Regulation Market Issues

RMISTF October 16, 2015

Howard Haas



Regulation: Efficient, least cost market design requirements

- Market design intended to minimize the cost to provide regulation using two different products but clearing the resources in a single market requires:
 - An accurate marginal rate of substitution (marginal benefit factor) in the optimization
 - A single price (or a single two part price pair) for settlement
 - That the two products be defined, cleared and settled in equivalent units throughout





Current Design

• Potentially incorrectly defined marginal benefit factor function (MBF)

 Evidence that MBF between RegA and RegD is incorrectly defined.

- Incorrectly applying the MBF in the optimization
 - **. MBF use not consistent with derivation.**
 - Inefficient displacement of RegA MW.
 - Incorrect calculation of contribution of RegD to total effective regulation.
- MBF inconsistently used in pricing and settlement
 Assumes MBF in offers/price but not settlement

- Incorrectly defined marginal benefit factor function (MBF)
 - Causing incorrect/inefficient combinations of RegA and RegD to clear the market
 - Adversely affecting ACE control in some hours

- Incorrectly applying the MBF in the optimization
 - Current market design incorrectly accounting for the amount of RegD it is acquiring in the market solution
 - Undercounting the contribution of RegD to total effective regulation
 - Contributes to optimization acquiring too much RegD in all hours
 - Inefficient squeezing out of RegA
 - Lowers regulation price per MW of RegA
 - Too much total regulation MW clearing



- MBF not consistently used in pricing and settlement
 - Current market model assumes MBF in price but not settlement
 - Result in incorrect compensation of RegD in all hours



- MBF not consistently used in pricing and settlement
 - When MBF is <1 (RegD MW contribution per incremental MW < RegA MW contribution per incremental MW)
 - RegD overcompensated on a \$/effective MW basis
 - Creates incentives to self schedule/price at \$0.00
 - Long term investment signals incorrect for RegA and RegD



- LOC calculated on the lower of price or cost schedule, not the operational schedule.
 - Marginal costs for lost energy to provide regulation not consistent with marginal costs to provide energy
 - Inefficient market result (price <> actual incremental offers)



Correcting Current Market Design

- Determine correct BF/MBF function
 - Determine correct BF (RTS) between RegA and RegD.
- Align BF/MBF definition with application in optimization
 - Correct RegD/RegA amount and proportions in market solution
- Consistent application of BF/MBF throughout construct: optimization to settlement
 - Price and compensate on equivalent terms





Correcting Current Market Design

• Address LOC issue.





Benefit Factor (MBF/BF) Derivation/Definition/Issues



KEMA Study

- KEMA study of RegA/RegD interactions indicated that there were diminishing returns to RegD as a substitute for RegA in providing regulation service.
- KEMA study showed that the marginal rate of substitution could go to zero or be negative.
- KEMA study showed that MRS function (curve) varies with system conditions.





Issue with current design: MBF not correctly defined?

- PJM experience indicates market is operating, in some hours, where MBF is zero or negative.
- PJM experience indicates that MBF does vary with system conditions.
- Evidence that a single curve is not optimal.
- Related Issue: Use within optimization inconsistent with derivation/definition.





13



Issue with current design: MBF not correctly defined



Combinations of RegA and RegD that provide the same CPS1 Scores

Slope of curve at any point describes marginal rate of substitution between RegA and RegD for a given CPS1 Score.

Slope is the Marginal Rate of Technical Substitution (MRTS) or the marginal benefit factor (MBF)



of

MW

MBF varies with system conditions



Benefit Factor (MBF/BF) Implementation Issues: Optimization/Market Clearing



Current Design

- Incorrectly applying the MBF in the optimization
 - Incorrect calculation of contribution of RegD to total effective regulation.
- BF of the last MW (of the last unit) of a price block assigned to every MW of every unit of that price block for purposes of effective MW calculations.

o Under estimates effective MW from RegD assigned.

• BF of the last MW of a unit assigned to every MW of every unit of that unit for purposes of effective MW calculations.

• Under estimates effective MW from RegD assigned.



Benefit Factor (MBF/BF) Implementation Issues: 1. Incorrect Calculation of Effective MW (assuming BF curve properly defined)



Current Design

- Issue 1: MBF of the last MW (of the last unit) of a price block is assigned to every MW of every unit of that price block for purposes of effective MW calculations.
 - Addressed (in part) in current proposal before the MRC.

Break block up into discrete unit MW.

- Issue 2: MBF of the last MW of a unit assigned to every MW of every unit of that unit for purposes of effective MW calculations.
 - Not addressed yet.





Current Design

 Issue 1: MBF of the last MW (of the last unit) of a price block is assigned to every MW of every unit of that price block for purposes of effective MW calculations.

PJM presentation 08-11-2015

PJM Current Approach

- Resource specific benefits factor determination
 - The BF is the intersection on the Y (BF) axis of the corresponding rolling effective MW on the X (percentage RegD) axis
 - > The slope equation is:



$$BF_i = \frac{EffMW_{i^*}(0.0001-2.9)}{Percentage RegD*RegReq} + 2.9$$

BF=2.9-((rise)/(run))*RegDMW



21

PJM current approach effective MW calculations

RegD%	RegD		
/700	MW	BF	
5%	35	2.67	
10%	70	2.43	
15%	105	2.20	
20%	140	1.96	
25%	175	1.73	
30%	210	1.50	
35%	245	1.26	
40%	280	1.03	
45%	315	0.80	





PJM current approach effective MW calculations



280 MW from 8 units offered at \$0 treated as 1 unit for BF assignment

©2015

MRC Proposed approach for effective MW calculations



280 MW from 8 units (35 MW blocks) offered at \$0 treated as 8 unit for BF assignment

©2015



Current Design

- Note, as more units added, closer to approximating the area under the curve.
 - Getting closer to correctly calculating the contribution of RegD to total effective regulation.
- Properly defined, the area under the MBF function defines effective MW for a set of MW.





Issues with the Current Design

 Issue 2: BF of the last MW of a unit assigned to every MW of every unit of that unit for purposes of effective MW calculations.

o Underestimates effective MW from RegD MW assigned.



PJM current approach to effective MW calculations



280 MW from 1 unit provides 288.15 Effective MW

©2015

PJM current approach: The smaller the unit size, the closer effective equals area under curve

RE	R	3.00]			Unit	D IM				
DF	Dr	2.50			Specific	Effective				
517.33 Effective		2.00	ve	Cumulative	Effective	Calculation	MW			
		1.50	ve	Effective	MW	(1 unit at	by		RegD	RegD%
		1.00	M)	MW (PJM)	(PJM)	each point)	Unit	BF	MW	/700
		0.50	31 #	93.31	93.31	93.31	35	2.67	35	5%
		0.00	44 S	178.44	85.13	170.26	35	2.43	70	10%
300 400 500 600 700 BF	100 200 300	0.00	39	255.39	76.94	230.83	35	2.20	105	15%
	100 200 500	-0.50	15	324.15	68.76	275.04	35	1.96	140	20%
		-1.00 -	72	384.72	60.57	302.87	35	1.73	175	25%
•		-1.50 -	11	437.11	52.39	314.33	35	1.50	210	30%
		-2.00	31	481.31	44.20	309.43	35	1.26	245	35%
RegD MW	Reg		33	517.33	36.02	288.15	35	1.03	280	40%
		-	17	545.17	27.83	250.50	35	0.80	315	45%

280 MW from 8 units (35 MW blocks) treated as 8 unit for BF assignment

©2015

Should be area under curve

							Area
				PJM	Unit		Under
				Effective	Specific		the
			MW	Calculation	Effective	Cumulative	Curve
RegD%	RegD		by	(1 unit at	MW	Effective	Effective
/700	MW	BF	Unit	each point)	(PJM)	MW (PJM)	MW
5%	35	2.67	35	93.31	93.31	93.31	97.41
10%	70	2.43	35	170.26	85.13	178.44	186.63
15%	105	2.20	35	230.83	76.94	255.39	267.67
20%	140	1.96	35	275.04	68.76	324.15	340.52
25%	175	1.73	35	302.87	60.57	384.72	405.18
30%	210	1.50	35	314.33	52.39	437.11	461.67
35%	245	1.26	35	309.43	44.20	481.31	509.96
40%	280	1.03	35	288.15	36.02	517.33	550.07
45%	315	0.80	35	250.50	27.83	545.17	582.00



Area under curve = 550.07 MW



29

Current Design

- As unit size shrinks (and more units added), calculation gets closer to approximating the area under the curve.
 - Getting closer to correctly calculating the contribution of RegD to total effective regulation.
- Current approach causes effective MW to vary with the size of units cleared, not the cumulative MW (of all unit) cleared.
- Properly defined, effective MW calculated as area under the MBF function.





Example: 1 Unit with 210 MW = 314 Effective





Example: 1 Unit with 280 MW = 288.15 Effective







Example: 1 Unit with 315 MW = 250.50 Effective







Example: 2^{Sum} 105 and 210= 315 MW = 397.83 Effective

34

Average monthly peak effective MW: PJM market calculated versus benefit factor based



Cost of excess effective MW cleared by month, peak and off peak: January 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015



- Assumes MBF function correctly implemented.
- Assumes no change in price.
- Upper bound estimate.


Benefit Factor (MBF/BF) Implementation Issues: Optimization/Market Clearing Issues 2. Implementation inconsistent with MBF/BF Definition



Current Design

 Potentially incorrectly defined marginal benefit factor function (MBF)

> Evidence that MBF between RegA and RegD may be incorrectly defined.

Incorrectly applying the MBF in the optimization

• MBF use not consistent with derivation.

Inefficient displacement of RegA MW.





Optimization Issues

- Basis for BF function presumes set combinations of RegA and RegD holding "ACE control" constant.
- Current optimization engine does not presume set combination of RegA and RegD.
- Use of BF in optimization is therefore not consistent with concept of BF function.



KEMA: Assumed Relationship





40



Average of all (12) KEMA Maps

CPS1					Re	g Requireme	ent %					
RegD%	0.50%	0.55%	0.60%	0.65%	0.70%	0.75%	0.80%	0.85%	0.90%	0.95%	1.00%	RegD%
50%	120%	125%	129%	132%	135%	138%	140%	142%	144%	146%	147%	50%
45%	122%	127%	131%	134%	137%	140%	142%	144%	146%	148%	149%	45%
40%	124%	129%	132%	136%	139%	142%	144%	146%	148%	149%	151%	40%
35%	126%	130%	134%	137%	140%	143%	145%	147%	149%	151%	152%	35%
30%	127%	131%	135%	138.6%	142%	144%	146%	148%	150%	152%	153%	30%
25%	128%	132%	136%	139%	142%	145%	147%	149%	151%	152%	153%	25%
20%	128%	133%	136%	140%	142%	145%	147%	149%	151%	152%	153%	20%
15%	128%	132%	136%	139.3%	142%	144%	146%	148%	150%	151%	152%	15%
10%	128%	132%	135%	138%	141%	143%	145%	147%	148%	149%	150%	10%
5%	127%	131%	134%	136%	139%	141%	142%	144%	145%	146%	147%	5%
0%	125%	129%	131%	134%	135%	137%	138%	139%	140%	141%	142%	0%
	0.50%	0.55%	0.60%	0.65%	0.70%	0.75%	0.80%	0.85%	0.90%	0.95%	1.00%	
					Reg	Requirem	ent %					





percent of regulation MW

ത

Reg D as a

Average of all (12) KEMA Maps

		Total Regulation MW												
	RegD MW	500.00	550.00	600.00	650.00	700.00	750.00	800.00	850.00	900.00	950.00	1,000.00	RegD MW	
N	50%	250	275	300	325	350	375	400	425	450	475	500	50%	M
Σ	45%	225	248	270	293	315	338	360	383	405	428	450	45%	Σ
tior	40%	200	220	240	260	280	300	320	340	360	380	400	40%	tior
gula	35%	175	193	210	228	245	263	280	298	315	333	350	35%	gula
f reg	30%	150	165	180	195	210	225	240	255	270	285	300	30%	f reg
it of	25%	125	138	150	163	175	188	200	213	225	238	250	25%	it of
rcer	20%	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200	20%	rcer
bei	15%	75	83	90	98	105	113	120	128	135	143	150	15%	bei
as a	10%	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	10%	as a
	5%	25	28	30	33	35	38	40	43	45	48	50	5%	
Re	0%	-	-	-	-	-	7	· -	-	-	-	-	0%	Re
		500.00	550.00	600.00	650.00	700.00	750.00	800.00	850.00	900.00	950.00	1,000.00		
		X				Total	Regiulatio	n MW						
									Re	aD	MW			

Total Reg MW

©2015

43

KEMA: Assumed Relationship



©2015

PJM presentation 08-11-2015

PJM Current Approach

Effective Reg Requirement



PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

BF with another logic

Perf_Adj_MW	BF	Eff_MW	
10	2.8332	28.3	Ł
9	2.773	2.05	
8	2.7196	21.8	
7	2.6728	18.7	
5	2.6394	13.2	
5	2.6060	13.0	
Total Eff_	MW	120	\leq

Source: PJM Presentation 08/11/2015

 $BF_i = \frac{EffMW_i^* (0.0001 - 2.9)}{Percentage RegD*RegReq} + 2.9$

RegA is set as residual requirement: 700 MW – RegD Effective = RegA Needed

Assumed proportion of RegA from underlying curve ignored Monitoring Analytics

Current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

Performance adju	sted MW	RegD%	RegD	E	ffective		RegD/(RegA	RegD% of
,		/700	MW	BF	MW	Residual A	+RegD)	Effective MW
%RegD = Perform	nance adjusted	5%	\rightarrow 35	7 2.67	97.41	602.59	5%	14%
MW/ Effective MW	/ Target	10%	70	2.43	7186.63	513.37	12%	27%
	J. J	15%	105	2.20	267.67	≠ 432.33	20%	38%
MBF of the last u	init of RegD MW listed	20%	140	1.96	340.52	359.48	28%	49%
		25%	175	1.73	405.18	294.82	37%	58%
Cumulative effect	tive MW for	30%	210	1,50	461.67	238.33	47%	66%
the cleared Deg	listod	35%	245	1.26	509.96	190.04	56%	73%
the cleared RegL	Jiisted	40%	280	1.03	550.07	149.93	65%	79%
		45%	315	0.80	582.00	118.00	73%	83%
		50%	350	0.56	605.74	94.26	79%	87%
		55%	385	0.33	621.30	78.70	83%	89%
Effective MW Red	quirement –	60%	420	0.09	628.67	71.33	85%	90%
Effective MW = R	esidual A cleared	65%	455	-0.14	627.85	72.15	86%	90%
		70%	490	-0.37	618.85	81.15	86%	88%
		75%	525	-0.61	601.66	98.34	84%	86%
		80%	560	-0.84	576.29	123.71	82%	82%
		85%	595	-1.08	542.74	157.26	79%	78%
		90%	630	-1.31	501.00	199.00	76%	72%
©2015	www.monitoringanalytics.com		47				Monitor	ing Analytics

Current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

	RegD%	RegD	E	Effective		RegD/(RegA	RegD% of
Assume % <> realized %	/700	MW	BF	MW	Residual A	+RegD)	Effective MW
	5%	35	2.67	97.41	602.59	5%	14%
Dan office Factory	10%	70-	2.43	186.63	513.37	12%	27%
	15%	105	2.20	267.67	432.33	20%	38%
2.9	20%	140	1.96	-340.52-	359.48	28%	49%
	25%	175	1.73	405.18	294.82	37%	58%
2.0	30%	210	1.50	461.67	238.33	47%	66%
	35%	245	1.26	509.96	190.04	56%	73%
1.0	40%	280	1.03	550.07	149.93	65%	79%
	45%	315	0.80	582.00	118.00	73%	83%
	50%	350	0.56	605.74	94.26	79%	87%
0.0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 RegD Percentage of the RTO Requirement	55%	385	0.33	621.30	78.70	83%	89%
-10	60%	420	0.09	628.67	71.33	85%	90%
	65%	455	-0.14	627.85	72.15	86%	90%
	70%	490	-0.37	618.85	81.15	86%	88%
	75%	525	-0.61	601.66	98.34	84%	86%
Too much ReaD%	80%	560	-0.84	576.29	123.71	82%	82%
	85%	595	-1.08	542.74	157.26	79%	78%
	90%	630	-1.31	501.00	199.00	76%	72%



PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations



PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations 5% of 700 MW



Effective MW from Reg D displaces Reg A. 5% of Reg, 14% of





PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations



Realized proportion of RegD and RegA not consistent. 56% of Reg, 73% of effective. **Monitoring Analytics**

©2015

51



Realized proportion <> assumed RegD proportion

Ideally engine should produce relevant combinations

- If defined relationship based on RegD/RegA combinations that meet operational requirements.
- Then axis should be in terms of RegD MW cleared, not on some percentage of RegD MW cleared.



Average of all (12) KEMA Maps

CPS1					Re	g Requireme	ent %					
RegD%	0.50%	0.55%	0.60%	0.65%	0.70%	0.75%	0.80%	0.85%	0.90%	0.95%	1.00%	RegD%
50%	120%	125%	129%	132%	135%	138%	140%	142%	144%	146%	147%	50%
45%	122%	127%	131%	134%	137%	140%	142%	144%	146%	148%	149%	45%
40%	124%	129%	132%	136%	139%	142%	144%	146%	148%	149%	151%	40%
35%	126%	130%	134%	137%	140%	143%	145%	147%	149%	151%	152%	35%
30%	127%	131%	135%	138.6%	142%	144%	146%	148%	150%	152%	153%	30%
25%	128%	132%	136%	139%	142%	145%	147%	149%	151%	152%	153%	25%
20%	128%	133%	136%	140%	142%	145%	147%	149%	151%	152%	153%	20%
15%	128%	132%	136%	139.3%	142%	144%	146%	148%	150%	151%	152%	15%
10%	128%	132%	135%	138%	141%	143%	145%	147%	148%	149%	150%	10%
5%	127%	131%	134%	136%	139%	141%	142%	144%	145%	146%	147%	5%
0%	125%	129%	131%	134%	135%	137%	138%	139%	140%	141%	142%	0%
	0.50%	0.55%	0.60%	0.65%	0.70%	0.75%	0.80%	0.85%	0.90%	0.95%	1.00%	
					Reg	Requirem	ent %					





percent of regulation MW

ത

Reg D as a

Average of all (12) KEMA Maps

						Tota	l Regulatior	n MW						
	RegD MW	500.00	550.00	600.00	650.00	700.00	750.00	800.00	850.00	900.00	950.00	1,000.00	RegD MW	
N	50%	250	275	300	325	350	375	400	425	450	475	500	50%	3
Σ	45%	225	248	270	293	315	338	360	383	405	428	450	45%	Σ
tior	40%	200	220	240	260	280	300	320	340	360	380	400	40%	tior
gula	35%	175	193	210	228	245	263	280	298	315	333	350	35%	gula
i reg	30%	150	165	180	195	210	225	240	255	270	285	300	30%	Leg
it of	25%	125	138	150	163	175	188	200	213	225	238	250	25%	it of
cen	20%	100	110	120	130	140	150	160	170	180	190	200	20%	.cen
bei	15%	75	83	90	98	105	113	120	128	135	143	150	15%	bei
as a	10%	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95	100	10%	as a
	5%	25	28	30	33	35	38	40	43	45	48	50	5%	
Re	0%	-	-	-	-	-	_ 1	<u> </u>	-	-	-	-	0%	Re
		500.00	550.00	600.00	650.00	700.00	750.00	800.00	850.00	900.00	950.00	1,000.00		
						Total	Regiulatio	n MW						
									\					
	_								$^{>}Re$	egD	MW			

Total Reg MW

©2015

55

KEMA provided RegA/RegD combinations

RegD MW = Reg% x Total RegMW

- Reg MW at 100% 1,000 REGA Total Reg REGD MW RegD % MW MW Score Reg% 90.0% 900 0% 0 900 140% 5% 37.5 140% 75.0% 750 712.5 140% 70.0% 700 10% 70 630 595 < 140% 15% 105 70.0% 700 65.0% 650 20% 130 520 140% 140% 70.0% 700 25% 175 525 30% 140% 70.0% 700 210 490 140% 70.0% 40% 280 420 700 140% 80.0% 800 50% 400 400 90.0% 900 55% 495 405 140%
- Constant regulation service from combination
 - Each combination equivalent to 900 MW of RegA (and 0 MW RegD)

Example assumes all MW are performance adjusted



KEMA provided RegA/RegD combinations

Note, total Reg MW not constant

	1,000					
Reg%		Total Reg MW	RegD %	REGD MW	REGA MW	Score
	90.0%	900	0%	0	900	140%
	75.0%	750	5%	37.5	712.5	140%
	70.0%	700	10%	70	630	140%
	70.0%	700	15%	105	595	140%
	65.0%	650	20%	130	520	140%
	70.0%	700	25%	175	525	140%
	70.0%	700	30%	210	490	140%
	70.0%	700	40%	280	420	140%
	80.0%	800	50%	400	400	140%
	90.0%	900	55%	495	405	140%

%D is correct here, with assumed pair. 280 RegD / (280 + 420) = 40%

Higher proportions of RegD require a greater amount of total Regulation MW (Balance from RegA) to provide effective MW target (750 MW of RegA)

Need to operationalize the curve.



Reg MW at 100%

57

KEMA based combinations with the same CPS1 Scores, Resulting BF Function



Relevant RegA/RegD MW Combinations

©2015



KEMA based combinations: Smooth the curve



KEMA based combinations: Smooth the curve





60

KEMA based combinations: Smooth the curve



Derivative of this function is MRTS = MBF Function

Change in RegA for Change in RegD



KEMA based combinations: MBF



Derivative of curve defining combinations of RegA/RegD

KEMA based combinations: MBF



 Effective MW from RegD = Area Under MBF Curve

Works so long as MBF function defined in terms of discrete MW, not percentage.



609.5 A, 105 D KEMA based combinations



KEMA based combinations: MBF

Area under curve calculation-

Results match curve

3 MBF of smoothed curve 2.5 2 Linear (MBF of smoothed curve) 1.5 MBF 1 0.5 0 100 200 300 400 500 600 -0.5 y = -0.0066x + 2.4388 -1 **RegD MW**

MBF of smoothed curve

	Smoothed		\rightarrow	
	Kema	MBF of	Effective	Total
RegD	Combinations	smoothed	MW from	effective
MW	RegA	curve	RegD	MW
0	829.19	2.44	0.00	829.19
37.5	742.38	2.19	86.81	829.19
70	674.64	1.98	154.55	829.19
105	609.50	1.75	219.69	829.19
130	567.92	1.58	261.27	829.19
175	503.46	1.28	325.73	829.19
210	462.57	1.05	366.62	829.19
280	405.05	0.59	424.14	829.19
400	381.67	-0.20	447.52	829.19
495	430.57	-0.83	398.62	829.19



Compare to Current Approach

- What if current clearing approach was applied to this MBF curve?
- Current approach defines relationship based on percentage of RegD relative to fixed number, not RegD/RegA combinations.
- Misinterprets axis (the relationship between RegD and RegA)
- Failure to correct interpretation of the axis would result combinations inconsistent with MBF.



PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

	KEMA Con	nbination App	roach			Cu	urrent Approa	ch	
									MW Cleared
	Smoothed					Residual			relative
	Kema					RegA	Actual	Actual	to 1000
	Combinations	Percentage	Percentage	Total		(PJM	Percentage	Percentage	WW
RegD MW	RegA	RegD	RegA	Reg%	RegD MW	approach)	RegD	RegA	target
0.0	829.2	0%	100%	83%	0.0	829.2	0%	100%	83%
37.5	742.4	5%	95%	78%	39.9	736.9	5%	95%	78%
70.0	674.6	9%	91%	74%	17.9	657.1	11%	89%	74%
105.0	609.5	15%	85%	71%	121.9	574.2	18%	82%	70%
130.0	567.9	19%	81%	70%	154.5	518.8	23%	77%	67%
175.0	503.5	26%	74%	68%	213.9	431.1	33%	67%	64%
210.0	462.6	31%	69%	67%	258.9	377.2	41%	59%	64%
280.0	405.0	41%	59%	69%	338.9	315.8	52%	48%	65%
400.0	381.7	51%	49%	78%	424.3	354.5	54%	46%	78%
495.0	430.6	53%	47%	93%	443.5	472.1	48%	52%	92%

Note different resulting percentages of RegD.

©2015



PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations



CPS1 Score constant, Effective MW constant

Monitoring Analytics

Combinations not consistent with MBF

CPS1 Score not constant, Effective MW not constant

Lower regulation control scores

Ideal Approach



69



Ideal Approach: Least Cost Combination



				-
Price		Price Paid		
paid per		per MW of		
MW of		RegA		
RegD	MRTS	Equivalent	RegD MW	RegA MW
\$ 70.00	0.6376	\$ 109.79	260	439.144

Computed solution limited in example to the listed combinations. Actual curve is smooth and continuous, would solve were MB/MC ratios constant across resource types (point of intersection of D and S).



Monitoring Analytics

70

Benefit Factor (MBF/BF): Consistent Application



Marginal Benefit Factor is not uniformly applied in price and settlement

- The Marginal Benefit Factor (MBF/BF) is not uniformly applied so that the valuation used in optimization process is consistent with the valuation used in settlement.
- MBF/BF used in price/offer conversion but not used in settlement.
- MBF/BF used to convert all offers to effective MW of RegA MW and \$/effective MW of RegA.




- Incorrectly compensating RegD in all hours
 - Sometimes too little (when MBF is >1)
 - Sometimes too much (when MBF is <1)</p>
- Mileage multiplier distorts signal in all hours
 - RegD payment per MW slightly higher than RegA payments per MW
 - Incentives to self schedule/price at zero
 - Inefficient squeezing out of RegA
 - Lowers regulation price per MW of RegA
 - Long term investment signals incorrect for RegA and RegD





Ideal Design

- Clearing price in terms of \$/Effective MW RegA
- Objective is to pay each resource for \$/effective MW provided
- Price realized should be the same for each effective MW provided



Components of Offers

- Offers are composed of
 - Capability (\$/MW)
 - PJM estimated LOC (\$/MW)
 - performance (\$/mile that is converted into \$/MW)
 . \$/Mile x historic mile/MW = \$/MW
 - Sum is \$/MW reg offer.
 - Reg offer (\$/MW) =capability (\$/MW)+LOC (\$/MW) + performance (\$/MW)



Example Offers

- Sum is \$/MW reg offer.
 - Reg offer (\$/MW) =capability (\$/MW)+LOC (\$/MW) + performance (\$/MW)
- Example offers:
- RegA offer:
 - \$8/MW capability + (\$1/mile) x 2mile/MW
 - = \$8/MW + \$2/MW = \$10/MW
- RegD offer:
 - \$6/MW capability +\$1/mile x 4mile/MW
 - =\$6/MW + \$4/MW = \$10/MW



Example Offers: Conversion to Effective MW

- **Offers are converted into \$/Effective MW**
- $$/E ffectiveMW = \frac{1}{Performance\%xBenefitFactor}$
- \$10 offer, 50% performance, 1 BF
 - 1 MW offered providing 0.5 MW effective
 - \$10/MW offer = \$10/(50%x1)= \$20/MW effective
- \$10 offer, 100% performance, .5 BF
 - **1 MW offered providing 0.5 effective**
 - \$10/MW offer = \$10/(100% x 0.5) = \$20/MW effective





Conversion to offers to \$/Effective MW

- Prices in stack are provided in \$/Effective MW
- Market Prices are set on the basis of \$/Effective MW (marginal offer)
- \$/E ffectiveMW =

Offer

Performance%xBenefitFactor



Two Basic Components of Price

- Marginal offer price is divided into two component pieces:
- Performance in \$/effective MW
 - Set by most expensive effective MW based performance offer, whether part of the marginal offer or not
- Capability in \$/effective MW
 - Capability price is determined as a residual (difference between total price and max performance price cleared stack)





Settlement: Effect of Current Design

- Clearing price in terms of \$/Effective MW RegA
- Reg A Resource paid
 - \$/Effective MW RegA for Capability
 - \$/Effective MW RegA for Performance
- RegD Resources paid
 - RegA price for Capability x RegD MW
 - RegA price for Performance x RegD MW x Mile Ratio

Depending on mileage rate, slight increase in payment to RegD, relative to RegA per MW.

Note: Performance piece relative small portion of total price.



Ideal Design

- Clearing price in terms of \$/Effective MW RegA
- Reg A Resource paid
 - \$/Effective MW RegA for Capability
 - \$/Effective MW RegA for Performance
- RegD Resources paid
 - RegA price for Capability x RegD MW x MBF
 - $_{\circ}$ Results in RegD paid in terms of \$/Effective MW $_{\swarrow}$
 - RegA price for Performance x RegD MW x MBF
 Results in RegD paid in terms of \$/Effective MW



MBF

MBF

ratio

replaced

mileage

MBF vs Mileage Ratio

	Margir	nal Benefit	Factor	Mileage Ratio					
	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average			
Jan	0.915	2.441	2.065	1.113	43.184	2.834			
Feb	0.911	2.361	2.058	1.160	54.340	2.747			
Mar	0.895	2.389	2.001	1.249	20.818	2.692			
Apr	1.188	2.424	2.066	1.402	60.054	2.722			
May	0.589	2.452	1.978	1.298	200.672	3.099			
Jun	0.784	2.375	1.840	1.243	15.155	2.666			
Jul	0.745	2.237	1.867	1.107	45.156	2.817			
Aug	0.757	2.272	1.875	1.186	19.904	2.617			
Sep	0.910	2.222	1.794	1.274	24.975	2.752			





MBF vs Mileage Ratio





83

Monitoring Analytics

	Miles/MW
RegA	5
RegD	10
Mileage Ratio	2

	\$ Capability/	\$ Performance	\$	Total Offer (Raw				Modified Total Offer	Modified Performance Offer	Effective	Regulation
Offer	MW	/MW	LOC/MW	\$/MW)	MW	RegA/RegD	BF	(Offer/BF)	(offer/BF)	MW	Requirement
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	10	RegD	2.8	\$0.00	\$0.00	29	300
Unit 2	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$8.00	10	RegD	2.6	\$3.08	\$1.54	28	300
Unit 3	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$40.00	10	RegD	2.5	\$16.00	\$8.00	27.5	300
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00	300	RegA	1	\$25.00	\$5.00	300	300
									T otal MW	384.5	300



Offers

				Total
	\$	\$		Offer
	Capability/	Performance	\$	(Raw
Offer	MW	/MW	LOC/MW	\$/MW)
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Unit 2	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$8.00
Unit 3	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$40.00
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00







85

	\$	\$	
	Capability/	Performance	\$
Offer	MW	/MW	LOC/MW
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Unit 2	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$0.00
Unit 3	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$0.00
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00
	(\$	(\$	(\$
	(\$ Capability/	(\$ Performance	(\$ LOC/MW)
Offer	(\$ Capability/ MW)/BF	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF
Offer Unit 1	(\$ Capability/ MW)/BF \$0.00	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF \$0.00	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF \$0.00
Offer Unit 1 Unit 2	(\$ Capability/ MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF \$0.00 \$0.00
Offer Unit 1 Unit 2 Unit 3	(\$ Capability/ MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54 \$8.00	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54 \$8.00	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF \$0.00 \$0.00

BF Adjusted offers





86

No BF adjustment

BF Adjusted

Monitoring Analytics





Settlement



Current Settlement: Mileage Ratio

	\$	\$											
	Capability/	Performance	\$	Total		Total Cost of							
Offer	MW	/MW	LOC/MW	Offer/MW	MW cleared	Offer							
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	10.0	\$0.00							
Unit 2	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$8.00	10.0	\$80.00							
Unit 3	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$40.00	10.0	\$400.00							
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00	215.5	\$5,387.50							
	(\$	(\$	(\$	Clearing	Performance			Capability					
	(\$ Capability	(\$ Performance	(\$ LOC/MW)	Clearing Price	Performance Clearing Price	Capability	Mileage	Capability Payment/	Performance		Total	Total	To
Offer	(\$ Capability MW)/BF	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF	Clearing Price \$/MW	Performance Clearing Price \$/MW	Capability Price \$/MW	Mileage Ratio	Capability Payment/ MW	Performance Payment/MW	Pay	Total /ment/MW	Total Payment	To Pr
Offer Unit 1	(\$ Capability/ MW)/BF \$0.00	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF \$0.00	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF \$0.00	Clearing Price \$/MW \$25.00	Performance Clearing Price \$/MW \$8.00	Capability Price \$/MW \$17.00	Mileage Ratio 2.00	Capability Payment/ MW \$17.00	Performance Payment/MW \$16.00	Pay	Total ment/MW \$33.00	Total Payment \$330.00	T Pr \$330
Offer Unit 1 Unit 2	(\$ Capability/ MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF \$0.00	Clearing Price \$/MW \$25.00 \$25.00	Performance Clearing Price \$/MW \$8.00 \$8.00	Capability Price \$/MW \$17.00 \$17.00	Mileage Ratio 2.00 2.00	Capability Payment/ MW \$17.00	Performance Payment/MW \$16.00 \$16.00	Pay	Total /ment/MW \$33.00 \$33.00	Total Payment \$330.00 \$330.00	To Pr \$330 \$250
Offer Unit 1 Unit 2 Unit 3	(\$ Capability/ MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54 \$8.00	(\$ Performance /MW)/BF \$0.00 \$1.54 \$8.00	(\$ LOC/MW) /BF \$0.00 \$0.00	Clearing Price \$/MW \$25.00 \$25.00 \$25.00	Performance Clearing Price \$/MW \$8.00 \$8.00	Capability Price \$/MW \$17.00 \$17.00 \$17.00	Mileage Ratio 2.00 2.00 2.00	Capability Payment/ MW \$17.00 \$17.00	Performance Payment/MW \$16.00 \$16.00 \$16.00	Pay	Total ment/MW \$33.00 \$33.00 \$33.00	Total Payment \$330.00 \$330.00 \$330.00	To Pr \$330 \$250 - \$70

- Higher payment for RegD per MW
- But payment inconsistent on effective MW basis.



Current Settlement: Mileage Ratio

												Effective
												Payment
											Total	per
	(\$	(\$	(\$	Clearing	Performance		Total				Effective	Effective
	Capability/	Performance	LOC/MW)	Price	Clearing Price	Capability	Payment/	Total		MW	MW (at	MW of
Offer	MW)/BF	/MW)/BF	/BF	\$/MW	\$/MW	Price \$/MW	MW	Payment	MBF	Cleared	margin)	RegA
Jnit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	\$33.00	\$330.00	2.50	10.00	25.00	\$13.20
Jnit 2	\$1.54	\$1.54	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	\$33.00	\$330.00	2.50	10.00	25.00	\$13.20
Jnit 3	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	\$33.00	\$330.00	2.50	10.00	25.00	\$13.20
Jnit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	\$25.00	\$5,387.50	1.00	215.50	215.50	\$25.00

- \$/effective MW not equal across resource types
- Caused by failure to use BF/MBF consistently in market.
- Price provided in terms of \$/Effective MW, needs to be settled in same terms.



Ideal Design

- Clearing price in terms of \$/Effective MW RegA
- Objective is to pay each resource for \$/effective MW provided
- Price realized should be the same for each effective MW provided
- Clearing price was \$25 per effective MW
- RegA resources should realize \$25 per effective MW
- RegD resources should realize \$25 per effective MW





Ideal Design

- Clearing price in terms of \$/Effective MW RegA
- Reg A Resource paid
 - \$/Effective MW RegA for Capability
 - \$/Effective MW RegA for Performance
- RegD Resources paid
 - RegA price for Capability x RegD MW x MBF
 - Results in RegD paid in terms of \$/Effective MW
 - RegA price for Performance x RegD MW x MBF
 Results in RegD paid in terms of \$/Effective MW



Settlement

Current approach

	Ý	Ψ								$\langle \rangle$		
	Capability/	Performance	\$	Total		Total Cost of					\backslash	
Offer	MW	/MW	LOC/MW	Offer/MW	MW cleared	Offer						
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	10.0	\$0.00						
Unit 2	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$0.00	\$8.00	10.0	\$80.00			<u> </u>			
Unit 3	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$0.00	\$40.00	10.0	\$400.00			Ideal		\backslash	
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00	215.5	\$5,387.50			\wedge		\	\backslash
	(\$	(\$	(\$	Clearing	Performance		Ľ	Capability				Ž
	Capability/	Performance	LOC/MW)	Price	Clearing Price	Capability	Mileage	Payment/	Performance	Total	Total	Total
Offer	MW)/BF	/MW)/BF	/BF	\$/MW	\$/MW	Price \$/MW	Ratio	MW	Payment/MW	Payment/MW	Payment	Profit
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	2.00	\$17,00	\$16.00	\$33.00	\$330.00	\$330.00
Unit 2	\$1.54	\$1.54	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	2.00	\$17.00	\$16.00	\$33.00	\$330.00	\$250.00
Unit 3	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	2.00	\$17.00	\$16.00	\$33.00	\$330.00	-\$70.00
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	1.00	\$17.00	\$8.00	\$25.00	\$5,387.50	\$0.00
	(\$	(\$	(\$	Clearing	Performance			Capability				
	Capability/	Performance	LOC/MW)	Price	Clearing Price	Capability	F	Payment/	Performance	Total	Total	Total
Offer	MW)/BF	/MW)/BF	/BF	\$/MW	\$/MW	Price \$/MW	MBF	MW	Payment/MW	Payment/MW	Payment	Profit
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	2.50	\$42.50	\$20.00	\$62.50	\$625.00	\$625.00
Unit 2	\$1.54	\$1.54	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	2.50	\$42.50	\$20.00	\$62.50	\$625.00	\$545.00
Unit 3	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	2.50	\$42.50	\$20.00	\$62.50	\$625.00	\$225.00
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00	\$8.00	\$17.00	1.00	\$17.00	\$8.00	\$25.00	\$5,387.50	\$0.00



¢

ተ



Monitoring Analytics

Current vs Proposed

											\$/Effective
							Effective	Total	\$/Effective MW		MW Using
	(\$	(\$	(\$	Clearing			MW	Payment	Using Current	Total Payment	Consistent
	Capability/ P	erformance	LOC/MW)	Price			provided	Current	Mileage Ratio	MBF Adjusted	Application
Offer	MW)/BF	/MW)/BF	/BF	\$/MW	MW Provided	MBF	at Margin	Method	Method	Method	of MBF
Unit 1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	10.00	2.50	25.00	\$330.00	\$13.20	\$625.00	\$25.00
Unit 2	\$1.54	\$1.54	\$0.00	\$25.00	10.00	2.50	25.00	\$330.00	\$13.20	\$625.00	\$25.00
Unit 3	\$8.00	\$8.00	\$0.00	\$25.00	10.00	2.50	25.00	\$330.00	\$13.20	\$625.00	\$25.00
Unit 4	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$10.00	\$25.00	215.50	1.00	215.50	\$5,387.50	\$25.00	\$5,387.50	\$25.00

Current approach (payment varies on \$/Effective MW basis)

Proposed Approach (same \$/Effective)







LOC: Optimization/Market Clearing Issues



Lost Opportunity Cost: LOC

- LOC is intended to reflect:
 - The lost opportunity associated with foregone energy sales incurred when providing regulation service
 - Costs associated with operating uneconomically to provide regulation (regulation set point above economic point for energy)
 - Real costs from not following economic dispatch signal





Lost Opportunity Cost: LOC

- LOC is intended to make participant indifferent to providing regulation (outside of regulation related costs/offer)
- In optimization, intended to reflect incremental cost to using resource to provide regulation rather than energy.
- To align incremental cost to provide regulation and incremental cost in terms of energy, need to base off the operational offer in use.

98





Lost Opportunity Cost: LOC

- Regulation market does not use the operational energy offer.
- Uses the lower of cost or price.
- Where lower of price or cost <> operational offer
 - Internalized opportunity cost to provide regulation
 > actual opportunity cost to provide regulation.
 - Reduced efficiency to market solution.
 - Artificial increase to regulation price when marginal.





Appendix: MBF based on MW vs. MBF based on %Reg D.



KEMA based combinations with the same CPS1 Scores, Resulting BF Function





PJM Current Approach

- RTO Regulation MW target for effective MW (829 MW for example).
- Reg requirement can be met with X MW of RegA (829 MW for example).
- RegD%, for purposes of determining resource specific BF, is Reg MW (*actual*) as a percent of X *effective* MW target (829 MW for example).





PJM presentation 08-11-2015

Monitoring Analytics

PJM Current Approach

Effective Reg Requirement





PJM Current Approach





PJM Current Approach: Applied to Current Example

- RTO Regulation MW target for effective MW (829 MW for example).
- Reg requirement can be met with X MW of RegA (829 MW for example).
- RegD%, for purposes of determining resource specific BF, is Reg MW as a percent of X MW target (829 MW for example).



Monitoring Analytics

PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations



- Same BF function, different axis interpretation (inconsistent with derivation).
 - BF determined/assigned as a function of RegD MW as a percent of Effective MW target.
 - BF not determined/assigned as RegD MW as a percent of total MW of regulation.

Monitoring Analytics



PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

MW			
Require			
ment		Assigned	
(Baseline	Percentage	MBF to	
for PJM	RegD	%	
829.19	0%	2.4388	
829.19	5%	2.1913	
829.19	9%	1.9768	
829.19	15%	1.7458	
829.19	19%	1.5808	
829.19	26%	1.2838	
829.19	31%	1.0528	
829.19	41%	0.5908	
829.19	51%	-0.2012	
829.19	53%	-0.8282	
00	045	www.monit	ori

- Same BF function, different axis interpretation (inconsistent with derivation).
- BF determined/assigned as a function of RegD MW as a percent of Effective MW target.
- BF not determined/assigned as RegD MW as a percent of total MW of regulation.

©2015

PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

MW				
Require				
ment		Assigned		
(Baseline	Percentage	MBF to		
for PJM	RegD	%	RegD MW	
829.19	0%	2.4388	0.00	
829.19	5%	2.1913	39.87	
829.19	9%	1.9768	77.95	
829.19	15%	1.7458	121.85	
829.19	19%	1.5808	154.45	
829.19	26%	1.2838	213.88	
829.19	31%	1.0528	258.90	
829.19	41%	0.5908	338.92	
829.19	51%	-0.2012	424.32	
829.19	53%	-0.8282	443.46	

- BF determined/assigned as a function of RegD MW as a percent of Effective MW target.
- RegA MW cleared determined as a residual= (assuming all the RegD priced at zero)
- Total Effective MW Needed –
 Effective MW from RegD cleared


PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

BF with another logic

7			D
Perf_Adj_MW	BF	Eff_MW	
10	2.8332	28.3	Ł
9	2.773	2.05	
8	2.7196	21.8	
7	2.6728	18.7	
5	2.6394	13.2	
5	2.6060	13.0	Δ
Total Eff_M	W	120	57

 $BF_i = \frac{EffMW_i^* (0.0001 - 2.9)}{Percentage RegD*RegReq} + 2.9$

Source: PJM Presentation 08/11/2015

Note: proportion of RegD to total Reg clearing not being used.

Monitoring Analytics

PJM current approach to RegA/RegD combinations

MW Require						
ment		Assigned		Calculated	Residual	PJM
(Baseline	Percentage	MBF to		Effective	RegA (PJM	Calculated
for PJM	RegD	%	RegD MW	MW RegD	approach)	Effective MW
829.19	0%	2.4388	0.00	0.00	829.19	829.19
829.19	5%	2.1913	39.87	92.30	736.89	829.19
829.19	9%	1.9768	77.95	172.09	657.10	829.19
829.19	15%	1.7458	121.85	254.96	574.23	829.19
829.19	19%	1.5808	154.45	310.42	518.77	829.19
829.19	26%	1.2838	213.88	398.09	431.10	829.19
829.19	31%	1.0528	258.90	451.99	377.20	829.19
829.19	41%	0.5908	338.92	513.39	315.80	829.19
829.19	51%	-0.2012	424.32	474.73	354.46	829.19
829.19	53%	-0.8282	443.46	357.12	472.07	829.19

Effective MW from RegD cleared = Cumulative effective MW from RegD.



Monitoring Analytics, LLC 2621 Van Buren Avenue Suite 160 Eagleville, PA 19403 (610) 271-8050 MA@monitoringanalytics.com www.MonitoringAnalytics.com

