Joint and Common Market

5. CAPACITY DELIVERABILITY
**Issue Review**
- Reliability / Operational
- System Planning / Cost Allocation
- Deliverability Studies
- Existing Transmission Rights
- Modeling of Transmission Limitations
- TSR Processes
- Model Coordination

**Proposal Development**
- Develop proposals to resolve issues
- Solicit additional options from stakeholders
- Recommend options to implement
- Prioritize proposals

**Implementation**
- Develop implementation plans for prioritized proposals
PROPOSED INITIATIVES

- Coordination and alignment of deliverability analysis of external resources (short-term)
  - External resource deliverability analysis should be comparable to that of internal resources – completed, education sessions in 2012
  - Study processes, timelines and assumptions should be aligned – completed, proposals accepted in January, 2013
- Coordination and alignment of overall capacity deliverability analyses and market timelines (mid-term)
  - Coordination of models and assumptions used in load and generation deliverability analyses – in process, ongoing
  - Coordination of market timelines – next step?
- Joint deliverability analyses and capacity markets (long-term)
  - Conduct joint deliverability analyses – identifying issues
  - More extensive resource adequacy process coordination – identifying issues
## Capacity Deliverability Issue Tracking and Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Resolution/Next Steps</th>
<th>Status*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>External Resource Reliability Issues</td>
<td>External resource meet RA requirements in MISO and PJM without reliability impacts</td>
<td>Closed – 10/26/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BA needs dispatch control over external resources</td>
<td>ER currently meeting performance requirements in both RTO without direct dispatch control</td>
<td>Closed – 10/26/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not all generators can be used in one RTO for RA requirements in the other</td>
<td>MISO and PJM agree that there are transmission limitations; need to ensure such limitations continue to be enforced through capacity auction processes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resolving issue requires MISO and PJM to have the same capacity market designs</td>
<td>Capacity has and will continue to be transferred across the seam despite any market design differences</td>
<td>Closed – 10/26/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Requires common DA market</td>
<td>Capacity has an will continue to be transferred across the seam despite any market design differences – this issue may need to be revisited if joint deliverability analysis to the combined footprint is pursued; may need to explore options to enhance commitment coordination</td>
<td>Closed – 10/26/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Define physical transfer capability</td>
<td>Need to determine whether a process is necessary for calculating transfer capability; could leverage GETC process</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These issues and status were discussed and agreed to at the 10/26/2012 JCM meeting*
• Stakeholders to identify additional issues and provide documentation of the specifics to MISO and PJM
• Send issue documentation to:
  • Kevin Larson (klarson@misoenergy.org); and
  • Stu Bresler (bresler@pjm.com)
• MISO and PJM to collect and summarize issues for discussion at next JCM
• Develop proposals that resolve or minimize impacts of identified issues
• Prioritize proposal and develop work plans with due dates for each proposal
Capacity Deliverability Contacts
PJM: Stu Bresler (bresler@pjm.com)
MISO: Kevin Larson (klarson@misoenergy.org)