Discussion of IMM's Proposed Changes to Counterflow FTR Payouts

November 12, 2014

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 states¹:
 - 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 <u>should</u> 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 <u>this would be false</u>, unless funding were 100%

2

Example

Assumptions:

- The system has only one transmission line from node A to node B with a rating of 10MW, 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
- 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



Scenario	Participant	FTR	Buy / Sell	MW	Price	Cost	Target Allocation	Payout Ratio with Netting (Status Quo)	Payout Ratio with No Netting (IMM)	Congestion Credit (Status Quo)		Con C (I	gestion redit MM)	Profit with Netting (Status Quo)	Profit With No Netting (IMM)
1	P1	A->B	Buy	10	\$10	\$100	\$130	40%	40%	\$52			\$52	(\$48)	(\$48)
2	P1	A->B	Buy	10	\$10	\$100	\$130	40%	40%	(\$26)			¢26	(\$24)	(\$24)
		A->B	Sell	5	\$10	(\$50)	(\$65)				,320		Ş20	(\$24)	
	P2	A->B	Buy	5	\$10	\$50	\$65				\$26		\$26	(\$24)	(\$24)
3	P1	A->B	Buy	10	\$10	\$100	\$130	40%	60%	\$	¢16		ć10	(\$24)	(\$37)
		B->A	Buy	5	(\$10)	(\$50)	(\$65)				Ş20		\$13		
	P2	A->B	Buy	5	\$10	\$50	\$65				\$26		\$39	(\$24)	(\$11)
								selling same as buying					selling	erent	

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