

Draft Poll on Solution Options for Select CCSTF Design Components

Melissa Pulong, Performance Compliance
Capacity Capability Senior Task Force
June 22, 2020

- A 4-hour class of resources (as part of Design Component 1: Classes)
 - For which it may be desirable to harmonize among corresponding 4-hour Energy Storage Resources, 4-hour generic limited duration resources, Solar+4-hour battery hybrids, and Other gen+4hour battery hybrids
- The timing of future ELCC accreditations (as part of Design Component 2: Timing and to some extent also Design Component 3: Consideration of a Changing ELCC).

- Respondents should choose PJM member(s) they represent. This includes trade industry associations.
 - Public Interest Organizations should choose that category.
 - State commissions, consumer advocates, energy agencies, or other state bodies should choose the appropriate category.
 - Stakeholders that do not fall into any of these categories should choose “other”.
- PJM suggests poll respondent names and answers be public (that is, it would not be an anonymous poll).
- PJM would produce an introductory slide deck to accompany the poll that could be used to facilitate answering the poll by member representatives not directly participating in the CCSTF.

1. Which solutions options in the "limited duration resources" design component could you support? (Please select one or more option(s))
 - a) Four classes comprising of: 6 hour and 10 hour energy storage resources, 6 hour and 10 hour generic limited duration resources; Linear derating allowed for ESR and limited duration resources.
 - b) Two classes comprising of: 4 hour and 10 hour storage; units between 4-10 hrs can qualify for either class
 - c) Model multiple classes (e.g., by hour) up to X-hr, where X is the duration expected to retain 100% capacity value over the study window
 - d) Three classes comprising of: 4 hour, 6 hour, and 10 hour energy storage resources; Allow derating along a curve.
 - e) None of the above

2. Is your support for a given solution option in Question 1 contingent on the presence of a 4-hour class?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

3. Is your support for a given solution option in Question 1 contingent on the absence of a 4-hour class?
 - a) Yes
 - b) No

Optional response for the following question:

4. If answer to Question 2 or Question 3 is 'Yes', please list conditions under which you could support either the presence or absence of a 4-hour class.

5. Please rank the following aspects in order of importance (A ranking of one will indicate the highest level of importance):
- a) Ability to retain the same capacity value over time
 - b) Having a predictable capacity value over time
 - c) Having the highest possible capacity value in any given year

6. Could you support a model that results in resources receiving a lower capacity value in exchange for increased predictability as to what that capacity value will be?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

7. Could you support only 1 year of forward certain predictability with indicative, but non-binding values for subsequent years?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

Optional response for the following questions:

8. If answer to Question 7 is 'No', what would you need to support only 1-year of forward binding predictability?

9. If you cannot support only 1 year of forward predictability, what is the minimum number of years that you would be willing to support?

10. A “vintage” approach sets the capacity value at a fixed value corresponding to the ELCC value for the year the project hit a certain milestone (for example, entering the Queue or first offering into an RPM auction). This capacity value is fixed for a number of years (or the entire life of a unit). Based on this description, could you support a “vintage” approach?
- a) Yes
 - b) No

11. Could you support an approach that uses "average" ELCC instead of "marginal" ELCC?
- a. Yes
 - b. No