortage would be determined relative to Reserve Requirement net of Tier 2 carried into the hour
 - Single reserve requirement being maintained: Sync Reserves
 - One penalty factor: No nesting within zone





Defining the Reserve Requirement Penalty Factor: Considerations

- The penalty factor sets a cap on the willingness to pay for reserves (max opportunity cost).
 - Setting the cap too low may cause a divergence between actual dispatch practice and "cooptimization" model
- The penalty factor will affect LMP during scarcity
 - Purpose is to signal scarcity and attract resources
 - In the context of RPM's role, purpose is to attract "uncommitted resources"
 - Setting the price too high may result in a wealth transfer, rather than meaningful increase in resources availability



Defining the Reserve Requirement Penalty Factor: Considerations

- No evidence that the scarcity signal in the energy market need exceed \$1,000
 - Resources, emergency and otherwise, have responded well below that level in the past
 - Years of empirical data have indicated that market results in the context of the \$1000 cap has attracted imports, max gen, DR
 - Last and "only" scarcity event reached \$1000 due to administrative process, not by the value of the most expensive *marginal* resource
 - If the most expensive resource available is \$150:
 - The value of using \$850 to force prices to \$1000 is unclear, value of \$1700 in penalty factors is less clear
 - The opportunity cost for re-dispatched resources should be less than \$850 in this scenario

- Many of the issues that PJM is attempting to address with the proposed \$850 adder are a result of:
 - Inflexible units in the dispatch
 - PJM identification of the marginal units, in the context of this inflexibility

17

Subsequent price formation

- "High" caps on opportunity cost are "required" when very high cost units set price and much lower cost units are dispatched down to meet reserves
 - Reason: Limited flexibility of higher cost units
- Issue is exacerbated if, subsequently, there is a reserve shortage, and lower cost units become the marginal units for energy:
 - Absent the penalty factor, LMP drops while reserves are converted to energy from the lowest cost unit
 - Reason: Lowest cost unit is now the marginal unit



- At issue:
 - High priced, inflexible units (or units that are ramp constrained during times of reserve constraint violation) have been dispatched and are obviously needed
 - Inflexibility negates marginal status and confers it on to lower cost flexible resources
 - Not an issue of failing to account for emergency DR or emergency generation



- Current proposal of \$850 is avoiding the central issue:
 - Inflexibility negates marginal status and confers it on to lower cost flexible resources

Dispatch Issues: Possible Fix (Option 1)

- Possible approaches to address:
 - Use the logic that allows inflexible, but needed CTs to be marginal
 - Apply to all needed, inflexible otherwise marginal units
 - Would still need the opportunity cost to be effectively "uncapped" prior to scarcity
 - Going short "Penalty factor" addition to marginal unit bus LMP
 - o Adder = \$1000 Marginal Offer at marginal unit bus
 - Pegs LMP at \$1000 during scarcity event
 - Maintain control through dispatch incentives between energy and reserves (opportunity cost is being calculated relative to \$1000 derived marginal unit effect on LMP)

©2009

Dispatch Issues: Possible Fix (Option 2)

- During shortage replace the offers of low cost marginal units with the offers of *needed* (for energy and already dispatched) high cost inflexible units.
 - Only during reserve shortage
 - Would need to make sure "flexibility" limitations are legitimate (by class of unit, historical performance)
 - Would need to make sure that "need" is not a function of limited run times
 - \$1000 "cap" on opportunity cost *prior* to shortage
 Re-dispatch is "unconstrained" under current bid cap



Dispatch Issues: Possible Fix (Option 2)

- During shortage penalty factor set equal to the difference between \$1000 and the offer of the highest priced unit applied to the marginal unit.
 - Marginal "offer" (replaced offer) is \$800, penalty factor is \$200, LMP is \$1000 at marginal bus.



Dispatch Issues: Possible Fix (Option 2)

- During shortage replace the offers of low cost marginal units with the offers of *needed* (and already dispatched) high cost inflexible units
 - Would eliminate the need for "excessive" penalty factors applied to LMP to reflect scarcity and control dispatch
 - Would set LMP consistent with current resource offer caps
 - Would ensure full resource stack is dispatched

