IMM MBR Challenges

MMUAC December 4, 2020 Catherine Tyler



Market-based Rates

- All PJM market sellers must have FERC approval to sell at market-based rates, instead of cost-based rates. MBR authority is reviewed every three years.
- Sellers rely on PJM market power mitigation as the sole justification for market-based rates.
- The MBR process allows for challenges to the assumption that PJM's market power mitigation is sufficient to prevent exercises of market power.
- The IMM has shown that exercises of market power are possible in PJM.
- The IMM has challenged sellers' MBRs.

©2020

IMM MBR Challenges

- 21 Interventions
 - 15 Triennial Review for Non-Transmission Owners
 - 6 New Units
- 10 Responses to Answers

Order 861 at P21

 "Public Citizen is mistaken in its view that challengers to a market-based rate filing would have to lodge their objections with the relevant RTO/ISO tariff in a different proceeding.³⁷ Any objections to a Seller's market-based rate authority can and should occur as a direct response to an initial application, a change in status filing, a triennial update, or in a proceeding instituted under FPA section 206.38"

Order 861 at P22

• "For example, PJM IMM notes that its quarterly State of the Market reports contain a comprehensive listing of market power concerns.³⁹ Anyone may use this information in support of a challenge to a Seller's market-based rate authority."

Unaddressed Market Power Mitigation Issues

- Capacity Market Seller Offer Cap
- Energy market offer capping
 - Crossing curves avoid offer capping
 - Markup on cost offer avoids parameter mitigation
- Real-time values can be used to avoid parameter mitigation.
- Fast-start pricing run has no TPS test.
- New: PJM should offer cap resources after commitment with online TPS test to ensure resources with market power are mitigated.

Overstated RPM Offer Cap

		Actual Auction Results		Noncompetitive Offers capped at net ACR	
LDA	Product Type	Clearing Prices (\$ per MW-day)	Cleared UCAP (MW)	Clearing Prices (\$ per MW-day)	Cleared UCAP (MW)
RTO	Annual	\$140.00	162,911.8	\$124.40	163,416.6
	Summer	\$140.00	715.5	\$124.40	715.5
	Winter	\$140.00_	715.5	\$124.40_	715.5
RTO Total			163,627.3		164,132.1
ATSI	Annual	\$171.33	8,007.3	\$169.65	8,013.1
	Summer	\$171.33	6.3	\$169.65	6.3
	Winter	\$171.33_	0.0	\$169.65_	0.0
ATSI Total			8,007.3		8,013.1
EMAAC	Annual	\$165.73	29,287.5	\$155.93	29,363.9
	Summer	\$165.73	88.0	\$155.93	87.9
	Winter	\$165.73_	1.0	\$155.93_	1.0
EMAAC Total			29,288.5		29,364.9
PSEG	Annual	\$204.29	5,366.6	\$204.29	5,366.6
	Summer	\$204.29	9.3	\$204.29	9.3
	Winter	\$204.29_	1.0	\$204.29_	1.0
PSEG Total			5,367.6		5,367.6
BGE	Annual	\$200.30	1,937.7	\$124.40	2,492.0
	Summer	\$200.30	85.0	\$124.40	84.6
	Winter	\$200.30_	0.0	\$124.40_	0.0
BGE Total			1,937.7		2,492.0
ComEd	Annual	\$195.55	22,083.6	\$130.04	22,421.0
	Summer	\$195.55	274.5	\$130.04	274.5
	Winter	\$195.55_	274.5	\$130.04_	274.5
ComEd Total			22,358.1		22,695.5
DEOK	Annual	\$140.00	2,733.3	\$128.47	2,636.3
	Summer	\$140.00	25.4	\$128.47	25.2
	Winter	\$140.00_	0.0	\$128.47_	0.0
DEOK Total			2,733.3		2,636.3

Unmitigated Real-Time Markups

	Not Failing	Failing TPS	Percent in
Markup Category	TPS Test	Test	Category
Negative Markup	32.7%	6.4%	39.1%
Zero Markup	10.8%	3.7%	14.6%
\$0 to \$5	34.6%	5.3%	39.8%
\$5 to \$10	3.9%	0.4%	4.3%
\$10 to \$15	0.6%	0.1%	0.7%
\$15 to \$20	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%
\$20 to \$25	0.5%	0.0%	0.5%
\$25 to \$50	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%
\$50 to \$75	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
\$75 to \$100	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Above \$100	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Total Positive Markup	40.3%	6.0%	46.3%
Total	83.8%	16.2%	100.0%
			_

Parameter Mitigation

			Percent Day
		Day-ahead	ahead Unit
Day-ahead commitment during hot and cold weather alerts		Unit Hours	Hours
Committed on price schedule less flexible than PLS		31,736	28.5%
Committed on price schedule as flexible as PLS		30,101	27.0%
Total committed on price schedule without parameter limits		61,837	55.4%
Committed on cost (cost capped)		3,228	2.9%
Committed on price PLS		46,485	41.7%
Total committed on PLS schedules (cost or price PLS)	•	49,713	44.6%

	Percent Day-	
	Day-ahead	ahead Unit
Day-ahead commitment for units that failed TPS test	Unit Hours	Hours
Committed on price schedule less flexible than cost	26,020	30.6%
Committed on price schedule as flexible as cost	8,220	9.7%
Total committed on price schedule without parameter limits	34,240	40.2%
Committed on cost (cost capped)	49,841	58.6%
Committed on price PLS	1,013	1.2%
Total committed on PLS schedules (cost or price PLS)	50,854	59.8%

Monitoring Analytics, LLC
2621 Van Buren Avenue
Suite 160
Eagleville, PA
19403
(610) 271-8050

MA@monitoringanalytics.com www.MonitoringAnalytics.com