

Capacity Market Reform: Phase 2

Patrick Bruno, Sr. Lead – Market Design Walter Graf, Sr. Director – Economics Capacity Market Workshop #8 September 17, 2021





Objectives of Today's Workshop

- Review stakeholder feedback provided in prior workshop
- Review the proposed assignment of topics in scope of Phase 2 to various stakeholder groups
- Provide a high-level view of the problems and potential problems PJM sees that are aligned with the scope from the April 6 Board letter, including thoughts on supporting analysis and sequencing of the work
- Get stakeholder feedback



- Stakeholders were largely supportive of forming a new Resource Adequacy Senior Task Force (RASTF) to work on the majority of Phase 2 topics
- Heard some concerns with delegating any of the discussions to groups outside the RASTF
- Received requests to explicitly define the problems that we are attempting to solve in the Phase 2 effort and the analysis that can be done to clarify and prioritize those problems



Phase 2 Scope and Proposed Stakeholder Groups



* Discussions on potential reform needed to related planning studies (e.g. CETO / CETL) will likely begin at the Planning Committee (PC)

** Load forecasting enhancements to be addressed in the Load Analysis Subcommittee (LAS)

Report outs between groups

pjm	Proposed Sequencing of Phase 2 Work
Near-Term Issues:	 Issues to begin work on now that can be addressed in near term Performance assessments Procurement levels (under current design)
Long-Term Issues:	 Current and long-term issues with a longer solution horizon to be discussed together under a holistic review Allows for majority of remaining topics under RASTF to be discussed and addressed in a holistic manner
Startup Issues:	 Startup issues that require more discussion and scoping to be started in parallel Procurement of clean resource attributes Additional reliability services



Primary Objectives of the Capacity Market

Problems identified where today's market falls short of one or both of the primary objectives of the market:

- Reliability: Ensure adequate supply & demand response to meet the resource adequacy target
- Efficiency: Embrace competitive principles and send transparent price signals for efficient entry and exit



Near-Term Issues

PJM proposes to begin work on issues that we expect can be addressed in the **near term**:

Performance Assessments

Procurement Levels (under current design)



Performance Assessments

- Symptoms observed during the October 2019 PAIs that indicate a problem with the current PAI rules:
 - Approximately 80% of nonperformance was excused on Capacity Performance Resources throughout the event
 - Energy prices were relatively low throughout the event, with negative prices occurring in regions where the PAI was in effect
- The expected number of PAIs in a given year assumed in the determination of the CP penalty rate has not been observed since implementation of CP
 - i.e., 360 PAIs or 30 hours per year

Impacted Market Objective: Reliability



Procurement Levels (Under Current Design)

- Procurement levels seen by some as too high in PJM. Indicators of a potential problem include:
 - Load forecast has systematically exceeded realized load (historically), particularly the forecast used at the time of the BRA
 - Capacity procured has been above the target IRM, and prices have been low even as merchant entry continues
- Addressing this problem:
 - Continue exploring load forecast enhancements in the LAS
 - Revisit the demand curve shape and reference technology in Quadrennial Review



Potential Issues With a Longer Solution Horizon to Be Discussed Together

- Propose working the remaining RASTF issues that have longer-term solution horizons together in the task force
- Many of these are largely interrelated issues that require discussion on seasonality, including:
 - Exploring reliability metrics beyond LOLE
 - Consideration of seasonal risk and variation in seasonal capacity needs
 - Review of capacity resource accreditation and seasonal capabilities
 - Potential for a sub-annual market construct



Various Interrelated Issues With Recognition of Seasonality

Evaluating Reliability Risks **Hypothesis:** 1-in-10 LOLE may not best represent desired reliability objective in a future (very different) power system

Hypothesis: Seasonal risks could be better recognized

Hypothesis: Annual capacity requirement overstates need for capacity in certain periods

Hypothesis: Explicit recognition of seasonality in requirements may reduce costs while maintaining reliability Resource Adequacy Requirements

Resource Accreditation Hypothesis: Seasonal resource capabilities may be undervalued in current annual construct

Proposed Analysis to Explore Issues Related to Seasonality

To test these seasonality-related hypotheses, we propose to conduct the following initial analyses:

- Calculate LOLE, EUE and other metrics for the PJM system in the future under different assumptions
- Calculate seasonal UCAP historically and into the future using seasonal EFORd/ELCC
- Estimate historical under-accredited seasonal UCAP under current annual construct
- Evaluate seasonal reliability targets under different assumptions

What additional analysis could help inform these questions?



Obligations Are Unclear or Inconsistent

Stated concerns: Expectations and obligations of a capacity resource are unclear or inconsistent

- Potential need for consistent energy market must offer requirements for all?
- Potential need to clarify requirements for flexibility for capacity resources?
 - When must resources maintain 24/7 staffing?
 - When must resources operate to PLS parameters 24/7?
- Others?



Value of clean energy attributes incompletely recognized in markets

- Today, the primary signal for value of clean energy comes from out of market RECs, state RPS, state procurements
- But those signals are not particularly well aligned with the ultimate policy goals (primarily decarbonization) nor integrated into the PJM markets

PJM believes a regional procurement of clean resource attributes can add value by promoting competition to achieve decarbonization goals. Competition in this area creates opportunities for suppliers and reduces costs for consumers.

 Begin discussion at RASTF as solution may have a forward procurement component (whether integrated with capacity market or not)

Impacted Market Objective: Efficiency



Additional Reliability Services

Flexibility, ramping, etc. are expected to be more valuable in the future with a changing resource mix

- Requires supporting analysis to help determine what and when these services may be needed in the markets (e.g., Renewable Integration Study 2.0 underway)
- Requires discussion on the appropriate place to compensate these services
 - Is there a need for additional flexible *capacity*, or should flexibility be primarily compensated in the operating time frame to better utilize flexible capability already on the system?

Initial proposal is to begin the discussion and scoping on this issue in parallel to kicking off the RASTF



Facilitator: Jen Tribulski Jennifer.Tribulski@pjm.com

Secretary: Alex Scheirer Alexandra.Scheirer@pjm.com

SME:

Pat Bruno Patrick.Bruno@pjm.com

Walter Graf Walter.Graf@pjm.com

Capacity Market Workshop - Session 8

Member Hotline (610) 666 – 8980 (866) 400 – 8980 custsvc@pjm.com