



Proposal for Pro Forma Dynamic Schedule Agreement



Phil D'Antonio
Manager, Interregional Market Ops
Operating Committee
July 11, 2017



Types of transactions into PJM

Type of transaction	Tag?	Granularity	Similar to an internal generator?	Subject to tag curtailments?
Dynamic Schedules	Yes	Dynamic	No	Yes
Pseudo Ties	No	Dynamic	Yes	No

- No FERC-approved standard agreement for use to request and implement a Dynamic Schedule
- Lack of a standard agreement resulted in multiple variations of agreement for each different Dynamic Schedule, or no agreement
- Lack of uniformity among the requirements for the Dynamic Schedules
- Allows for confusion as to the appropriate operating procedure for Dynamic Schedules when they may all vary slightly

- Standard pro-forma Dynamic Schedule agreement approved by FERC
 - Standard set of applicable rules
 - Transparency up front regarding requirements
 - Modeled after pseudo-tie agreement, but changes made that are specific to dynamic schedules versus pseudo-ties
- Require agreement by PJM and entity seeking to dynamically schedule
- Only require Native BA to acknowledge aware of dynamic schedule since Native BA is still operationally responsible for the dynamically scheduled resource
- Consistency

- Process may take longer because agreement required
- Dynamic Schedules will only be implemented if they satisfy PJM's requirements, and after the entity seeking to dynamically schedule signs the agreement
- Requesting party knows in advance of the requirements and presumably this will lead to better decision-making with respect to whether to pursue a Dynamic Schedule

- Operating Committee
 - First read – July 2017
 - Second read and vote – August 2017
 - Vote – August 2017
- Markets and Reliability Committee
 - First read – August 2017
 - Second read and vote – September 2017
- Members Committee
 - Vote – October 2017
- FERC Filing – November 2017

