Transition Cycle 1, Phase III System Impact Study Results

FAQs for Developers

Version: 002, 10/7/2025

General Questions

Q1 Who is impacted by these Transition Cycle 1 (TC1), Phase III study results?

A1 Transition Cycle 1 projects are all New Service Requests in the AE1-AG1 queues that did not yet receive a Final Agreement and were not eligible for the Expedited Process per Tariff Part VII, Subpart B, section 304. The AE1-AG1 projects entered the PJM interconnection process in the April 2018 through September 2020 time frame. Summer peak and light load steady state load flow, short circuit and transient stability analyses, as well as an electromagnetic transient study, if applicable, were performed for the AE1-AG1 projects that make up Transition Cycle 1. The Phase III System Impact Study summarizes the results of these studies and provides cost allocation for any required Network Upgrades to accommodate the new interconnection.

The Interconnection timeline is posted on the PJM.com Planning page.

Q2 What does the System Impact Study (SIS) tell me?

A2 The Phase I, Phase II and Phase III System Impact Studies are a regional analysis of the effect of adding New Service Requests to the Transmission System and include an evaluation of the New Service Requests' impact on deliverability to the aggregate of PJM Network Load.

- The Phase III SIS study results show both (i) the scope, cost and estimated schedule to complete the required physical interconnection work and (ii) the scope, cost and estimated schedule to complete any Network Upgrade work to accommodate the interconnection and to address any reliability criteria violations on the grid. This also includes the PJM's neighboring ISOs Affected System Study Results required reinforcements for their respective reliability criteria violations.
- Procedures and other terms related to the three study phases are outlined in Tariff Part VII Subpart D, sections 307, 308, 310 and 312 and Tariff Part VIII Subpart C, sections 404, 405, 407 and 409. See PJM Manual 14H, Section 4.2.1 for more details on what the System Impact Study provides.

Q3 Where can I find the definitions of terms used for the Cycle and Serial study approaches?

A3 Refer to following sections of the PJM Tariff for definitions:

- Serial Study Approach Definitions – Tariff Part I, section 1
- Cycle Study Approach Definitions – Tariff P VII, Subpart A, section 300

Q4 What if I have a question about my SIS report results?

A4 Please review this FAQ document prior to contacting your PJM project manager with any project-specific questions. If you still have any general questions regarding TC1 Phase III SIS or TC1 Decision Point III (DP3) after reviewing the FAQ, please contact InterconnectionSupport@pjm.com.

System Impact Study (SIS) Analysis Questions

Q5 What is the study approach for Transition Cycle 1 projects?

A5 Transition Cycle 1 projects will be studied under the Cycle study process approved as part of PJM's interconnection process reform. The Cycle study process is to evaluate Transition Cycle 1 projects under the same generator deliverability methodology used in their prior impact study analysis as outlined in Manual 14B, Attachment C. However, following the process, Transition Cycle 1 projects will be cost allocated under the Cycle-based cost allocation rules in Manual 14H, Attachment B. Additionally, PJM stability analysis for TC1 was performed by grouping projects into stability clusters based on electrical proximity.

Q6 The terms "Cluster study" and "Cycle study" seem to be used interchangeably. What is the difference between a "Cluster study" and "Cycle study"?

A6 A "Cycle study" refers to the study approach used for a group of New Service Requests (i.e., cycle) approved as part of PJM's interconnection process reform, whereas a "Cluster study" refers to the stability study approach of grouping a subset of New Service Requests within a Cycle into a cluster based on their electrical proximity to be studied together.

Q7 What base case is being used to study Transition Cycle 1 projects?

A7 The Transition Cycle 1 base case is based on the 2027 RTEP base case.

Q8 My project's System Impact Study (SIS) report only provides the final Cycle loading for each overloaded flowgate. Why is the pre-Cycle loading not provided?

A8 In the new Cycle study process, pre-Cycle loading is no longer a concept or part of the study results (e.g., there is no serial first to cause/driver). The final Cycle facility loading (MVA to mitigate) is the responsibility of the Cycle under study if it is not already covered by a preexisting upgrade (e.g., Prior Queue/Cycle upgrades and RTEP baseline/supplemental upgrades).

- The final facility loading results for each Cycle are contained within that Cycle and the base case year assumptions for that Cycle's model.
- Please refer to PJM Tariff Part VII, Subpart D, section 307 A.5.C, PJM Tariff Part VIII, Subpart C, section 404 A.5.c and PJM Manual 14H, Section 4.2.6-3, first sub-bullet.

Q9 There is a withdrawn project contributing to an overloaded facility that my project also contributes to. Why wasn't this withdrawn project removed for the Phase III analysis?

A9 The TC1 Phase III study officially commenced on April 21, 2025. The Phase III model was locked on this date for the Phase III analysis. The study results posted on September 19 prior to the start of Decision Point III were based on the April 21 study model. After DP3, PJM will perform a retool (Retool 1) of the analysis results considering (i) the TC1 projects that withdrew at DP3 as well as (ii) any other projects with signed interconnection-related agreements that have withdrawn since the start of Phase III. For Retool 1 (as well as Retool 2, if necessary), the new lock date for the TC1 case will be the end of DP3, October 21, 2025. (Retool 2 may be required in the event of cost allocation changes related to Project Developers who opt not to execute their service agreements).

Q10 Did Transmission Owners update their analysis of lower-voltage facilities for the Transition Cycle 1, Phase III?

A10 Yes, the Transmission Owner analysis was retooled as part of the Transition Cycle 1, Phase III study process.

Q11 My project doesn't have any cost allocation for system reliability Network Upgrades or any contingent upgrades identified in the System Impact Study report. Why are system reliability upgrades still listed in my report?

A11 Although your project may not have cost allocation or any contingent upgrades required for overloaded flowgates listed in your System Impact Study report, your project may fall into the potential aggregate contributor pool. Projects in this pool may receive cost allocation in later phases of the Cycle study based on changes to New Service Request projects, and therefore these upgrades will be listed until the upgrades are securitized (or drop away as a required upgrade based on changes in the study results). A securitized Network Upgrade is a Network Upgrade that has been fully funded by a prior cycle or prior New Service Request under the old interconnection process. Please refer to PJM Manual 14H, Section B.3.1 for cost allocation eligibility criteria.

Q12 How is the charging portion of battery storage projects modeled/studied in TC1?

A12 In the Summer Peak analysis, only the discharging (injection) portion is studied. In the Light Load analysis, both discharging (injection) and charging (withdrawal) are studied.

Q13 Some of the Network Upgrades in my System Impact Study report have significant cost estimate changes compared to the cost estimates for the same or similar upgrades identified in my Phase II study. Why are the cost estimate changes so significant in some cases?

A13 There are a variety of reasons or factors as to why cost estimates may have significant changes (either increases or decreases) compared to the Phase II study. In many cases, the cost estimates for large upgrades are being updated to reflect facility-level estimates based on recent information, current-day engineering, material and construction costs as provided by the Transmission Owners. Furthermore, the Transmission Owners have completed facility-level cost estimates for physical interconnection facilities as well as system reliability Network Upgrades, which will reflect a higher fidelity estimate than the planning-level estimates provided in prior phases.

Q14 Do the TC1 study results also consider recent system network changes, such as rating increases, substation reconfigurations, etc.?

A14 Yes, as part of the PJM analysis and review with the Transmission Owners, any current known rating increases and contingency changes as the result of in-service system reconfigurations are considered before assigning any system reinforcements for a TC1 reliability criteria violation.

Q15 When should I expect to see the next set of study results for my project?

A15 Project Developers with Transition Cycle 1 projects (that meet the DP3 requirements to move forward to negotiation and GIA Execution phase in the Cycle) can anticipate seeing the DP3 Retool 1 Final System Impact Study (SIS) results posted on PJM.com around the end of November–early December. PJM will make an announcement prior to the release of the Transition Cycle 1, DP3 Retool 1 SIS Results.

Retooled load flow, stability and short circuit analyses will be performed, and results will be shared in the DP3 Retool 1 Final SIS report.

Q16 My project has a battery component. How can I determine whether my project is injecting (i.e., generating) or withdrawing (i.e., charging) for a given flowgate?

A16 For TC1, PH3 battery charging is considered only for light load analysis and not for summer peak. In the flowgate details for light load analysis, if the project was dispatched as withdrawing (i.e., charging) for a given flowgate, it will be labeled with a suffix of “BT” or “BAT” (i.e., AG1-000 BT).

Q17 My project loads into potential congestion due to local energy deliverability. How should I interpret these impacts?

A17 The purpose of this analysis is to inform the Project Developer of potential congestion issues. These potential congestion issues do not require reinforcements to mitigate the issue. A potential congestion or operational flowgate is a single contingency where projects are dispatched up to their full megawatt impact in accordance with the generation deliverability procedure. These operational flowgates do not require reinforcement because PJM in real-time operations will maintain an N-1 secure dispatch pattern. Thus, the generators local to the impacted facility will never be dispatched to their full megawatt energy output; however, this is based on the extreme seasonal corner cases used for planning the reliability of the Transmission System (not based on an average/typical day). A project can proceed with Network Upgrades to eliminate an operational restriction at their discretion by submitting an Upgrade Request according to Tariff Part VII, Subpart H, section 337.

Q18 Does my project's short circuit analysis include the impact of topology-changing reinforcements?

A18 Yes, the impact of topology-changing upgrades on short circuit analysis is included and evaluated in Phase III. For Phase III, the evaluation of topology-changing upgrades drove the need for additional short circuit upgrades of which many were covered by existing baseline upgrades. Please refer to the Short Circuit Analysis and System Reinforcement section of your System Impact Study report as well as the Short Circuit Reinforcements section of the TC1 executive summary report.

Q19 Does my project's transient stability analysis include the impact of topology-changing reinforcements?

A19 Yes, the impact of topology-changing upgrades on transient stability analysis is included and evaluated in Phase III. Additionally, PJM completed an electromagnetic transient analysis on an as-needed basis. Please refer to the Stability Analysis section of your System Impact Study.

Q20 My TC1 Phase III stability study report recommends certain dynamic model parameter/project updates. Would I be required to provide updated data during Decision Point III based on these changes?

A20 Yes, any changes recommended by PJM to the dynamic model or the overall project data based on the TC1 Phase III stability analysis (as outlined in the stability executive summary of your Phase III SIS report) will need to be confirmed during Decision Point III. Only the parameters that require updating may be modified. No other changes to the technical data may be made.

Cost Allocation Questions

Q21 How was my project's cost allocation determined?

A21 For Phase III, PJM performed the generation deliverability test to determine thermal impacts for summer peak and light load conditions, including the impact of topology-changing upgrades required by TC1. Furthermore, PJM performed voltage, short circuit and stability analysis. Additionally, PJM member Transmission Owners performed an analysis of their lower-voltage systems. PJM's neighboring Affected System Operators have determined which PJM projects require an Affected System Study. If your project was dispatched against an overloaded facility in TC1, then your project is eligible for cost allocation. PJM has applied the new Cycle cost allocation rules defined in Manual 14H, Attachment B. Your project's impact to the facility will be classified in one of five ways: cost allocated, contingent, noncontingent, potential aggregate contributor and informational.

Q22 When determining cost allocation for a given Network Upgrade(s), is PJM using the megawatt impact for each project from the worst reportable flowgate against that facility for the given project?

A22 For a load flow violation, a project's cost allocation for a Network Upgrade is based on the project's megawatt impact to the flowgate (monitored facility/contingency pair) with the highest post-Cycle loading reported against the facility for the given project. If the Network Upgrade addresses multiple facility overloads, the megawatt impact is additive and includes the megawatt impact from the worst overloaded flowgate reported for each facility. This methodology is required because not all projects in a given cycle may contribute to the same overloaded flowgate for a given facility. This can occur due to topology differences when a given contingency is taken and the generator dispatch is applied for a given flowgate. Ultimately if the project loads into an overload on the facility (monitored element), which requires a system reinforcement, the project is subject to the cost allocation criteria.

Q23 If my project shares an Interconnection Switchyard (Common Use Upgrade) with another New Service Request project, how will my interconnection costs be calculated?

A23 If multiple Project Developers request to connect to the same interconnection substation, the Transmission Owner will determine the scope of work to accommodate all the requests at the substation. The cost for the interconnection will be allocated in proportion to the number of required terminations into the substation.

Q24 My project loads into a reinforcement marked as topology-changing or eliminated. How was my project associated with these types of reinforcements?

A24 As a part of the Phase III load flow analysis, PJM evaluated topology-changing reinforcements as part of the generation deliverability test. The topology-changing reinforcement's impact on the TC1 cycle loading as well as the impact on other facilities that were alleviated by modeling these topology-changing reinforcements was assessed. All the topology-changing reinforcements were modeled into a load flow cycle-based sensitivity case and compared with a cycle base case that did not include the topology-changing reinforcements. Each impacted facility was reviewed to see if all of the contingencies against the originally impacted facility were eliminated as a result of modeling the topology-changing reinforcements.

- **Impacted Facility *Directly* Addressed by Topology Upgrade:**
  If all flowgates for the impacted facility were directly addressed by a topology-changing reinforcement such as adding a parallel line or eliminating a contingency driving an overload on the impacted facility, then projects were assigned cost based on the topology reinforcement that addressed that impacted facility.
- **Impacted Facility *Indirectly* Addressed by Topology Upgrade:**
  However, if the impacted facility was indirectly addressed by one or more topology-changing reinforcements, then projects were assigned cost based on the cost allocation for the topology reinforcement(s) that address the facility but no longer need to be constructed as a result of modeling the topology-changing reinforcements. An example of the latter could be a 230 kV line that is overloaded in the base run and would require a rebuild, but is no longer overloaded in the queue sensitivity run because of power flow changes resulting from topology-changing reinforcements that reconfigure the 500 kV system – in this case, the cost assigned to the projects loading in to the 230 kV overload are based on the cost allocation for the 230 kV line rebuild.

Q25 My project loads into a reinforcement marked as topology-changing or eliminated. How was my project assigned cost?

A25 PJM evaluated the topology-changing reinforcements required by the TC1 cycle for thermal impacts. Furthermore, PJM determined a subset of facility-type reinforcements (i.e., eliminated) that are no longer required to alleviate certain impacted facilities as a result of modeling the topology-changing reinforcements. The cycle only requires the construction of the topology-changing reinforcements and not facility upgrades that are eliminated as result of modeling topology upgrades (refer to PJM Tariff Part VIII, Subpart C, section 404 A.5.c for requirement of minimum amount of Network Upgrades for the Cycle).

Projects will receive cost allocation based on how they are dispatched into each flowgate; however, topology and eliminated reinforcements will be discounted to account for only constructing the topology upgrades. PJM grouped topology and eliminated reinforcements by region and computed a discount factor for each region. The three regions are PJM Dominion, PJM Mid-Atlantic Area Council (MAAC) and PJM West. Additionally, a regional discount factor was computed as the sum of the topology-changing reinforcements for given region divided by the sum of the topology-changing reinforcements plus the sum of the eliminated reinforcements for a given region. The specific details of the regional discount factor can be found in the system reinforcements section of the TC1 PH3 executive summary report.

Furthermore, Projects will only be held contingent in their Final Agreements on the regional topology Network Upgrades, not the eliminated Network Upgrades. Each project's cost allocation to each of the regional topology upgrades is the pro-rata amount of their cost obligations into both topology and eliminated upgrades. The details of this conversion from a project's impacts into topology and eliminated upgrades to a project's impact into just the relevant regional topology upgrades can be found by clicking the Regional Topology Conversion button in your individual Phase III System Impact Study report. Furthermore, the details for both the unconverted and converted cost allocation are provided for each regional topology upgrade that impacts your project. If your project has no cost allocation into a topology or eliminated upgrade but is contingent on at least one of these topologies or eliminated upgrades, then your project will be considered contingent on all of the relevant regional topology upgrades.

Q26 My project shares a point of interconnection with another project. How might this impact my cost allocation?

A26 In accordance with the PJM OATT, Part VII, Subpart D, Section 407 (A)(2)(a)(iii), PJM aggregated the megawatt impacts of New Service Requests sharing the same point of interconnection (POI) for the purpose of screening them against PJM's cost allocation criteria. This aggregation of the megawatt impact for projects sharing the same POI was implemented to prevent subdividing projects from avoiding the cost allocation thresholds and requirements. For thermal impacts, a project's cost allocation will still be based on the individual project's megawatt impact and NOT the aggregated megawatt impact. Please refer to the presentation given at the March 2025 Interconnection Process Subcommittee.

Q27 My project has a short circuit violation(s). How was my project's cost allocation for the short circuit upgrade determined?

A27 New Service Requests short circuit cost allocation was determined as outlined in Manual 14H, Attachment B, Section 3.2. If the TC1 Cycle as a whole increased the circuit breaker's applicable interrupting rating greater than 1%, or if the Cycle resulted in a greater than 1% increase in fault current at the substation, then the TC1 Cycle will receive some cost allocation. A New Service Request will have some cost allocation if the project's contributing fault current impact on the circuit breaker's applicable interrupting rating is greater than 1% or if it results in a greater than 1% increase in fault current at the substation. If no single New Service Request project meets these thresholds, the top five New Service Requests contributing to the breaker overduty shall receive cost allocation proportional to the individual impact of each project.

Q28 My project has stability violation(s). How was my project's cost allocation against stability overload(s) determined?

A28 PJM stability analysis for TC1 was performed by grouping projects into stability clusters based on electrical proximity. A single report was available at the end of TC1 PH2 for all projects within the same stability cluster and was updated as part of the PH3 analysis. A New Service Request's stability cost allocation was determined as outlined in Manual 14H, Attachment B, Section 3.4. If a stability violation is identified during the study of a stability cluster, costs for the required Network Upgrade to eliminate the stability violation will be allocated in proportion to the Maximum Facility Output (MFO) (or energy request for an uprate) of each New Services Request in that stability cluster.

Q29 Multi-Driver Cost Allocation

A29 In some instances, there are reliability Network Upgrades(s) that address multiple reliability criteria violations across multiple types of analysis (steady state thermal & voltage, short circuit and transient stability) and require proportional cost allocation based on each individual project's cumulative impact (all analysis types). These types of system reinforcements are not like the typical topology-changing reinforcements that eliminate the need for multiple conventional facility reinforcements (e.g., Reconductor) for steady state thermal constraints. In this case, these types of multi-driver reinforcements are the only feasible solution(s) to mitigate reliability criteria violations across multiple types of analysis where costs must be proportionally allocated to the applicable projects.

One multi-drive cost allocation reinforcement example may be the wreck and rebuild of an existing transmission line in order to convert it to double circuit because it addresses both steady state thermal and transient stability violations. In these cases, the total project contribution to the violation(s) for each type of analysis is used to determine the cumulative impact of the project for the purposes of calculating the proportional cost allocation. For example:

	MFO	Thermal (MW)	Short Circuit (Amps)	Stability (MFO)	Total	% Allocation
Project A	50	10	-	-	10	3.7 %
Project B	75	20	-	75	95	35.2 %
Project C	125	40	-	125	165	61.1 %
Total		**70**	**-**	**200**	**270**	**100.0 %**

Security Questions

Q30 How will I know if my project met criteria for Adverse Study Results?

A30 Each New Service Request should refer to the Adverse Test Eligibility section of their individual System Impact Study report to check whether they're eligible to withdraw their request and be refunded the cumulative Readiness Deposit amounts paid by the Project Developer or Eligible Customer per PJM Manual 14H, Section 6.2.2. The costs subject to the adverse eligibility test are dependent on whether the New Service Request is FERC or non-FERC jurisdictional.

FERC Jurisdictional New Service Requests:

For FERC jurisdictional New Service Requests, the following costs are considered in the adverse eligibility test:

(i) The physical interconnection work (Transmission Owner build option only) including Stand-Alone Network Upgrades and Network Upgrades, (ii) all BES system reliability upgrades, (iii) Transmission Owner-identified upgrades on subregional facilities, and (iv) any costs identified in affected systems studies including MISO upgrades identified as part of PJM analysis.

Non-FERC Jurisdictional New Service Requests:

For Non-FERC jurisdictional New Service Requests, the following costs are considered in the adverse eligibility test:

(i) All BES system reliability upgrades, (ii) Transmission Owner-identified upgrades on subregional facilities, and (iii) any costs identified in affected systems studies including MISO upgrades identified as part of PJM analysis.

A summary of these costs can be found in the Cost Summary section of the individual System Impact Study report and further details on affected systems can be found in both the Affected System – PJM Identified Violations and Affected System – Non-PJM Identified Violations sections of the individual System Impact Study report.

Q31 How much does my project owe in Security?

A31 Each New Service Request should refer to the relevant Security requirements in their Final Agreements provided via DocuTrack. For FERC jurisdictional facilities, Security is paid per GIA. For Non-FERC jurisdictional facilities, Security is paid across all applicable standalone CSAs. Furthermore, projects contributing to non-PJM facilities will be required to pay Security in accordance with relevant agreements issued by the non-PJM transmission operator. Security will be summarized in each TC1 New Service Request's Phase III System Impact Study under the Security Requirement section. Security is paid per interconnection-related agreement, which can be represented by multiple New Service Requests. Please note that for uprate projects, costs considered in Security include all required Transmission Owner scope items that are not yet in service.

Q32 When is Security due?

A32 Project Developer must provide full Security as part of their Decision Point III submission. The Security amount is calculated as the full costs of work allocated to the project in their respective final service agreement. After Retool 1, Security may be adjusted based on project withdrawal after Decision Point III deficiency review period. PJM will issue a revised draft agreement with the adjusted Security after the conclusion of Retool 1. Project Developer is required to provide the adjusted Security at the time of agreement execution. For Security treatment post Decision Point III, please refer to June 2025 IPS Presentation TC1 Post Decision Point III Process (PDF).

Q33 When is my Security at risk?

A33 Security is not at risk before the Final Agreement execution. After the Final Agreements are executed, Security will be at risk and will be held in order to:

- Protect Transmission Owner(s) and ratepayers in the event the Project Developer fails to pay for any work performed by the Transmission Owner(s) and terminates their project. The Security will allow the Transmission Owner(s) to ensure system reliability by completing the work.
- Protect other New Service Customers in the event the Project Developer terminates the project after executing a NUCRA, GIA, EPA, WMPA or UCSA when another New Service Customer is relying on those facilities. The Security would cover the cost of the Transmission Owner(s) to complete the required Network Upgrades that other New Service Customers need. Please refer to the June 2025 IPS Presentation TC1 Post Decision Point III Process (PDF) for Security treatment post Decision Point III.

Q34 My New Service Request is contingent on Network Upgrades with estimated in-service dates beyond my New Service Request's expected in-service date. Does my project have limitations until those Network Upgrades are completed?

A34 New Service Requests that are contingent on network, supplemental or baseline upgrade(s) that are not expected to be completed prior to New Service Requests coming online will need to request an interim deliverability study. Additionally, any New Service Request that is expected to come into service prior to the TC1 2027 study year will need to request an interim deliverability study as well. The interim deliverability study will determine whether all or a portion of the New Service Request output would be deliverable for a particular requested delivery year.

New Service Requests that are contingent on regional topology upgrades and were therefore dispatched into topology or eliminated upgrades will be evaluated against the violation addressed by the eliminated upgrade in their final system impact study. The topology and eliminated upgrades and constraints can be found in the first table of the Regional Topology Conversion dialog box, which can be accessed by clicking the Regional Topology Conversion button in the System Reinforcement section of the System Impact Study.

Please refer to the IPS presentations below for additional information on interim deliverability studies and how to request a study.

- IDS New Application Process and Updates
- Reminder of Deadline for Interim Deliverability

Q35 Multiple New Service Requests contribute to the need for the same reinforcement, but I received no corresponding Network Upgrade Cost Responsibility Agreement (NUCRA)

A35 New Service Requests that contribute to the need for the same reinforcement but are owned by the same company will not receive a Network Upgrade Cost Responsibility Agreement (NUCRA). All cost responsibilities will be reflected in the relevant Final Agreements such as the operating facility's Generation Interconnection Agreement (GIA) and/or Construction Service Agreements (CSA).

Decision Point III and Final Agreement Negotiation Phase Questions

Q36 When will Transition Cycle 1, Decision Point III start and end?

A36 Decision Point III will begin on Monday, Sept. 22, 2025, and end on Tuesday, Oct. 21, 2025.

Q37 Where can I find a complete list of Decision Point III requirements?

A37 Please refer to the PJM Tariff and manual reference below for complete list of Decision Point III requirements.

- PJM Tariff Part VII, Subpart D, section 313

- PJM Manual 14H, Section 4.8, Decision Point III
- July 2025 IPS Presentation for Final Agreement Negotiation Phase and Decision Point III requirements

Q38 Are there any additional Site Control requirements at Decision Point III?

A38 At Decision Point III, the Project Developer must show full (100%) Site Control for the Generating Facility, Interconnection Facilities and the Interconnection Switchyard for an additional one year from the last day of Phase III. You can find more information on Site Control requirements in the following documents:

- PJM Tariff, Part VII, Subpart A, section 302, Site Control
- PJM Manual 14H, Section 7, Site Control
- July 2025 IPS Presentation for Final Agreement Negotiation Phase and Decision Point III requirements
- September 2025 IPS Presentation for Site Control Modification Manual 14H Update

Q39 What modifications are allowed at Decision Point III (reduction, POI change, equipment change, etc.)?

A39 At Decision Point III, no modifications are permitted except for site modifications. For details, please refer to the following documents:

- PJM Manual 14H, Sections 7.2.1–7.2.5 for Site Control Requirements in the Cycle Process
- September 2025 IPS Presentation for Site Control Modification Manual 14H Update

Q40 If I withdraw at Decision Point III, what happens to my deposits?

A40 At Decision Point III, the deposits will be treated as follows:

Readiness Deposits: Readiness Deposit 1 (RD1), Readiness Deposit 2 (RD2) and Readiness Deposit 3 (RD3) are 100% at risk. The only exception is if Adverse Study criteria are met (see note below).

Note: Adverse Study results tests will be applied at Decision Point II and III. If a New Service Request meets the Adverse Study criteria and chooses to withdraw the request, PJM will refund the cumulative Readiness Deposit amounts paid by the Project Developer at the Application Phase, Decision Point I and Decision Point II. Please refer to PJM Manual 14H, Section 6.0.

Study Deposits: 10% of the Study Deposit is at risk regardless of actual study costs. PJM will draw from the refundable portion of the study deposit to cover actual study cost.

For a complete understanding of the treatment of these deposits at Decision Point III, refer to:

- PJM Manual 14H, Section 6.0, Study and Readiness Deposits

- June 2025 IPS Presentation, TC1 Post Decision Point III Process for Readiness Deposit and Security treatment post DP3.

Q41 When does Final Agreement Negotiation Phase begin? Where can I find additional information on Final Agreement Phase?

A41 The Final Agreement Negotiation Phase begins on Monday, Sept. 22, 2025. It runs concurrently with Decision Point III. For complete information on the Final Agreement Negotiation Phase, please refer to:

- PJM Tariff, Part VII, Subpart D, section 314, Final Agreement Negotiation Phase
- PJM Manual 14H, Section 5, Final Agreement Negotiation Phase
- June 2025 IPS Presentation for Final Agreement Negotiation Phase and Decision Point III Requirements
- July 2025 IPS Presentation for Final Agreement Negotiation Phase and Decision Point III Requirements
- Training Video on Final Agreement Negotiation Phase
- Training Video on Types of Final Agreements

Q42 What is the difference between DocuTrack and Docusign?

A42 **DocuTrack:** Final Agreement Negotiations are conducted through DocuTrack. PJM will send the draft agreements to the project primary contact, as listed in Queue Point via DocuTrack. Both Project Developers and Transmission Owners will then have 20 Business Days to review and provide comments on their respective agreements within DocuTrack.

Docusign: Final Agreement execution will continue to be handled through Docusign. The process remains unchanged. The primary contact will receive the Final Agreement for execution via Docusign. This contact has the option to use Docusign's "reassign" function to forward the document to the designated signatory for final signature.

Please refer to the following training material and IPS presentations for more information on DocuTrack and Docusign:

- Training Video: Draft Review of Final Agreements in DocuTrack
- June 2025 IPS Presentation (PDF) for Final Agreement Negotiation Phase and Decision Point III Requirements
- July 2025 IPS Presentation (PDF) for Final Agreement Negotiation Phase and Decision Point III requirements