1. On March 30, 2015, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM), filed revisions to the Amended and Restated Operating Agreement of PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (Operating Agreement) and the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (Tariff) to modify the processes governing the timing for submission of actual Power Meter and InSchedule data for settlement and billing purposes. PJM states that these reforms will allow for the

---

1 PJM, Operating Agreement, OA Schedule 1 Sec 3.6, OA Schedule 1 Sec 3.6 - Metering Reconciliation, 1.0.0

2 PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Tariff, 31.7, OATT 31.7 Changing Network Load Energy Settlement Area Defi, 2.0.0, ATTACHMENT F-1, OATT ATTACHMENT F-1, 4.0.0, OATT ATT K APPX Sec 3.6, OATT Attachment K Appendix Sec 3.6 Metering Reconciliation, 1.0.0.

3 Power Meter, formerly known as eMTR, is a PJM internet application through which electric distribution companies, load-serving entities, and generators submit hourly revenue meter data.

4 InSchedule, formerly known as eSchedules, is a PJM internet application used by power marketers, load serving entities (LSE), and generators to submit internal PJM energy schedule data.
use of larger volumes of actual data which will consequently minimize adjustments between Market Participants’ initial settlements and reconciliation settlements.\(^5\) As discussed below, we accept the proposed revisions, effective June 1, 2015, as requested.

2. PJM explains that, in the PJM Interchange Energy Market, real-time generation values and the load served at each bus are initially determined by the State Estimator. The initial values are later superseded by values determined based on revenue meter data uploaded by Market Participants to Power Meter by the relevant deadline.\(^6\) If a Market Participant does not have actual meter data by the deadline, it can submit estimated data and then provide the actual data through meter error correction submission in Power Meter and through electric distribution company (EDC) load reconciliation data submission in InSchedule.\(^7\)

3. PJM states that the current deadlines for Power Meter and InSchedule data submissions were established at a time when there were fewer interval meters providing data to PJM. PJM states that interval meters are now more common among Market Participants, and as a result Market Participants’ settlement systems are processing more data. This additional time is resulting in Market Participants frequently submitting estimated meter data, rather than actual data to meet the submission deadlines.\(^8\)

4. In response to these changes, PJM is proposing to reform its processes to give Market Participants additional time to submit actual data for settlement and billing purposes. PJM states that these reforms will minimize adjustments between Market Participants’ initial settlements and reconciliation settlements which will help Market Participants more accurately manage their cash and credit on a month-to-month basis.\(^9\)

5. Specifically, PJM proposes to: (1) extend the meter correction data deadline; (2) establish procedures for setting the daily default load bus distributions for Zonal aggregates and Residual Metered Load aggregates for the Day-ahead Energy market in instances when certain State Estimator or InSchedule data are delayed or unavailable; and (3) clarify the rate used for reconciliation billing.

\(^5\) Transmittal at 3.

\(^6\) Transmittal at 2.

\(^7\) Transmittal at 2-3.

\(^8\) Transmittal at 3.

\(^9\) Transmittal at 4.
6. Notice of the filing was published in the Federal Register, 80 Fed. Reg. 18,226 (2015), with interventions and protests due on or before April 20, 2015. Potomac Electric Power Company; NRG Companies; American Municipal Power; and Dayton Power and Light Company (DP&L) filed timely motions to intervene. DP&L submitted supporting comments and a limited protest seeking further modifications.

7. DP&L states that it fully supports the proposed revisions and agrees that they will improve the accuracy of settlement and billing computations. However, DP&L requests that the Commission direct PJM to initiate a stakeholder process to develop and propose additional modifications to the Operating Agreement and Tariff that would create a third settlement process for significant errors discovered outside of the current 60-day settlement period (Settlement C). DP&L explains that, currently, PJM will informally allow a settlement to occur outside the 60-day window, but only if there is unanimous affirmative consent from all affected LSEs. DP&L states that this unanimous consent has proven to be almost impossible to achieve and that the creation of a Settlement C process within the Operating Agreement and Tariff would improve the accuracy and transparency of the market for LSEs and load itself. DP&L states that such a settlement process would be best developed through PJM stakeholder process.

8. On May 5, 2015, PJM filed an answer to the DP&L limited protest. PJM urges the Commission to reject DP&L’s proposal to develop an additional settlement process. PJM states that the DP&L proposal is outside the scope of this proceeding. Moreover, PJM asserts that DP&L presents no evidence that the existing tariff provisions are unjust and unreasonable due to the lack of an additional settlement process.

9. Pursuant to Rule 214, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2014), the unopposed, timely-filed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding.

10 The NRG Companies include NRG Power Marketing LLC and GenOn Energy Management, LLC.


12 Id. at P 7.

13 Id. at P 9.

10. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2014), prohibits an answer to a protest unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We will accept the answer filed by PJM because it includes information that assisted us in our decision-making process.

11. We accept PJM’s proposed revisions, effective June 1, 2015, as requested. We agree that the proposed revisions should improve the ability of market participants to submit actual Power Meter and InSchedule data for settlement and billing purposes. In making this determination, we add that all parties to this proceeding support these revisions.

12. DP&L’s request for an additional settlement process for significant data errors outside of the current tariff’s 60-day window is beyond the scope of this proceeding. DP&L, however, may pursue these changes on its own through the PJM stakeholder process.

By direction of the Commission. Commissioner Moeller is concurring with a separate statement attached.

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.
MOELLER, Commissioner, *concurring*:

Dayton Power and Light Company (DP&L) alleges that data from a malfunctioning or stopped meter that is discovered after PJM’s 60-day reconciliation period may not be correctable because PJM’s billing and settlement process requires unanimous consent from load-serving entities, which has proven almost impossible to achieve.\(^1\) This order correctly finds that DP&L’s arguments are beyond the scope of this proceeding.

As I discussed in my concurrence regarding the procedures for addressing meter data problems in New York Independent System Operator, I encourage all RTOs/ISOs to work with their stakeholders to ensure that they have transparent processes for correcting invoices and to provide market participants with sufficient time to remedy lost or invalid meter data.\(^2\)

\[^1\] DP&L Protest at 3-4.
