TEAC Re-design

Lauren Strella & Christina Catalano
ARC Engineers
November 11, 2016
Preliminary PJM Identified Areas for Improvement

Communication Methods and Timing
- Evaluate existing & new communication technologies & methods
- Improve administration and coordination of direct stakeholder communications
- Improve channels for stakeholder feedback to PJM Decisional & Recommendation processes
- More dynamic communications with faster cycle times

RTEP Cycle Structure & Timeline
- Optimize to better accommodate competitive window process
- Reorganize to include new milestones for stakeholder communication & analytical schedules
- Examine current timing of TEAC reviews, PJM recommendation and PJM Board approvals

Quality Control Process
- Scenario & Assumption Phases
- Model and or Violation changes
- Model changes or Results Validation after the quality check
Stakeholder Identified Areas for Improvement

Confirm additional areas of TEAC Process that should be evaluated in redesign

- Shared education and build alignment on concepts
- Develop relative priorities and requirements
- Turn requirements over to PJM project teams for implementation
Goal

Embrace technologies that enable better business processes

- Understand stakeholder needs
- Greater focus on quality control
- More dynamic, frequent, auditable communication
- Promote enhanced transparency
Transparency
- Ensuring open communication and fairness of information.
- “Up-voting” and other interactivity can bring visibility to relevant/popular topics and issues.

Security
CEII/CIP information is kept confidential and secure.

Ease of Use
User-friendly to help efficient communication

Information Articles
Detailed information for self-help on key topics.

Alerts and Notifications
Follow topics of interest, receive updates, and enhance awareness

Tagging
Topic tracking through keyword searches.
Goal

Enhance RTEP Process, Improve Rule Enforcement, and Identify Legal Requirements

Improve Transparency for Members, Developers and Stakeholders through the TEAC

Quality Control of Results Going into Windows

Decisional Process Documentation
Window Revision Analysis

What
Analysis of updates that occurred after the opening of the window and led to violations being taken out of consideration or added to the window.

Why
Determine common reasons for updates and address issues.
**Flowgate**
Identified as part of a violation before opening of window

**Revision**
Changes to the open window as a result of new information becoming available

**Revised Flowgate**
A flowgate that is changed, removed from or added to the open window as a result of the new information
Perspective: Revision Timing

- **First & Second TO Reviews**
- **Modeling & Contingency Updates**
- **Analysis Verification**

**Case Build**

**Analysis**

**Quality Control Check**

**Open Window**

**Close Window**

- **Focus of Analysis**
- **2 weeks**
- **> 6 months** with TEAC communications
Sample Size

Years studied 2014-2016

Flowgates originally posted for studied windows 876

Windows studied 7 + addendums

Revised flowgates during studied windows 140 added/removed/changed
Total Flowgates vs. Number of Revised Flowgates

- Original Violations: 15.9%
- Flowgates Added, Removed, or Updated During Window (% of Revisions to Violations): 10.4%
Number of Days into Window when Revision was Made
(30-day Reliability Windows)

Revisions made on day 39 were after the close of 2014 Window 2
Reason for Revision

- Contingency update, 32%
- Modeling Error, 30%
- Radial Load, 24%
- Queue/Deactivation Related, 3%
- Terminal Equipment Limited, 1%
- TO Criteria, 2%
- Action/Scheme, 4%
- Admin, 4%

Note: Data excludes Market Efficiency
Questions/Feedback on Window Revision Analysis?
Next Steps

Continue to solicit stakeholder feedback on focus areas for redesign.

Present documentation of the decision making process at next Special PC.

Studying various technologies and determining which best meets the technology requirements.
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Objective

Review and refine existing 12 month RTEP Cycle

- Capture timing needs & interdependencies between pre-processing, analytical, and decisional phases
- Examine competitive window duration for the technical & commercial aspects of proposals

Build stakeholder consensus and develop Manual revisions

- Ensure changes are in place for 2018 RTEP Planning Cycle

Note

This effort will focus only on the RTEP 12-month Cycle

- Any changes to the RTEP 12-month cycle are envisioned to support the existing RPM, Market Efficiency and 24-month RTEP cycles
Revision History

- Nov 8, 2016 – Rev 0
- Nov 10, 2016 – Rev 1, added slides on Proposal Window flowgate revision analysis
Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation Type</th>
<th>Number of Violations</th>
<th>Number of Flowgates Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Efficiency</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>876</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>