



## Stakeholder Process for FERC Rejected Items

### Background

#### Original Driver / Issue to Address:

Two orders ER24-1387 (MCE) and ER24-98 (CIFP) were rejected by FERC.

- Neither filing resulted in compliance obligation for PJM.
- Both filings had what may be considered “guidance” from FERC.
- Both filings had items that were considered in previously stakeholder processes (The MIC and the CIFP).
  - And in the case of one of them, the original filing multiple market reforms.
- Both stakeholder processes had votes taken.
  - And in one case that vote was indicative.

At the MIC, PJM presented what they considered to be next steps. Stakeholders began to raise process concerns regarding how these previous discussions and solutions should be considered by the membership. Members across multiple sectors expressed the desire to discuss the next steps and consideration of all elements and solutions. As well as consideration of discussions that may be currently ongoing since the original filings were made, that may impact the going forward steps needed. PJM indicated that M34 was silent on the process for FERC rejected items.

#### Initial Sponsor:

Lynn Horning, AMP

#### Subgroup Members:

Lynn Horning (AMP), Juliet Anderson (Constellation), John Horstmann (AES), Rich Corash (PSEG), Heather Svenson (PSEG), Laurel Klingensmith (First Energy), Shawn Hurd (First Energy), Dave Scarpignato (Calpine), Alex Stern (Exelon), Dave Anders (PJM), and Michele Greening (PJM)

#### Seeks to Accomplish:

Stakeholder discussion considering stakeholder process changes that may be needed in the circumstance of a FERC rejection.

### Recommendation

**Proposed Recommendation:** Potential stakeholder process changes and corresponding Manual 34 revisions if necessary.



## Stakeholder Process for FERC Rejected Items