

176 FERC ¶ 61,163  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

September 13, 2021

In Reply Refer To:  
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.  
Docket Nos. ER19-2722-005  
ER19-2722-006

Thomas DeVita, Esq.  
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.  
2750 Monroe Boulevard  
Audubon, PA 19403

Reference: Fast-Start Compliance Filing Establishing Effective Date to September 1, 2021

Dear Mr. DeVita:

1. On June 7, 2021, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) filed a Motion requesting a delay in the effective date for implementation of its fast-start pricing revisions to the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) and the Amended and Restated Operating Agreement (Operating Agreement) from July 1, 2021 to September 1, 2021. On June 22, 2021, the Commission issued an order granting the extension and directed PJM to submit a compliance filing with a new effective date of September 1, 2021. On July 16, 2021, PJM submitted the required compliance filing (July 2021 Compliance Filing), and on August 30, 2021, PJM submitted a supplemental filing (August 2021 Supplemental Filing) to correct a clerical error in the July 2021 Compliance Filing. PJM explains that the OATT and Operating Agreement provisions in the instant filings are those accepted by the Commission in its May 20, 2021 Order with a July 1, 2021 effective date,<sup>1</sup> and subsequently extended by the Commission in its June 22, 2021 Order to a September 1, 2021 effective date.<sup>2</sup> In addition, PJM states that its compliance filing contains all changes to the relevant tariff sections accepted by the Commission since

---

<sup>1</sup> *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 175 FERC ¶ 61,130, at P 19 (2021).

<sup>2</sup> *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 175 FERC ¶ 61,240, at P 1 (2021) (June 2021 Order).

PJM submitted its initial fast-start compliance filing on August 30, 2019.<sup>3</sup> As discussed below, we accept PJM's July 2021 Compliance Filing and August 2021 Supplemental Filing, effective September 1, 2021, as requested.

2. Notice of PJM's July 2021 Compliance Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 86 Fed. Reg. 38,710 (July 16, 2021), with interventions and protests due on or before August 6, 2021. On August 9, 2021, Monitoring Analytics, LLC, acting in its capacity as the Independent Market Monitor for PJM (Market Monitor), filed a protest. On August 23, 2021, PJM filed an answer. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2020), prohibits an answer to a protest unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We accept PJM's answer because it has provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process. Notice of PJM's August 2021 Supplemental Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 86 Fed. Reg. 50,095 (Sept. 7, 2021), with interventions and protests due on or before September 7, 2021. No protests were filed.

3. The Market Monitor does not assert that PJM failed to comply with the Commission's June 2021 Order, but raises entirely new allegations that it believes the software and business rules that PJM plans to implement on September 1 are not consistent with the Operating Agreement that the Commission accepted in the June 2021 Order.<sup>4</sup> In its answer, PJM states that it did not make any changes to the tariff language that the Commission had previously accepted in this proceeding other than changing the effective date for those provisions, as directed by the June 2021 Order, from July 1, 2021 to September 1, 2021.<sup>5</sup> PJM argues that the Commission should dismiss the Market Monitor's protest as beyond the scope of this compliance filing proceeding.

4. We accept PJM's July 2021 Compliance Filing and August 2021 Supplemental Filing and reject the Market Monitor's protest as beyond the scope of this proceeding, as discussed below. The Commission's June 2021 Order directing the compliance filing contained a single compliance directive – proposing a September 1, 2021 effective date. The Market Monitor does not contend that PJM has failed to comply with the

---

<sup>3</sup> July 2021 Compliance Filing at 1.

<sup>4</sup> Market Monitor Protest at 1-12.

<sup>5</sup> PJM Answer at 2.

Docket Nos. ER19-2722-005 and ER19-2722-006

- 3 -

Commission's directive to propose a September 1, 2021 effective date for fast-start pricing. We therefore reject the Market Monitor's protest, find that PJM has complied with the Commission's directive, and accept PJM's July 2021 Compliance Filing and August 2021 Supplemental Filing effective September 1, 2021.<sup>6</sup>

By direction of the Commission.

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Commission has stated on numerous occasions that the sole relevant issue in reviewing a compliance filing is whether it complies with the directions in the order requiring the compliance filing. *See Delmarva Power & Light Co.*, 63 FERC ¶ 61,321, at 63,160 (1993). *See also PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 168 FERC ¶ 61,134, at 61,753 (2019); *Sw. Power Pool, Inc.*, 163 FERC ¶ 61,010 (2018); *New York Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 127 FERC ¶ 61,042, at P 28 (2009); *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,302, at 62,264 (2002); *ISO New England, Inc.*, 91 FERC ¶ 61,016, at 61,060 (2000); *Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 80 FERC ¶ 61,376, at 62,271 (1997). We therefore find, without commenting on the substance of the Market Monitor's objections, that our consideration of this PJM compliance filing does not provide the appropriate forum for the Market Monitor to raise its concerns.

Document Content(s)

ER19-2722-005.docx.....1