

Energy Efficiency's role in Pay-for-Performance

Presentation to the NEPOOL Markets Committee Stakeholders
June 10, 2020



Mark Spencer
mspencer@lspower.com
254-644-2352

LS POWER

Acronyms used in this Presentation

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|------|------------------------------|
| ACP | Actual Capacity Performance | M&V | Measurement and Validation |
| CBR | Capacity Balancing Ratio | PfP | Pay-for-Performance |
| CMR | Current Market Rules | RT | Real Time |
| CSC | Capacity Scarcity Condition | RTOR | Real Time Operating Reserves |
| CSO | Capacity Supply Obligation | | |
| DA | Day Ahead | | |
| DR | Demand Resource | | |
| EE | Energy Efficiency | | |
| FCM | Forward Capacity Market | | |
| LMP | Lead Market Participants | | |

Presentation Outline

- Examine how re-distribution of base capacity payments occurs during a CSC;
- Examine how different Resource types participate in a CSC;
- Provide numerical examples of the re-distribution effect;
- Describe the credit support costs of participating in PfP; and
- Discuss the proposal and the stakeholder schedule.

What is a Capacity Scarcity Condition?

It's a re-distribution of base FCA payments

- Triggered upon *a measurable* RTOR deficiency;
- Step 1: all CSO holders are assessed a charge (PfP rate x CBR x CSO) from their base forward capacity market payments; load bears no cost;
- Step 2: Resources' receive gross payments (ACP x PfP Rate) based on their performance:
 - Directly Measured Assets:
 - based on metering requirements of Appendix C of OP-18
 - 0.2% for Generator and Tie-Line Assets, 2.0% or less for Active DR
 - Settled on 5-minute intervals
 - Statistically sampled:
 - based on the M&V requirements of MR1 III.13.1.4.3.1
 - 10% relative precision with 80% confidence
 - Reported once monthly; and
- “Allocation of Deficient or Excess Capacity Performance Payments” is ignored. The principle concern is that a CSC causes a re-distribution.

How do Resources Participate in a Capacity Scarcity Condition?

Not all Resources respond to operating reserve deficiencies equally

| Type | Measured? | Participates in DAM? | May Deliver Energy / Reduce Load in RT | May Deliver Reserves |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Dispatchable Generator | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Non-dispatchable Generator | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Intermittent Power | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| Active DR | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| BTM PV | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Energy Efficiency | No | No | No | No |

Examples to highlight the Redistribution Effect

Actual and hypothetical examples

- During the CSC on 9/3/18, EE received a charge of \$551k, its *pro rata* share of the insurance pool. The non-EE Resources' share of the pool charge was \$7.3 million;
- Holding the 9/3/18 conditions constant except:
 - changing the PfP rate to \$5,455/MWh, EE's **charge would have been \$1.5 million**, non-EE CSO holders would have been charged \$20 million;
 - (a) changing the PfP rate to \$5,455/MWh, and (b) applying DR On-Peak and Seasonal Peak Hours rules, EE would have received a **net payment of \$10.3 million** funded by charges to all non-EE CSO holders, a net reduction of \$0.31/kW in base capacity payments to all non-EE CSO holders; and
 - (a) changing the PfP rate to \$5,455/MWh, (b) applying DR On-Peak and Seasonal Peak Hours rules, and (c) reducing system load by 10%, EE would have received a **net payment of \$12.6 million**, a net reduction of \$0.39/kW in base capacity payments to all non-EE CSO holders.
 - This increase in net payments to EE as system load decreases is in direct contradiction to the evidentiary record.
- Under this proposal net charges or net payments to EE in any hour of any CSC would be ZERO.

Participating in PfP does have a Cost

It's specific to each Lead Market Participant

- All LMPs that retain a CSO must post credit support for “FCM Delivery Financial Assurance” in accordance with the Financial Assurance Policy;
- ISO *estimated* that for CCP 2019-20 the face value of credit support required due to EE’s participation in PfP was between \$11 – 19 million;
- The cost of providing this support is higher for smaller, non-public companies that may have lower credit ratings; and
- If EE did not participate in PfP this requirement, and its associated cost, would be eliminated.

Conclusion and Recommendation

- Conclusions:

- CSCs are dynamic events that may be triggered by a minimal reserve deficiencies;
- A CSC is a re-distribution of base FCM payment from all Resources. A key principle of PfP is to reward Resources' *actual* performance during a CSC;
- Being measured and being able to influence the outcome of a CSC should be the minimum criteria for a Resource to be able to participate in PfP. EE is not measured and does not participate in the RT;
- Under CMR EE receives higher performance payments the lower system load is, which is in direct contradiction to the evidentiary record; and
- There is a cost (i.e., posting of collateral) for all Resources to participate in PfP.

- Recommendations:

- Retain EE's base capacity payments;
- Remove EE from the PfP settlement including the "insurance pool"; and
- Eliminate EE's requirement to provide credit support for the FCM Delivery Financial Assurance.

The Proposal and Schedule

- Market's Committee schedule
 - 6/10: Introduce proposal and solicit stakeholder feedback
 - 7/9: Distribute Tariff changes and respond to stakeholder questions
 - 8/11: bring Tariff changes to the committee for a vote
- Budget & Finance Subcommittee:
 - 8/10: Introduce FAP changes and solicit stakeholder feedback
 - 8/21: Review FAP changes and respond to stakeholder questions
- Seek a vote on the Market Rule 1 and FAP changes at the 9/3 PC meeting.

Thank You for Your Time and Attention Today
