2024 Annual State of the Market Report for PJM

Information MC April 25, 2025

IMM



Market Monitoring Unit

- Monitoring Analytics, LLC
 - Independent company
 - Formed August 1, 2008
- Independent Market Monitor for PJM
 - Independent from Market Participants
 - Independent from RTO management
 - Independent from RTO board of managers
- MMU Accountability
 - To FERC (per FERC MMU Orders and MM Plan)
 - To PJM markets
 - To PJM Board for administration of the contract

Monitoring Analytics

Role of Market Monitoring

- Market monitoring is required by FERC Orders
- Role of competition under FERC regulation
 - Mechanism to regulate prices
 - Competitive outcome = just and reasonable
 - Competitive markets replace traditional regulation
- FERC has enforcement authority
- Relevant model of competition is not laissez faire
- Competitive outcomes are not automatic
- Competitive outcomes require effective market power mitigation rules.



Role of Market Monitoring

- Detailed rules required
- Detailed monitoring required:
 - Of participants
 - Of RTO
 - Of rules
- Market monitoring is primarily analytical
 - Adequacy of market rules
 - Compliance with market rules
 - Exercise of market power
 - Market manipulation



Role of Market Monitoring

- Market monitoring provides inputs to prospective mitigation
- Market monitoring provides retrospective mitigation
- Market monitoring provides information
 - To FERC
 - To state regulators
 - To market participants
 - To RTO





Market Monitoring Plan

- Monitor compliance with rules
 - Monitor the potential of market participants to exercise market power
 - Monitor for market manipulation
- Recommend changes to rules
 - Monitor actual or potential design flaws in rules
 - Monitor structural problems in the PJM market
- Report on market issues
 - State of the market reports
 - Other reports





PJM's footprint



©2025

7

Total Cost of Wholesale Power



PJM market summary statistics

2023	2024	Percent Change
92,455	94,787	2.5%
94,165	96,605	2.6%
152,797	154,045	0.8%
144,215	148,890	3.2%
178,253	179,656	0.8%
\$31.08	\$33.74	8.5%
\$1,068.60	\$1,754.40	64.2%
\$156.9	\$269.9	72.0%
\$48.50	\$51.74	6.7%
	92,455 94,165 152,797 144,215 178,253 \$31.08 \$1,068.60 \$156.9	92,45594,78794,16596,605152,797154,045144,215148,890178,253179,656\$31.08\$33.74\$1,068.60\$1,754.40\$156.9\$269.9



9

The energy market results were competitive

Market Element		Evaluatio	n	Market Design
Market Structure: Aggregat	e Market	Partially Competitive	9	
Market Structure: Local Ma	rket	Not Competitive	9	
Participant Behavior		Competitive	e	
Market Performance		Competitive	e	Effective
©2025 www.moni	toringanalytics.com	10	Monitoring Analytics	

Real-time load-weighted average LMP



Real-time load-weighted average LMP map



DA monthly and yearly load-weighted average LMP



DA load-weighted average LMP

	Day-Ahead Load	-Weighted Av	erage LMP		Year t	o Year Chang	ge
			Standard		Average		Standard
	Average	Median	Deviation	Average	Percent	Median	Deviation
2001	\$36.01	\$29.02	\$37.48	NA	NA	NA	NA
2002	\$31.80	\$26.00	\$20.68	(\$4.21)	(11.7%)	(10.4%)	(44.8%)
2003	\$41.43	\$38.29	\$21.32	\$9.63	30.3%	47.3%	3.1%
2004	\$42.87	\$41.96	\$16.32	\$1.44	3.5%	9.6%	(23.4%
2005	\$62.50	\$54.74	\$31.72	\$19.62	45.8%	30.4%	94.3%
2006	\$51.33	\$46.72	\$26.45	(\$11.16)	(17.9%)	(14.6%)	(16.6%
2007	\$57.88	\$55.91	\$25.02	\$6.55	12.8%	19.7%	(5.4%
2008	\$70.25	\$62.91	\$33.14	\$12.37	21.4%	12.5%	32.4%
2009	\$38.82	\$36.67	\$14.03	(\$31.43)	(44.7%)	(41.7%)	(57.7%
2010	\$47.65	\$42.06	\$20.59	\$8.83	22.7%	14.7%	46.8%
2011	\$45.19	\$39.66	\$24.05	(\$2.46)	(5.2%)	(5.7%)	16.8%
2012	\$34.55	\$31.84	\$15.48	(\$10.64)	(23.5%)	(19.7%)	(35.6%
2013	\$38.93	\$35.77	\$18.05	\$4.37	12.7%	12.3%	16.6%
2014	\$53.62	\$39.84	\$59.62	\$14.70	37.8%	11.4%	230.4%
2015	\$36.73	\$30.60	\$25.46	(\$16.89)	(31.5%)	(23.2%)	(57.3%
2016	\$29.68	\$27.00	\$11.64	(\$7.05)	(19.2%)	(11.8%)	(54.3%
2017	\$30.85	\$28.21	\$12.64	\$1.17	3.9%	4.5%	8.6%
2018	\$37.97	\$32.49	\$24.76	\$7.13	23.1%	15.2%	95.9%
2019	\$27.23	\$25.28	\$10.18	(\$10.74)	(28.3%)	(22.2%)	(58.9%
2020	\$21.40	\$19.78	\$7.59	(\$5.83)	(21.4%)	(21.7%)	(25.5%
2021	\$39.37	\$33.72	\$19.30	\$17.97	84.0%	70.5%	154.3%
2022	\$75.44	\$64.13	\$41.25	\$36.07	91.6%	90.2%	113.8%
2023	\$31.93	\$29.04	\$16.64	(\$43.51)	(57.7%)	(54.7%)	(59.7%
2024	\$33.79	\$28.37	\$21.75	\$1.86	5.8%	(2.3%)	30.7%



Components of RT load-weighted average LMP

	2023		2024		Change in
Element	Contribution to LMP	Percent	Contribution to LMP	Percent	Percen
Gas	\$13.60	43.7%	\$13.41	39.7%	(4.0%
Coal	\$4.49	14.4%	\$4.09	12.1%	(2.3%
Positive Markup	\$3.29	10.6%	\$3.56	10.6%	(0.0%
/ariable Maintenance	\$2.31	7.4%	\$3.18	9.4%	2.0%
Fransmission Constraint Penalty Factor	\$1.62	5.2%	\$3.01	8.9%	3.7%
Fen Percent Adder	\$1.95	6.3%	\$2.00	5.9%	(0.3%)
CO ₂ Cost	\$1.93	6.2%	\$1.94	5.8%	(0.5%)
/ariable Operations	\$1.10	3.5%	\$1.43	4.2%	0.7%
Ancillary Service Redispatch Cost	\$0.50	1.6%	\$1.33	3.9%	2.3%
Dpportunity Cost Adder	\$0.87	2.8%	\$1.24	3.7%	0.9%
Dil	\$0.31	1.0%	\$1.08	3.2%	2.2%
Market-to-Market	\$0.41	1.3%	\$0.34	1.0%	(0.3%
ncrease Generation Differential	\$0.13	0.4%	\$0.24	0.7%	0.3%
PA Rounding Difference	\$0.40	1.3%	\$0.18	0.5%	(0.8%
Scarcity	\$0.07	0.2%	\$0.17	0.5%	0.3%
NA	\$0.15	0.5%	\$0.09	0.3%	(0.2%
NO _x Cost	\$0.51	1.6%	\$0.09	0.3%	(1.4%
andfill Gas	\$0.06	0.2%	\$0.05	0.2%	(0.0%
Other	\$0.02	0.1%	\$0.02	0.0%	(0.0%
SO ₂ Cost	\$0.00	0.0%	\$0.00	0.0%	(0.0%
PA-SCED Differential	(\$0.00)	(0.0%)	(\$0.00)	(0.0%)	0.0%
Decrease Generation Differential	(\$0.01)	(0.0%)	(\$0.04)	(0.1%)	(0.1%
Renewable Energy Credits	(\$0.07)	(0.2%)	(\$0.07)	(0.2%)	0.0%
Negative Markup	(\$2.56)	(8.2%)	(\$3.58)	(10.6%)	(2.4%
Fotal	\$31.08	100.0%	\$33.74	100.0%	0.0%

Components of Change in RT load-weighted average LMP

Component	2023	2024	Change in LMP	Change
Fuel and Consumables	\$19.56	\$20.06	\$0.50	18.9%
Emission Related	\$3.24	\$3.19	(\$0.05)	(1.9%)
Market Power Related	\$4.99	\$5.16	\$0.16	6.2%
Scarcity	\$0.07	\$0.17	\$0.10	3.7%
Transmission Constraint Penalty Factor	\$1.62	\$3.01	\$1.39	52.4%
Ancillary Service Redispatch Cost	\$0.50	\$1.33	\$0.83	31.2%
Emergency Demand Response	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.0%
PJM Administrative Cap	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.0%
All Other	\$1.10	\$0.82	(\$0.28)	(10.6%)
Total Change	\$31.08	\$33.74	\$2.66	100.0%

Comparison of components of RT load-weighted average LMP in the dispatch run and pricing run

	Dispatch		Pricing		Change in
Element	Contribution to LMP	Percent	Contribution to LMP	Percent	Percent
Gas	\$12.57	40.1%	\$13.41	39.7%	(0.4%)
Coal	\$4.36	13.9%	\$4.09	12.1%	(1.8%)
Positive Markup	\$3.08	9.8%	\$3.56	10.6%	0.7%
Variable Maintenance	\$2.26	7.2%	\$3.18	9.4%	2.2%
Transmission Constraint Penalty Factor	\$2.90	9.3%	\$3.01	8.9%	(0.3%)
Ten Percent Adder	\$1.86	6.0%	\$2.00	5.9%	(0.0%)
CO ₂ Cost	\$1.99	6.4%	\$1.94	5.8%	(0.6%)
Variable Operations	\$1.39	4.4%	\$1.43	4.2%	(0.2%)
Ancillary Service Redispatch Cost	\$0.93	3.0%	\$1.33	3.9%	1.0%
Opportunity Cost Adder	\$1.09	3.5%	\$1.24	3.7%	0.2%
Oil	\$0.97	3.1%	\$1.08	3.2%	0.1%
Market-to-Market	\$0.47	1.5%	\$0.34	1.0%	(0.5%)
Increase Generation Differential	\$0.18	0.6%	\$0.24	0.7%	0.1%
LPA Rounding Difference	\$0.26	0.8%	\$0.18	0.5%	(0.3%)
Scarcity	\$0.20	0.6%	\$0.17	0.5%	(0.1%)
NA	\$0.10	0.3%	\$0.09	0.3%	(0.0%)
NO _x Cost	\$0.08	0.2%	\$0.09	0.3%	0.0%
Landfill Gas	\$0.06	0.2%	\$0.05	0.2%	(0.0%)
Other	\$0.02	0.1%	\$0.02	0.0%	(0.0%)
SO ₂ Cost	\$0.00	0.0%	\$0.00	0.0%	(0.0%)
LPA-SCED Differential	\$0.00	0.0%	(\$0.00)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
Decrease Generation Differential	(\$0.02)	(0.1%)	(\$0.04)	(0.1%)	(0.1%)
Renewable Energy Credits	(\$0.08)	(0.2%)	(\$0.07)	(0.2%)	0.0%
Negative Markup	(\$3.36)	(10.7%)	(\$3.58)	(10.6%)	0.1%
Total	\$31.31	100.0%	\$33.74	100.0%	0.0%
www.monitoringanaly		17	Monite	oring Analy	TICS

www.monitoringanarytics.com

17

Generation by fuel source (GWh)

		2023		2024		Change ir
		GWh	Percent	GWh	Percent	Output
Coal		120,876.1	14.7%	122,583.3	14.5%	1.4%
	Bituminous	108,651.3	13.2%	107,270.7	12.7%	(1.3%
	Sub Bituminous	6,428.1	0.8%	9,548.2	1.1%	48.5%
	Other Coal	5,796.7	0.7%	5,764.4	0.7%	(0.6%
Nuclear		273,488.6	33.3%	272,744.4	32.2%	(0.3%
Gas		363,659.7	44.3%	376,249.8	44.5%	3.5%
	Natural Gas CC	331,767.3	40.4%	340,951.1	40.3%	2.8%
	Natural Gas CT	21,077.7	2.6%	20,916.2	2.5%	(0.8%
	Natural Gas Other Units	9,570.7	1.2%	13,250.0	1.6%	38.49
	Other Gas	1,244.0	0.2%	1,132.6	0.1%	(9.0%
Hydroelectric		15,488.8	1.9%	16,001.4	1.9%	3.39
	Pumped Storage	6,096.5	0.7%	6,430.5	0.8%	5.5%
	Run of River	7,644.6	0.9%	7,624.6	0.9%	(0.3%
	Other Hydro	1,747.6	0.2%	1,946.3	0.2%	11.49
Wind		28,937.2	3.5%	31,384.5	3.7%	8.5%
Waste		3,992.6	0.5%	3,912.1	0.5%	(2.0%
Oil		2,676.7	0.3%	4,098.6	0.5%	53.19
	Heavy Oil	38.2	0.0%	156.8	0.0%	310.4%
	Light Oil	918.5	0.1%	2,188.2	0.3%	138.2%
	Diesel	40.4	0.0%	32.4	0.0%	(19.8%
	Other Oil	1,679.6	0.2%	1,721.2	0.2%	2.5%
Solar		11,097.7	1.4%	17,547.7	2.1%	58.1%
Battery		28.7	0.0%	51.7	0.0%	80.4%
Biofuel		1,265.0	0.2%	1,249.4	0.1%	(1.2%
Total		821,511.0	100.0%	845,823.0	100.0%	3.0%
					A Marilan	المراجع المراجع

Share of generation by fuel source

	Natural G	Bas Coal	Nuclear	Other Fuel T	уре
2008	7.	4% 54.9%	34.7%	3	8.0%
2009	10.	0% 50.3%	35.9%	3	8.7%
2010	11.	7% 49.3%	34.6%	4	.4%
2011	14.	1% 47.1%	34.5%	4	.3%
2012	18.	8% 42.1%	34.6%	4	.5%
2013	16.	7% 44.2%	34.8%	4	.3%
2014	17.	8% 43.3%	34.4%	4	.5%
2015	23.	0% 36.2%	35.5%	5	5.3%
2016	26.	5% 33.9%	34.4%	5	5.3%
2017	26.	8% 31.8%	35.6%	5	5.9%
2018	30.	6% 28.6%	34.2%	6	6.6%
2019	36.	2% 23.8%	33.6%	6	6.4%
2020	39.	6% 19.3%	34.2%	6	6.9%
2021	37.	7% 22.2%	32.8%	7	.4%
2022	39.	8% 20.0%	32.3%	7	. 9%
2023	44.	1% 14.7%	33.3%	7	.9%
2024	44.	3% 14.5%	32.2%	8	8.9%



Average short run marginal costs



Type of fuel used by RT marginal units





RT daily load



RT hourly average load and load plus exports

	PJM	Real-Time D				Year to Yea	ar Change	
	Loa	ad	Load Plus	s Exports	Lo	ad	Load Plus	s Exports
		Standard		Standard		Standard		Standard
	Load	Deviation	Demand	Deviation	Load	Deviation	Demand	Deviation
2001	30,297	5,873	32,165	5,564	NA	NA	NA	NA
2002	35,776	7,976	37,676	8,145	18.1%	35.8%	17.1%	46.4%
2003	37,395	6,834	39,380	6,716	4.5%	(14.3%)	4.5%	(17.5%)
2004	49,963	13,004	54,953	14,947	33.6%	90.3%	39.5%	122.6%
2005	78,150	16,296	85,301	16,546	56.4%	25.3%	55.2%	10.7%
2006	79,471	14,534	85,696	15,133	1.7%	(10.8%)	0.5%	(8.5%)
2007	81,681	14,618	87,897	15,199	2.8%	0.6%	2.6%	0.4%
2008	79,515	13,758	86,306	14,322	(2.7%)	(5.9%)	(1.8%)	(5.8%)
2009	76,034	13,260	81,227	13,792	(4.4%)	(3.6%)	(5.9%)	(3.7%)
2010	79,611	15,504	85,518	15,904	4.7%	16.9%	5.3%	15.3%
2011	82,541	16,156	88,466	16,313	3.7%	4.2%	3.4%	2.6%
2012	87,011	16,212	92,135	16,052	5.4%	0.3%	4.1%	(1.6%)
2013	88,332	15,489	92,879	15,418	1.5%	(4.5%)	0.8%	(3.9%)
2014	89,099	15,763	94,471	15,677	0.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%
2015	88,594	16,663	92,665	16,784	(0.6%)	5.7%	(1.9%)	7.1%
2016	88,601	17,229	93,551	17,498	0.0%	3.4%	1.0%	4.3%
2017	86,618	15,170	91,015	15,083	(2.2%)	(11.9%)	(2.7%)	(13.8%)
2018	90,308	15,982	94,351	16,142	4.3%	5.4%	3.7%	7.0%
2019	88,120	15,867	92,920	16,085	(2.4%)	(0.7%)	(1.5%)	(0.4%)
2020	84,584	16,016	90,059	16,233	(4.0%)	0.9%	(3.1%)	0.9%
2021	87,606	15,725	92,774	16,485	3.6%	(1.8%)	3.0%	1.6%
2022	88,884	15,689	94,301	16,047	1.5%	(0.2%)	1.6%	(2.7%)
2023	86,193	13,926	92,455	14,324	(3.0%)	(11.2%)	(2.0%)	(10.7%)
2024	89,274	15,630	94,787	15,766	3.6%	12.2%	2.5%	10.1%

Difference between DA and RT on peak and off peak hourly average load by month



DA and RT average LMP

		202	3			202	4	
				Percent of				Percent of
	Day-Ahead	Real-Time	Difference	Real-Time	Day-Ahead	Real-Time	Difference	Real-Time
Average	\$30.38	\$29.69	(\$0.69)	(2.3%)	\$31.41	\$31.32	(\$0.09)	(0.3%)
Median	\$27.98	\$25.80	(\$2.19)	(8.5%)	\$26.76	\$25.37	(\$1.39)	(5.5%)
Standard deviation	\$14.60	\$18.42	\$3.82	20.7%	\$19.40	\$24.84	\$5.44	21.9%
Peak average	\$36.01	\$35.13	(\$0.88)	(2.5%)	\$37.77	\$37.32	(\$0.45)	(1.2%)
Peak median	\$32.49	\$30.22	(\$2.28)	(7.5%)	\$32.26	\$30.17	(\$2.09)	(6.9%)
Peak standard deviation	\$17.12	\$21.87	\$4.75	21.7%	\$22.38	\$27.86	\$5.48	19.7%
Off peak average	\$25.51	\$24.97	(\$0.53)	(2.1%)	\$25.86	\$26.08	\$0.22	0.8%
Off peak median	\$23.68	\$21.85	(\$1.83)	(8.4%)	\$22.37	\$21.30	(\$1.07)	(5.0%)
Off peak standard deviation	\$9.64	\$13.08	\$3.44	26.3%	\$14.20	\$20.49	\$6.29	30.7%



Average number of pivotal suppliers (DA)



Average hourly estimated capacity (MW) failing the ICAP must offer requirement

Month	90th Percentile	Average	10th Percentile
Jan-24	2,434	1,785	1,228
Feb-24	2,099	1,659	1,307
Mar-24	3,396	2,815	2,409
Apr-24	2,251	1,700	1,188
May-24	3,323	2,513	1,803
Jun-24	3,314	2,238	1,343
Jul-24	3,394	2,325	1,357
Aug-24	2,885	1,865	806
Sep-24	3,272	2,322	985
Oct-24	3,476	2,726	2,034
Nov-24	3,950	2,498	920
Dec-24	3,910	2,983	2,054
2024	3,336	2,290	1,292
			1 I.u.

28

Monthly up to congestion cleared bids



Recommendations: Energy Market

• The MMU recommends, in order to ensure effective market power mitigation, that PJM commit all resources that fail the TPS test on their cost-based offers, that the Market Seller designate the cost-based offer if there is more than one, and that PJM implement this solution as soon as possible. (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)



Total energy uplift charges by category

	2023 Charges	2024 Charges		
Category	(Millions)	(Millions)	Change (Millions)	Percent Change
Day-Ahead Operating Reserves	\$49.7	\$114.7	\$65.0	130.7%
Balancing Operating Reserves	\$105.6	\$152.1	\$46.5	44.0%
Reactive Services	\$0.1	\$0.9	\$0.8	1,024.9%
Black Start Services	\$0.3	\$0.3	\$0.0	1.3%
Local Congestion Charges	\$0.6	\$1.3	\$0.7	121.7%
Total	\$156.3	\$269.3	\$113.0	72.3%
Energy Uplift as a Percent of Total PJM Billing	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	61.5%



Monthly energy uplift charges

	2023 Charges (Millions)						2024 Charges (Millions)					
	Day-Ahead	Balancing	Reactive Services	Local Congestion	Black Start Services	Total	Day- Ahead	Balancing	Reactive Services C	Local ongestion	Black Start Services	Total
Jan	\$1.7	\$5.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7.2	\$32.7	\$23.9	\$0.9	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$57.6
Feb	\$1.0	\$3.5	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$4.7	\$1.2	\$5.44	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$6.8
Mar	\$1.3	\$4.7	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$6.2	\$1.1	\$10.75	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$12.0
Apr	\$2.0	\$13.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$15.1	\$12.1	\$19.34	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$31.6
May	\$0.4	\$10.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$11.3	\$12.5	\$20.94	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$33.5
Jun	\$1.8	\$6.6	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$8.8	\$14.4	\$12.65	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$28.1
Jul	\$10.6	\$12.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$23.1	\$8.4	\$11.50	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$19.9
Aug	\$12.0	\$6.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$18.5	\$6.9	\$10.90	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$17.8
Sep	\$11.9	\$8.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$20.9	\$4.4	\$6.88	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$11.3
Oct	\$2.8	\$13.7	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$16.7	\$6.4	\$9.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$15.4
Nov	\$3.7	\$12.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$16.1	\$3.2	\$8.8	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$12.0
Dec	\$0.4	\$7.4	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7.9	\$11.3	\$12.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$23.4
Total	\$49.7	\$105.61	\$0.1	\$0.6	\$0.3	\$156.3	\$114.7	\$152.1	\$0.9	\$1.3	\$0.3	\$269.3
Share	31.8%	67.6%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	100.0%	42.6%	56.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.1%	100.0%

Uplift Concentration

- The data show that uplift is highly concentrated among a small subset of resources and owners, especially day ahead uplift.
- Most uplift is due to unit specific or location specific issues, rather than general market design issues.
- This was the case for the year 2024. The unit specific data for the year is published in the State of the Market Report.
- Uplift was also highly concentrated during the 2025 Polar Vortex, as shown by January 2025 uplift data.



Top 10 recipients of total uplift: 2024

				Share of Total Uplift
Rank	Unit Name	Zone	Total Uplift Credit	Credits
1	BC BRANDON SHORES 2 F	BGE	\$31,118,688	11.5%
2	BC BRANDON SHORES 1 F	BGE	\$22,184,006	8.2%
3	PEP CHALKPOINT 3 F	PEPCO	\$20,530,544	7.6%
4	PEP CHALKPOINT 4 F	PEPCO	\$13,474,563	5.0%
5	BC WAGNER 3 F	BGE	\$10,637,591	3.9%
6	BC WAGNER 4 F	BGE	\$7,883,568	2.9%
7	PL BRUNNER ISLAND 3 F	PPL	\$3,926,768	1.5%
8	BC WAGNER 1 F	BGE	\$2,429,167	0.9%
9	PL MARTINS CREEK 4 F	PPL	\$2,294,786	0.9%
10	DPL INDIAN RIVER 4 F	DPL	\$2,151,960	0.8%
Total of Top 1	0		\$116,631,640	43.2%
Total Uplift Cr	edits		\$269,850,402	100.0%





Recommendations: Energy Market Uplift

- The MMU recommends that PJM not pay uplift to units not following dispatch.
- The MMU recommends that self scheduled units not be paid energy uplift credits for their startup cost when the units are scheduled by PJM to start before the self scheduled hours.
- The MMU recommends reincorporating the use of net regulation revenues as an offset in the calculation of balancing generator credits.



Capacity market issues

- 2025/2026 BRA results: Parts A, B, C, D, E, F
- Issues for 26/27 BRA
- PJM ELCC issues
- DR
- CIRs/Interconnection queue
- Market power mitigation
- Reserve margin
- RMR issues (implied markup)
- Gas availability/dual fuel options




Recommendations: Capacity

- ELCC should be modified:
 - Unit specific; hourly
 - Recognize PJM commitment impact on performance data.
 - Winter thermal resource ratings
 - Weight summer and winter risk in a more balanced manner
 - Eliminate PAI risks
 - Pay for actual hourly performance.





Recommendations: Capacity

- Reference resource should be a CT.
- Must offer requirement for all capacity resources.
- RMR resources should be treated consistently.
- Max VRR price should be 1.5 * Net CONE.
- Capacity should be physical resources.



Installed capacity by fuel source

	01-Jan-2	24	31-May-2	24	01-Jun-2	24	31-Dec-2	24
	MW	Percent	MW	Percent	MW	Percent	MW	Percent
Battery	21.9	0.0%	21.9	0.0%	21.5	0.0%	21.5	0.0%
Coal	37,936.3	21.3%	38,013.1	21.5%	37,751.4	21.3%	37,793.7	21.0%
Gas	88,868.7	49.8%	88,815.5	50.3%	88,860.7	50.2%	88,760.5	49.4%
Hybird	10.2	0.0%	10.2	0.0%	9.3	0.0%	9.3	0.0%
Hydroelectric	7,507.2	4.2%	7,507.2	4.3%	7,673.1	4.3%	7,674.7	4.3%
Nuclear	32,183.0	18.0%	32,180.5	18.2%	32,180.5	18.2%	32,179.9	17.9%
Oil	4,295.6	2.4%	4,184.4	2.4%	3,865.1	2.2%	3,965.9	2.2%
Solar	3,603.3	2.0%	3,780.6	2.1%	4,279.2	2.4%	5,046.5	2.8%
Solid waste	627.4	0.4%	627.4	0.4%	627.4	0.4%	609.4	0.3%
Wind	3,321.4	1.9%	1,478.9	0.8%	1,717.1	1.0%	3,594.8	2.0%
Total	178,375.0	100.0%	176,619.7	100.0%	176,985.3	100.0%	179,656.2	100.0%



Wind and solar output during the top 100 load hours



Wind and solar output: 2024



©2025

Percent of installed capacity by fuel source



©2025

RPM reserve margin

		01-Jun-21	01-Jun-22	01-Jun-23	01-Jun-24	01-Jun-25	
Forecast peak load ICAP (MW)		149,482.9	149,263.6	149,382.2	151,631.1	153,883.0	A
FRR peak load ICAP (MW)		11,717.7	28,292.8	29,554.6	30,431.0	11,597.3	В
PRD ICAP (MW)		510.0	230.0	235.0	305.0	224.0	С
Installed reserve margin (IRM)		14.7%	14.9%	14.9%	17.7%	17.8%	D
Pool wide average EFORd		5.22%	5.08%	4.87%	5.10%		E
Pool wide accredited UCAP fact	or					79.69%	F
Forecast pool requirement (FPR)	1.0871	1.0906	1.0930	1.1170	0.9387	G=(1+D)*(1-E) or G=(1+D)*F
RPM committed less deficiency	UCAP (MW) (generation and DR)	156,633.6	137,944.8	136,401.8	138,318.6	134,224.2	Н
RPM committed less deficiency	ICAP (MW) (generation and DR)	165,260.2	145,327.4	143,384.6	145,751.9	168,432.9	J=H/(1-E) or J=H/F
RPM peak load ICAP (MW)		137,255.2	120,740.8	119,592.6	120,895.1	142,061.7	K=A-B-C
Reserve margin ICAP (MW)		28,005.0	24,586.6	23,792.0	24,856.9	26,371.2	L=J-K
Reserve margin (%)		20.4%	20.4%	19.9%	20.6%	18.6%	M=L/K
Reserve margin in excess of IRI	M ICAP (MW)	7,828.5	6,596.3	5,972.7	3,458.4	1,084.2	N=L-D*K
Reserve margin in excess of IRI	M (%)	5.7%	5.5%	5.0%	2.9%	0.8%	P=N/K
RPM peak load UCAP (MW)		130,090.5	114,607.2	113,768.4	114,729.4	113,209.0	Q=K*(1-E) or Q=K*F
RPM reliability requirement UCA	AP (MW)	149,210.1	131,679.9	130,714.7	135,039.8	133,353.3	R=K*G
Reserve margin UCAP (MW)		26,543.1	23,337.6	22,633.4	23,589.2	21,015.2	S=H-Q
Reserve cleared in excess of IR	M UCAP (MW)	7,423.5	6,264.9	5,687.1	3,278.8	870.9	T=H-R
Projected replacement capacity	UCAP (MW)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	U
Projected reserve margin		20.4%	20.4%	19.9%	20.6%	18.6%	V=(J-U/(1-E))/K-1 or V=(J-U/F)/K-1

Part V reliability service summary

Unit Names	Owner		ICAD (MW) Cost Baseyony Method	Dookot Numbere	Start of Tarm	End of Torm
		Fuel Type	ICAP (MW) Cost Recovery Method	Docket Numbers		
Brandon Shores 1	Talen Energy Corporation	Coal	635.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER24-1790	01-Jun-25	
Brandon Shores 2	Talen Energy Corporation	Coal	638.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER24-1790	01-Jun-25	31-Dec-28
Wagner 3	Talen Energy Corporation	Coal	305.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER24-1787	01-Jun-25	31-Dec-28
Wagner 4	Talen Energy Corporation	Oil	397.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER24-1787	01-Jun-25	31-Dec-28
Indian River 4	NRG Power Marketing LLC	Coal	410.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER22-1539	01-Jun-22	24-Feb-25
B.L. England 2	RC Cape May Holdings, LLC	Coal	150.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER17-1083	01-May-17	01-May-19
Yorktown 1	Dominion Virginia Power	Coal	159.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER17-750	06-Jan-17	13-Mar-18
Yorktown 2	Dominion Virginia Power	Coal	164.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER17-750	06-Jan-17	13-Mar-18
B.L. England 3	RC Cape May Holdings, LLC	Oil	148.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER17-1083	01-May-17	24-Jan-18
Ashtabula	FirstEnergy Service Company	Coal	210.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	11-Apr-15
Eastlake 1	FirstEnergy Service Company	Coal	109.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Eastlake 2	FirstEnergy Service Company	Coal	109.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Eastlake 3	FirstEnergy Service Company	Coal	109.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Lakeshore	FirstEnergy Service Company	Coal	190.0 Deactivation Avoidable Cost Rate	ER12-2710	01-Sep-12	15-Sep-14
Elrama 4	GenOn Power Midwest, LP	Coal	171.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER12-1901	01-Jun-12	01-Oct-12
Niles 1	GenOn Power Midwest, LP	Coal	109.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER12-1901	01-Jun-12	01-Oct-12
Cromby 2 and Diesel	Exelon Generation Company, LLC	Natural gas/oil, Diesel	203.7 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER10-1418	01-Jun-11	01-Jan-12
Eddystone 2	Exelon Generation Company, LLC	Coal	309.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER10-1418	01-Jun-11	01-Jun-12
Brunot Island CT2A, CT2B, CT3 and CC4	Orion Power MidWest, L.P.	Natural gas	244.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER06-993	16-May-06	05-Jul-07
Hudson 1	PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC and PSEG Fossil LLC	Natural gas	355.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER05-644, ER11-2688	25-Feb-05	08-Dec-11
Sewaren 1-4	PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC and PSEG Fossil LLC	Natural gas	453.0 Cost of Service Recovery Rate	ER05-644	25-Feb-05	01-Sep-08

Part V reliability service cost summary

			Initial Fili	ng	Actual		Weighted Average
				Cost per		Cost per	RPM Clearing Price
Unit Names	Owner		Total Cost	MW-day	Total Cost	MW-day	(\$ per MW-day)
Brandon Shores 1	Talen Energy Corporation		\$327,039,342	\$393.45	NA	NA	\$296.56
Brandon Shores 2	Talen Energy Corporation		\$328,584,409	\$393.45	NA	NA	\$296.56
Wagner 3	Talen Energy Corporation		\$64,791,528	\$162.29	NA	NA	\$296.56
Wagner 4	Talen Energy Corporation		\$84,335,202	\$162.29	NA	NA	\$296.56
Indian River 4	NRG Power Marketing LLC		\$357,065,662	\$871.76	\$167,337,698	\$431.89	\$54.04
B.L. England 2	RC Cape May Holdings, LLC		\$35,953,561	\$328.34	\$51,779,892	\$472.88	\$154.51
Yorktown 1	Dominion Virginia Power		\$9,739,434	\$142.12	\$8,427,011	\$122.97	\$134.64
Yorktown 2	Dominion Virginia Power		\$10,045,705	\$142.12	\$9,529,149	\$134.81	\$134.64
B.L. England 3	RC Cape May Holdings, LLC		\$28,710,481	\$723.84	\$10,058,665	\$253.60	\$138.95
Ashtabula	FirstEnergy Service Company		\$35,236,541	\$176.25	\$25,177,042	\$125.94	\$107.91
Eastlake 1	FirstEnergy Service Company		\$20,842,416	\$257.01	\$18,484,399	\$227.93	\$102.73
Eastlake 2	FirstEnergy Service Company		\$20,182,025	\$248.87	\$17,683,994	\$218.06	\$102.73
Eastlake 3	FirstEnergy Service Company		\$20,192,938	\$249.00	\$17,391,797	\$214.46	\$102.73
Lakeshore	FirstEnergy Service Company		\$33,993,468	\$240.47	\$20,532,969	\$145.25	\$102.73
Elrama 4	GenOn Power Midwest, LP		\$15,435,472	\$739.88	\$7,576,435	\$363.17	\$75.08
Niles 1	GenOn Power Midwest, LP		\$9,510,580	\$715.19	\$4,829,423	\$363.17	\$75.08
Cromby 2 and Diesel	Exelon Generation Company, LLC		\$20,213,406	\$463.70	\$17,776,658	\$407.80	\$108.63
Eddystone 2	Exelon Generation Company, LLC		\$165,993,135	\$1,467.74	\$85,364,570	\$754.81	\$108.63
Brunot Island CT2A, CT2B, CT3 and CC4	Orion Power MidWest, L.P.		\$60,933,986	\$601.76	\$23,507,795	\$232.15	\$89.78
Hudson 1	PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC and PSEG	Fossil LLC	\$28,934,341	\$32.90	\$62,364,359	\$70.92	\$132.72
Sewaren 1-4	PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC and PSEG	Fossil LLC	\$47,633,115	\$81.89	\$79,580,435	\$136.82	\$97.39

45



History of capacity prices: 1999/2000 through 2025/2026



Map of RPM capacity prices: 2022/2023 through 2025/2026









Monitoring Analytics

Nuclear unit surplus (shortfall)

	ICAP							Sur	plus (Sho	ortfall) (\$/	MWh)							
	(MW)	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Beaver Valley	1,808	\$26.3	\$6.3	\$10.5	\$8.8	(\$3.3)	\$1.4	\$11.7	\$3.2	(\$0.4)	\$2.6	\$13.9	\$3.7	(\$2.7)	\$15.0	\$42.4	\$2.1	\$12.0
Braidwood	2,337	\$24.9	\$2.5	\$6.4	\$3.4	(\$6.1)	(\$2.6)	\$7.2	(\$1.2)	(\$3.2)	(\$1.6)	\$5.9	\$3.9	(\$0.0)	\$15.1	\$35.0	(\$1.5)	\$10.3
Byron	2,300	\$24.5	(\$1.3)	\$3.4	(\$0.6)	(\$9.4)	(\$3.6)	\$4.9	(\$6.1)	(\$9.6)	(\$2.8)	\$5.8	\$3.2	(\$0.6)	\$14.1	\$34.5	(\$1.9)	\$10.6
Calvert Cliffs	1,726	\$60.6	\$20.9	\$28.6	\$17.9	\$4.5	\$14.6	\$31.6	\$14.1	\$7.2	\$6.1	\$16.3	\$5.4	(\$0.9)	\$19.4	\$54.6	\$9.1	\$13.5
Cook	2,177	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Davis Besse	894	NA	NA	NA	NA	(\$13.2)	(\$7.0)	\$6.6	(\$1.2)	(\$4.0)	(\$8.4)	(\$0.9)	(\$6.3)	(\$15.1)	\$5.9	\$31.6	(\$10.0)	(\$0.0)
Dresden	1,797	\$25.6	\$3.0	\$7.6	\$4.4	(\$5.2)	(\$1.0)	\$9.1	\$0.3	(\$1.6)	(\$0.1)	\$7.1	\$4.5	\$0.5	\$15.7	\$36.2	(\$2.1)	\$10.8
Hope Creek	1,172	\$54.0	\$17.0	\$24.5	\$16.9	\$2.6	\$12.4	\$26.0	\$6.3	(\$1.9)	\$1.6	\$12.3	\$8.8	\$7.8	\$21.0	\$48.0	\$6.9	\$11.7
LaSalle	2,265	\$24.8	\$2.5	\$6.4	\$3.3	(\$6.1)	(\$1.9)	\$7.7	(\$0.9)	(\$3.6)	(\$1.9)	\$6.0	\$3.7	(\$0.2)	\$14.8	\$34.7	(\$1.8)	\$10.0
Limerick	2,242	\$54.1	\$17.1	\$24.7	\$16.6	\$2.6	\$12.2	\$25.7	\$6.5	(\$2.1)	\$1.5	\$12.1	\$1.6	(\$2.6)	\$11.6	\$38.2	(\$3.3)	\$11.2
North Anna	1,892	\$52.0	\$14.6	\$25.5	\$16.8	\$0.2	\$5.7	\$23.2	\$10.9	\$3.0	\$4.7	\$16.0	\$4.8	(\$2.0)	\$17.9	NA	NA	NA
Oyster Creek	608	\$47.5	\$8.4	\$15.9	\$7.2	(\$8.2)	\$3.3	\$16.4	(\$4.7)	(\$11.6)	(\$9.9)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Peach Bottom	2,550	\$53.7	\$16.9	\$24.2	\$16.1	\$2.3	\$12.3	\$25.5	\$5.8	(\$2.2)	\$1.4	\$11.9	\$0.6	(\$2.8)	\$11.4	\$38.3	(\$3.3)	\$11.3
Perry	1,240	NA	NA	NA	NA	(\$13.2)	(\$6.4)	\$5.5	(\$0.3)	(\$4.0)	(\$7.4)	\$1.9	(\$5.9)	(\$15.2)	\$6.2	\$32.0	(\$9.3)	\$0.0
Quad Cities	1,819	\$24.1	(\$0.4)	\$2.4	(\$1.8)	(\$13.2)	(\$6.9)	\$0.6	(\$7.7)	(\$9.5)	(\$3.5)	\$4.3	\$18.8	\$14.4	\$29.4	\$51.3	\$14.4	\$12.1
Salem	2,285	\$54.0	\$17.1	\$24.5	\$16.9	\$2.6	\$12.4	\$26.0	\$6.2	(\$2.1)	\$1.5	\$12.2	\$8.5	\$7.5	\$20.7	\$47.6	\$6.6	\$11.4
Surry	1,676	\$48.8	\$13.8	\$24.2	\$16.4	(\$0.0)	\$5.1	\$21.6	\$10.8	\$2.6	\$4.5	\$16.0	\$4.2	(\$2.5)	\$17.4	NA	NA	NA
Susquehanna	2,494	\$46.8	\$15.2	\$22.4	\$16.1	\$1.4	\$11.1	\$24.6	\$6.3	(\$1.6)	\$1.8	\$10.1	(\$1.7)	(\$6.9)	\$8.3	\$35.9	(\$2.8)	\$10.7
Three Mile Island	803	\$40.7	\$6.5	\$13.3	\$4.6	(\$9.6)	\$0.9	\$13.7	(\$6.8)	(\$12.4)	(\$10.3)	(\$3.8)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA



Nuclear unit forward annual surplus (shortfall)

		(Shortfall) IWh)	Subsidy (\$/MWh)		Surplus (She Excluding Si (\$ in millio	ubsidy	Surplus (Shortfall) Including Subsidy (\$ in millions)		
	2025	2026	2025	2026	2025	2026	2025	2026	
Beaver Valley	\$21.18	\$31.80	\$0.00	\$8.30	\$319.1	\$479.0	\$319.1	\$604.0	
Braidwood	\$12.08	\$19.88	\$1.70	\$12.30	\$235.2	\$387.1	\$268.3	\$626.5	
Byron	\$10.22	\$20.64	\$3.20	\$12.05	\$195.8	\$395.5	\$257.1	\$626.4	
Calvert Cliffs	\$26.47	\$37.47	\$0.00	\$6.40	\$380.6	\$538.8	\$380.6	\$630.8	
Cook	NA	NA	\$2.60	\$0.00	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Davis Besse	\$6.71	\$17.63	\$0.00	\$9.00	\$50.0	\$131.3	\$50.0	\$198.3	
Dresden	\$11.67	\$22.24	\$2.05	\$11.45	\$174.7	\$332.9	\$205.4	\$504.3	
Hope Creek	\$17.29	\$27.38	\$4.17	\$1.60	\$168.8	\$267.3	\$209.5	\$282.9	
LaSalle	\$11.98	\$19.79	\$1.80	\$12.35	\$226.1	\$373.5	\$260.0	\$606.5	
Limerick	\$16.40	\$26.68	\$0.00	\$10.05	\$306.4	\$498.2	\$306.4	\$685.9	
North Anna	NA	\$31.23	\$0.00	\$10.75	NA	\$618.2	NA	\$787.7	
Peach Bottom	\$16.59	\$26.80	\$0.00	\$9.90	\$352.5	\$569.4	\$352.5	\$779.7	
Perry	\$10.12	\$20.91	\$0.00	\$7.90	\$104.5	\$216.0	\$104.5	\$297.6	
Quad Cities	\$8.16	\$18.65	\$16.50	\$16.50	\$123.6	\$282.6	\$373.7	\$532.6	
Salem	\$17.15	\$27.31	\$4.17	\$1.70	\$326.4	\$519.8	\$405.7	\$552.2	
Surry	NA	\$29.31	\$0.00	\$11.40	NA	\$520.8	NA	\$679.9	
Susquehanna	\$14.28	\$24.01	\$0.00	\$10.80	\$296.7	\$498.9	\$296.7	\$723.3	

49



Recommendations: Demand Response

- The MMU recommends that PJM report the response of demand capacity resources to dispatch by PJM as the actual change in load rather than simply the difference between the amount of capacity purchased by the customer and the actual metered load. The current approach significantly overstates the response to PJM dispatch.
- The MMU recommends that demand resources offering as supply in the capacity market be required to offer a guaranteed load drop (GLD) to ensure that demand resources provide an identifiable MW resource to PJM when called.



Recommendations: Demand Response

- The MMU recommends that PJM define when operators can and should call on demand resources, given that a call on demand resources no longer triggers a PAI.
- The MMU recommends that the ELCC for demand resources be based on measured response rather than assumption of perfect response.
- The MMU recommends that demand resources be required to provide their nodal location.
- The MMU recommends that measurement and verification methods for demand resources be modified to reflect compliance more accurately.

Demand response revenue by market



©2025

Energy efficiency resources (MW)

	EE Paid	Total RPM Cleared	EE MW/	
Delivery Year	(MW)	(UCAP MW)	Capacity MW	EE Revenue
2011/2012	76.4	134,182.6	0.1%	\$139,812
2012/2013	666.1	141,295.6	0.5%	\$11,408,552
2013/2014	904.2	159,844.5	0.6%	\$21,598,174
2014/2015	1,077.7	161,214.4	0.7%	\$42,308,549
2015/2016	1,189.6	173,845.5	0.7%	\$66,652,986
2016/2017	1,723.2	179,773.6	1.0%	\$68,709,670
2017/2018	1,922.3	180,590.5	1.1%	\$86,147,605
2018/2019	2,296.3	175,996.0	1.3%	\$103,105,796
2019/2020	2,528.5	177,064.2	1.4%	\$92,569,666
2020/2021	3,569.5	174,023.8	2.1%	\$101,348,169
2021/2022	4,806.2	174,713.0	2.8%	\$185,755,803
2022/2023	5,734.8	150,465.2	3.8%	\$135,265,303
2023/2024	5,896.4	150,143.9	3.9%	\$93,603,058
2024/2025	7,716.0	154,362.5	5.0%	\$130,780,274
2025/2026	1,459.8	135,684.0	1.1%	\$144,180,260



Recommendations: Planning

- The MMU recommends that PJM establish an expedited PJM managed queue process to identify commercially viable projects that could help eliminate or reduce the need for specific RMRs or that could address specific reliability needs and allow the identified projects to advance in the queue ahead of projects which have failed to make progress, subject to rules to prevent gaming. (Priority: High. Q2 2024. Status: Not adopted.)
- PJM's RRI option.



Recommendations: Planning

 The MMU recommends that the implementation of Grid Enhancing Technology (GET) be opened to competition from third parties, subject to NERC standards and guidelines, subject to review by NERC, PJM and the MMU, and approval by FERC. (Priority: Medium. Q2 2024. Status: Not adopted.)



Recommendations: Planning

The MMU recommends that all PJM transmission owners investigate the applicability and potential cost savings of Grid Enhancing Technology (GET) and that all PJM transmission owners implement cost effective GET, subject to NERC standards and guidelines, subject to review by NERC, PJM and the MMU, and approval by FERC. (Priority: Medium. Q2 2024. Status: Not adopted.)



Recommendations: Interchange

 The MMU recommends eliminating the mechanism that defines FFE and M2M payments. These mechanisms are not consistent with markets and are not needed for efficient interface pricing. The MMU recommends that PJM file with the Commission to eliminate the FFE calculation and M2M payment of the PJM and MISO joint operating agreement. (Priority: Medium. Q2 2024. Status: Not adopted.)



RT scheduled net interchange volume by interface (GWh)

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
CPLE	(60.5)	(11.3)	34.9	12.7	144.4	3.2	(7.7)	(19.0)	(2.9)	(11.5)	28.4	20.8	131.7
CPLW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.4	0.9	0.4	0.0	(0.1)	0.0	0.0	2.8
DUK	349.4	651.4	465.2	427.9	436.6	(215.9)	254.7	180.6	114.6	462.1	362.9	366.5	3,855.9
LGEE	(89.3)	(91.1)	(101.0)	(50.7)	(55.7)	(66.5)	(67.4)	(68.2)	(58.7)	(66.5)	(90.6)	(101.8)	(907.6)
MISO	(1,798.4)	(2,048.3)	(2,097.1)	(1,367.9)	(995.1)	(2,004.9)	(1,100.9)	(1,873.0)	(1,458.0)	(307.9)	(403.6)	(622.5)	(16,077.7)
ALTE	(495.5)	(508.9)	(613.7)	(409.0)	(221.7)	(435.2)	(230.4)	(335.9)	(123.7)	(38.9)	(45.7)	(80.0)	(3,538.6)
ALTW	(19.3)	(28.7)	(46.7)	(45.4)	(36.7)	(83.9)	(4.3)	(29.6)	1.4	11.7	9.6	(6.6)	(278.6)
AMIL	204.0	51.9	117.3	257.5	104.7	(16.8)	138.0	44.0	84.3	238.7	308.2	349.4	1,881.1
CIN	(696.8)	(699.5)	(626.0)	(485.4)	(235.5)	(573.7)	(370.2)	(625.0)	(451.1)	(13.0)	(160.6)	(347.9)	(5,284.6)
CWLP	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
IPL	3.4	(3.6)	(5.4)	(16.5)	(11.7)	(27.0)	(7.3)	(11.5)	(22.9)	(7.2)	(25.7)	19.0	(116.5)
MEC	(464.9)	(492.9)	(467.6)	(487.3)	(500.1)	(490.9)	(446.5)	(542.0)	(532.1)	(396.0)	(426.8)	(517.6)	(5,764.6)
MECS	(228.7)	(263.7)	(329.7)	(107.8)	(55.0)	(227.0)	(68.8)	(237.4)	(217.1)	9.8	22.8	140.9	(1,561.6)
NIPS	(0.5)	(1.2)	(0.5)	(0.4)	(0.8)	(17.5)	(40.5)	(52.6)	(100.2)	(77.1)	(88.7)	(100.1)	(480.1)
WEC	(100.1)	(101.6)	(125.0)	(73.6)	(38.2)	(132.9)	(71.0)	(82.9)	(96.6)	(35.8)	3.2	(79.5)	(934.2)
NYISO	(2,222.8)	(1,824.3)	(1,748.7)	(1,131.4)	(1,127.8)	(1,695.8)	(1,693.2)	(1,841.0)	(1,620.1)	(1,628.7)	(1,657.4)	(2,177.3)	(20,368.4)
HUDS	(416.4)	(375.4)	(369.0)	(213.4)	(173.4)	(284.1)	(334.1)	(387.4)	(277.0)	(224.3)	(209.3)	(171.7)	(3,435.4)
LIND	(235.4)	(221.1)	(235.1)	(145.9)	(213.2)	(210.3)	(210.3)	(222.7)	(225.2)	(237.4)	(175.1)	(237.8)	(2,569.5)
NEPT	(491.9)	(465.7)	(499.0)	(471.8)	(391.9)	(470.2)	(494.9)	(497.6)	(337.0)	(496.6)	(425.1)	(493.5)	(5,535.2)
NYIS	(1,079.1)	(762.0)	(645.7)	(300.3)	(349.3)	(731.1)	(653.8)	(733.3)	(780.9)	(670.4)	(848.0)	(1,274.3)	(8,828.3)
TVA	17.1	229.3	153.7	79.2	92.8	(118.4)	(187.0)	(196.5)	(76.1)	326.4	120.5	230.3	671.3
Total	(3,804.4)	(3,094.3)	(3,293.1)	(2,030.1)	(1,503.8)	(4,097.8)	(2,800.5)	(3,816.7)	(3,101.2)	(1,226.2)	(1,639.8)	(2,284.0)	(32,692.0)



New Recommendations: Reserve Markets

- The MMU recommends that to minimize lag, PJM use an electronic synchronized reserve event notification process for all resources and that all resources be required to have the ability to receive and respond to the notifications. (Priority: Medium. First reported 2023. Status: Partially adopted December 17, 2024.)
- The MMU recommends that PJM remove the 30 percent increase to the synchronized reserve reliability requirement. (Priority: High. New recommendation. Status: Not adopted.)



The synchronized reserve market results were not competitive

Market Eleme	nt	Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structur	e: Regional Markets	Not Competitive	
Participant Beh	avior	Competitive	
Market Perform	nance	Not Competitive	Flawed
©2025	www.monitoringanalytics.com	61	Monitoring Analytics

Daily average RT reserve products cleared and daily average RT reserve service requirements used by RT SCED: 2024



©2025

Daily average market clearing prices for synchronized reserve and nonsynchronized reserve



Recommendations: Ancillary Services

- The procurement for fuel assured black start units should be reevaluated in order to prevent overpayment and double procurement of fuel assured resources.
- Use of Net CONE in payment for black start base formula rate.



The regulation market results were not competitive

Market Element	Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structure	Not Competitive	
Participant Behavior	Competitive	
Market Performance	Not Competitive	Flawed
©2025 www.monito	ringanalytics.com 65	Monitoring Analytics

Black start revenue requirement charges

	Revenue Requirement		
Year	Charges	Uplift Charges	Total
2010	\$11,490,379	\$0	\$11,490,379
2011	\$13,695,331	\$0	\$13,695,331
2012	\$18,749,617	\$8,384,651	\$27,134,269
2013	\$20,874,535	\$86,701,561	\$107,576,097
2014	\$26,945,112	\$32,906,733	\$59,851,845
2015	\$56,425,648	\$5,175,644	\$61,601,292
2016	\$69,376,257	\$279,017	\$69,655,275
2017	\$69,258,169	\$257,174	\$69,515,342
2018	\$64,439,926	\$294,753	\$64,734,679
2019	\$64,327,918	\$226,014	\$64,553,932
2020	\$64,643,080	\$230,754	\$64,873,834
2021	\$67,694,868	\$316,437	\$68,011,305
2022	\$68,110,179	\$476,876	\$68,587,055
2023	\$66,950,499	\$323,028	\$67,273,527
2024	\$73,515,489	\$326,675	\$73,842,164
			•



Reactive service charges and capability charges

	Reactive Service Charges	Reactive Capability Charges	Total
2010	\$69,314,376	\$241,994,431	\$311,308,807
2011	\$44,568,672	\$255,910,059	\$300,478,731
2012	\$76,100,839	\$272,864,535	\$348,965,374
2013	\$312,640,950	\$276,918,698	\$589,559,649
2014	\$29,560,453	\$280,840,576	\$310,401,029
2015	\$10,543,187	\$276,567,702	\$287,110,889
2016	\$2,498,279	\$294,389,603	\$296,887,882
2017	\$20,379,379	\$302,704,116	\$323,083,495
2018	\$13,183,120	\$303,465,206	\$316,648,326
2019	\$570,589	\$329,215,657	\$329,786,246
2020	\$428,629	\$345,647,272	\$346,075,901
2021	\$909,343	\$364,007,391	\$364,916,734
2022	\$1,513,558	\$384,991,729	\$386,505,287
2023	\$609,938	\$388,451,473	\$389,061,411
2024	\$1,500,424	\$379,153,040	\$380,653,464
www.monitori	nganalytics.com	67	Monitoring Ar

Recommendations: FTR/ARR

 Rights to all congestion revenues should be assigned to load.



The FTR/ARR markets results were partially competitive

Market Element	Evaluation	Market Design
Market Structure	Competitive	
Participant Behavior	Partially Competitive	
Market Performance	Partially Competitive	Flawed
©2025 www.monitoringanalytics.	com 69 Monitoring	g Analytics

Total congestion costs (Dollars (Millions))

	Conge	stion Cost	Percent Change	Total PJM Billing	Percent of PJM Billing
2008	Conge	\$2,052	NA	\$34,300	6.0%
2009		\$719	(65.0%)	\$26,550	2.7%
2010		\$1,423	98.0%	\$34,770	4.1%
2011		\$999	(29.8%)	\$35,890	2.8%
2012		\$529	(47.0%)	\$29,180	1.8%
2013		\$677	28.0%	\$33,860	2.0%
2014		\$1,932	185.5%	\$50,030	3.9%
2015		\$1,385	(28.3%)	\$42,630	3.2%
2016		\$1,024	(26.1%)	\$39,050	2.6%
2017		\$698	(31.9%)	\$40,170	1.7%
2018		\$1,310	87.8%	\$49,790	2.6%
2019		\$583	(55.5%)	\$41,690	1.4%
2020		\$529	(9.4%)	\$36,300	1.5%
2021		\$995	88.2%	\$54,100	1.8%
2022		\$2,501	151.3%	\$86,240	2.9%
2023		\$1,069	(57.3%)	\$48,500	2.2%
2024		\$1,754	64.2%	\$51,740	3.4%
		1.4	70		Monitoring Analyti

ARR and self scheduled FTR total congestion offset (in millions) for ARR holders: 2011/2012 through 2024/2025 planning periods

					Revenue				Pre 2017 (Without Ba		2017/2018 Balanc	3 (With	Post 2017/20 Balancin Surple	g and	Effective (Offset
		Unadjusted		Balancing +	Revenue	Surplus Revenue		Post	、 		Current		New		Elicoure	71301
Planning	ARR	SS FTR		M2M	Total		Surplus Revenue	2017/2018	-	Percent	Revenue	Percent		New		
Period	Credits	Credits	Congestion	Congestion	Congestion	Rules	2017/2018 Rules	Rules	Offset	Offset	Received	Offset	Received	Offset	Revenue	Offset
2011/2012	\$515.6	\$310.0	\$1,025.4	(\$275.7)	\$749.7	(\$50.6)	\$35.6	\$113.9	\$775.0	103.4%	\$585.5	78.1%	\$663.8	88.5%	\$775.0	103.4%
2012/2013	\$356.4	\$268.4	\$904.7	(\$379.9)	\$524.8	(\$94.0)	\$18.4	\$62.1	\$530.7	101.1%	\$263.2	50.2%	\$306.9	58.5%	\$530.7	101.1%
2013/2014	\$339.4	\$626.6	\$2,231.3	(\$360.6)	\$1,870.6	(\$139.4)	(\$49.0)	(\$49.0)	\$826.5	44.2%	\$556.3	29.7%	\$556.3	29.7%	\$826.5	44.2%
2014/2015	\$487.4	\$348.1	\$1,625.9	(\$268.3)	\$1,357.6	\$36.7	\$111.2	\$400.6	\$872.2	64.2%	\$678.4	50.0%	\$967.8	71.3%	\$872.2	64.2%
2015/2016	\$641.8	\$209.2	\$1,098.7	(\$147.6)	\$951.1	\$9.2	\$42.1	\$188.9	\$860.2	90.4%	\$745.5	78.4%	\$892.3	93.8%	\$860.2	90.4%
2016/2017	\$648.1	\$149.9	\$885.7	(\$104.8)	\$780.8	\$15.1	\$36.5	\$179.0	\$813.1	104.1%	\$729.6	93.4%	\$872.1	111.7%	\$813.1	104.1%
2017/2018	\$429.6	\$212.3	\$1,322.1	(\$129.5)	\$1,192.6	\$52.3	\$80.4	\$370.7	\$694.2	58.2%	\$592.8	49.7%	\$883.1	74.1%	\$592.8	49.7%
2018/2019	\$531.6	\$130.1	\$832.7	(\$152.6)	\$680.0	(\$5.8)	\$16.2	\$112.2	\$655.87	96.4%	\$525.3	77.2%	\$621.3	91.4%	\$621.3	91.4%
2019/2020	\$547.6	\$91.9	\$612.1	(\$169.4)	\$442.7	(\$1.6)	\$21.6	\$157.8	\$637.9	144.1%	\$491.7	111.1%	\$627.9	141.8%	\$627.9	141.8%
2020/2021	\$392.7	\$179.9	\$899.6	(\$256.2)	\$643.4	(\$43.2)	(\$0.0)	(\$0.0)	\$529.31	82.3%	\$316.4	49.2%	\$316.4	49.2%	\$316.4	49.2%
2021/2022	\$469.7	\$500.5	\$2,069.2	(\$457.4)	\$1,611.8	(\$104.6)	(\$2.9)	(\$2.9)	\$865.6	53.7%	\$509.9	31.6%	\$509.9	31.6%	\$509.9	31.6%
2022/2023	\$998.7	\$630.0	\$2,223.5	(\$526.5)	\$1,697.1	(\$80.6)	\$65.1	\$235.2	\$1,548.2	91.2%	\$1,167.4	68.8%	\$1,337.5	78.8%	\$1,337.5	78.8%
2023/2024	\$912.1	\$371.4	\$1,618.9	(\$327.0)	\$1,291.9	(\$44.1)	\$24.6	\$117.2	\$1,239.4	95.9%	\$981.2	76.0%	\$1,073.7	83.1%	\$1,073.7	83.1%
2024/2025*	\$552.4	\$283.7	\$1,352.1	(\$185.4)	\$1,166.8	(\$35.6)	\$0.2	\$0.9	\$800.5	68.6%	\$650.9	55.8%	\$651.7	55.9%	\$651.7	55.9%
Total	\$7,823.0	\$4,312.1	\$18,701.8	(\$3,740.9)	\$14,960.9	(\$486.3)	\$400.0	\$1,886.6	\$11,648.8	77.9%	\$8,794.1	58.8%	\$10,280.8	68.7%	\$10,409.0	69.6%

*First seven months of the 2024/2025 planning period



Zonal ARR and self scheduled FTR total congestion offset (in millions) for ARR holders: 2024/2025 planning period

		Adjusted	Balancing+	Surplus		Day Ahead	Balancing		Total	
Zone	ARR Credits	FTR Credits	M2M Charge	Allocation	Total Offset	Congestion	Congestion	M2M Payments	Congestion	Offset
ACEC	\$2.6	(\$0.0)	(\$2.34)	\$0.0	\$0.2	\$13.8	(\$2.2)	(\$0.2)	\$11.5	1.7%
AEP	\$41.8	\$32.2	(\$28.0)	\$0.1	\$46.0	\$218.8	(\$25.8)	(\$2.2)	\$190.7	24.1%
APS	\$37.2	\$22.8	(\$12.6)	\$0.1	\$47.5	\$93.4	(\$11.8)	(\$0.8)	\$80.8	58.8%
ATSI	\$35.8	\$0.6	(\$14.4)	\$0.0	\$22.1	\$115.2	(\$13.2)	(\$1.2)	\$100.8	22.0%
BGE	\$82.8	\$10.7	(\$7.2)	\$0.1	\$86.4	\$56.3	(\$6.6)	(\$0.5)	\$49.2	175.8%
COMED	\$32.4	\$0.0	(\$18.6)	\$0.0	\$13.8	\$174.1	(\$17.0)	(\$1.6)	\$155.5	8.9%
DAY	\$7.3	\$1.0	(\$3.8)	\$0.0	\$4.5	\$27.3	(\$3.5)	(\$0.3)	\$23.4	19.3%
DOM	\$44.6	\$186.9	(\$28.1)	\$0.0	\$203.4	\$193.7	(\$25.9)	(\$2.2)	\$165.7	122.8%
DPL	\$46.7	\$13.2	(\$5.1)	\$0.0	\$54.8	\$54.2	(\$4.8)	(\$0.3)	\$49.2	111.5%
DUKE	\$27.1	\$0.8	(\$5.8)	\$0.2	\$22.3	\$38.4	(\$5.4)	(\$0.5)	\$32.6	68.5%
DUQ	\$6.9	\$0.2	(\$3.0)	\$0.1	\$4.2	\$18.3	(\$2.8)	(\$0.2)	\$15.3	27.6%
EKPC	\$4.7	\$0.0	(\$3.0)	\$0.0	\$1.7	\$21.6	(\$2.8)	(\$0.2)	\$18.6	9.1%
EXT	\$0.4	\$0.0	(\$3.9)	\$0.0	(\$3.5)	\$19.0	(\$3.9)	\$0.0	\$15.1	(23.2%)
JCPLC	\$5.4	\$0.0	(\$6.2)	\$0.0	(\$0.8)	\$37.3	(\$5.8)	(\$0.4)	\$31.1	(2.7%)
MEC	\$13.4	\$0.6	(\$4.8)	\$0.0	\$9.2	\$22.6	(\$4.6)	(\$0.3)	\$17.8	51.4%
OVEC	\$0.0	\$0.0	(\$0.2)	\$0.0	(\$0.2)	\$2.0	(\$0.2)	(\$0.0)	\$1.8	(12.2%)
PE	\$24.6	\$6.2	(\$4.0)	\$0.0	\$26.8	\$28.6	(\$3.8)	(\$0.3)	\$24.6	109.3%
PECO	\$17.0	(\$0.1)	(\$8.8)	\$0.0	\$8.2	\$51.6	(\$8.1)	(\$0.7)	\$42.8	19.1%
PEPCO	\$33.9	\$6.2	(\$6.6)	\$0.0	\$33.5	\$46.6	(\$6.1)	(\$0.5)	\$40.0	83.8%
PPL	\$38.8	\$2.1	(\$8.8)	\$0.0	\$32.2	\$60.0	(\$8.1)	(\$0.7)	\$51.2	62.8%
PSEG	\$47.2	\$0.3	(\$9.7)	\$0.0	\$37.7	\$56.7	(\$9.0)	(\$0.8)	\$47.0	80.4%
REC	\$1.9	\$0.0	(\$0.3)	\$0.0	\$1.5	\$2.6	(\$0.3)	(\$0.0)	\$2.2	68.3%
Total	\$552.4	\$283.7	(\$185.4)	\$0.9	\$651.7	\$1,352.1	(\$171.5)	(\$13.9)	\$1,166.8	55.9%

Offset available to load if all ARRs are held: 2022/2023 through 2024/2025 planning periods

	2	2/23 Plannin	g Period		2	3/24 Planni	ng Period		24/25 Planning Period*				
			Bal+M2M	Congestion+		Bal+M2M Congestion+							
	ARR Held TA	Charges	M2M	Offset	ARR Held TA	Charges	M2M	Offset	ARR Held TA	Charges	M2M	Offset	
ACEC	\$3.8	(\$6.2)	\$16.3	(14.6%)	\$4.9	(\$3.8)	\$10.8	9.7%	\$2.6	(\$2.3)	\$11.5	2.3%	
AEP	\$187.1	(\$79.3)	\$274.1	39.3%	\$185.2	(\$50.4)	\$201.8	66.8%	\$93.2	(\$28.0)	\$190.7	34.2%	
APS	\$104.0	(\$31.4)	\$105.8	68.6%	\$85.5	(\$22.4)	\$87.6	72.1%	\$53.9	(\$12.6)	\$80.8	51.1%	
ATSI	\$39.6	(\$40.7)	\$133.1	(0.8%)	\$50.3	(\$25.6)	\$99.4	24.8%	\$36.3	(\$14.4)	\$100.8	21.7%	
BGE	\$151.5	(\$19.4)	\$68.4	193.2%	\$145.8	(\$12.5)	\$44.4	300.4%	\$89.7	(\$7.2)	\$49.2	167.9%	
COMED	\$42.4	(\$56.2)	\$182.5	(7.5%)	\$44.9	(\$31.4)	\$215.9	6.3%	\$32.4	(\$18.6)	\$155.5	8.9%	
DAY	\$9.9	(\$10.8)	\$32.4	(2.7%)	\$13.3	(\$6.7)	\$23.7	27.7%	\$8.0	(\$3.8)	\$23.4	17.8%	
DOM	\$218.5	(\$85.5)	\$270.1	49.3%	\$642.0	(\$52.0)	\$181.8	324.6%	\$249.1	(\$28.1)	\$165.7	133.4%	
DPL	\$95.3	(\$13.7)	\$64.6	126.3%	\$69.6	(\$8.4)	\$51.2	119.7%	\$53.4	(\$5.1)	\$49.2	98.3%	
DUKE	\$48.7	(\$16.9)	\$51.7	61.5%	\$52.1	(\$10.3)	\$37.7	110.9%	\$28.8	(\$5.8)	\$32.6	70.5%	
DUQ	\$11.2	(\$8.3)	\$18.5	15.8%	\$8.6	(\$5.2)	\$15.1	22.5%	\$7.1	(\$3.0)	\$15.3	26.7%	
EKPC	\$6.8	(\$8.4)	\$27.2	(5.6%)	\$6.5	(\$5.7)	\$20.6	4.0%	\$4.7	(\$3.0)	\$18.6	9.1%	
EXT	\$0.0	(\$12.7)	\$28.9	(43.8%)	\$1.9	(\$9.6)	\$26.4	(29.1%)	\$0.7	(\$3.9)	\$15.1	(20.9%)	
JCPLC	\$7.6	(\$16.3)	\$53.0	(16.4%)	\$4.6	(\$10.4)	\$32.4	(18.1%)	\$5.4	(\$6.2)	\$31.1	(2.7%)	
MEC	\$50.1	(\$11.2)	\$32.4	119.6%	\$34.2	(\$6.7)	\$21.8	126.3%	\$14.2	(\$4.8)	\$17.8	52.4%	
OVEC	NA	(\$0.5)	\$3.3	(15.4%)	(\$0.0)	(\$0.4)	\$2.1	(19.1%)	\$0.0	(\$0.2)	\$1.8	(12.2%)	
PE	\$28.5	(\$10.8)	\$35.3	50.2%	\$22.2	(\$6.5)	\$28.3	55.6%	\$29.2	(\$4.0)	\$24.6	102.5%	
PECO	\$36.6	(\$24.0)	\$74.9	16.8%	\$21.2	(\$14.9)	\$42.3	14.8%	\$17.5	(\$8.8)	\$42.8	20.3%	
PEPCO	\$76.3	(\$17.9)	\$61.0	95.8%	\$65.4	(\$11.6)	\$38.3	140.7%	\$38.2	(\$6.6)	\$40.0	79.1%	
PPL	\$151.0	(\$28.2)	\$83.7	146.6%	\$80.0	(\$15.6)	\$57.9	111.2%	\$39.9	(\$8.8)	\$51.2	60.8%	
PSEG	\$103.5	(\$27.1)	\$75.4	101.4%	\$69.3	(\$16.4)	\$50.3	105.0%	\$47.6	(\$9.7)	\$47.0	80.5%	
REC	\$0.9	(\$0.9)	\$4.5	(1.0%)	\$2.7	(\$0.6)	\$2.2	98.8%	\$1.8	(\$0.3)	\$2.2	65.8%	
Total	\$1,373.4	(\$526.4)	\$1,697.1	49.9%	\$1,610.1	(\$327.0)	\$1,291.9	99.3%	\$853.6	(\$185.4)	\$1,166.8	57.3%	

* First seven months of the 2024/2025 planning period



Top 5 and bottom 5 FTR profits by ownership type: June through December, 2024/2025

					Top 5 Profit Share				Bottom 5 Loss Share
				Top 5	Among			Bottom 5	Among
		Top 5	Top 5	Market Share	Profitable	Bottom 5	Bottom 5	Market Share	Unprofitable
Organization Type	Total MWh	Profit	Profit/MWh	in MWh	Participants	Loss	Loss/MWh	in MWh	Participants
Financial	2,375,554,547	\$151,514,758	\$0.29	22.0%	38.5%	(\$5,476,760)	(\$0.21)	1.1%	54.0%
Physical	464,184,898	\$88,429,300	\$0.46	41.4%	56.9%	(\$8,061,720)	(\$0.25)	6.9%	67.5%
Physical ARR	173,950,948	\$17,703,080	\$0.37	27.4%	75.8%	(\$30,132,228)	(\$0.34)	51.0%	93.4%
All	3,013,690,392	\$163,607,634	\$0.38	14.2%	28.6%	(\$32,593,178)	(\$0.30)	3.6%	60.0%



Monitoring Analytics, LLC 2621 Van Buren Avenue Suite 160 Eagleville, PA 19403 (610) 271-8050

MA@monitoringanalytics.com www.MonitoringAnalytics.com





