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## Summary

- The IMM appears to misunderstand how PJM's current netting rules are applied and how their proposed rules would impact FTR settlements
- The IMM states ${ }^{1}$ :
- On a portfolio basis, selling an FTR should be the same as buying a counter flow for the same quantity
- Under current rules, this is not true
- Under proposed rules, this becomes true
- Selling an FTR should have the same economic impact as buying a counterflow FTR of the same quantity
- Under the current rules this is always true
- Under the IMM's proposed rules this would be false, unless funding were 100\%


## Example

## Assumptions:

- The system has only one transmission line from node A to node B with a rating of 10 MW, PJM makes the full capacity of the line available in the FTR auction
- The price at node B exceeds the price at node A by $\$ 10$ in the FTR auction(s)
- The sum of the CLMPs at node B exceeds the sum of the CLMPs at node A by \$13 over the relevant liquidation period


## FTR Auction



In the DA market the line is derated to 4MW, PJM collects \$52 of excess congestion rents


- There are two participants in the market, P1 and P2



## Notes:

- Scenarios 2 and 3 require a second participant, a FTR can not be sold and counterflow cannot be purchased without two participants in the market (assuming PJM is not buying back oversold capacity)
- In scenario 3 with the IMM's proposed rules P1 is effectively providing P2 with a $\$ 13$ subsidy

