

FEAM WG Administration Assumptions & Governance Structure Poll

Purpose: any state interested in being a market participant in a future FEAM, should indicate that state’s preference (if any) the Assumptions to be carried forward regarding the Administration Structure and Governance Model for development of the FEAM. This vote is not binding for final FEAM implementation; consensus among the states may be re-pollled at a future point depending on the advice and obstacles learned in the development and implementation phase of this market.

State: DC, DE, IL, MD, NJ, PA

1.	<p>Market Administrator: The Memo details that the FEAM Board will have the authority to select the FEAM Administrator once the FEAM Board is established. The current assumption is that the FEAM Administrator will most likely be a PJM affiliate.</p>	<p>The Interested States are comfortable with the assumption that a future FEAM Board will select the market administrator.</p>
2.	<p>FEAM Board: the Memo describes the FEAM Board as being composed of 5-14 Board Members, with one representative from each “Participating State”¹ and if there are fewer than 5 Participating States, the remaining seats will be appointed by OPSI.</p>	<p>The Interested states support the Board Structure described above.</p>
3.	<p>Processes for Changing Market Rules: the Memo describes an annual stakeholder review process, following each auction and Filing Rights, described in more detail below.</p>	
	<p>a. Annual Performance Review: a post-auction report with performance outcomes and recommendations provided by the IMM that is presented to stakeholders.</p>	<p>Support</p>
	<p>b. Stakeholder Process: annually, following this post-auction report, where all recommendations from the IMM as well as other topics presented by administrative staff or stakeholders can be included for discussion. Administrative Staff will present the FEAM Board with a proposal for rule changes. Any individual stakeholder may offer an alternative or additional proposal for consideration.</p>	<p>Support</p>

¹ “Participating State” is defined in the memo as a state that has agreed to share the FEAM Administrative costs.

	<p>c. Sector Weighted Voting: the voting will determine what proposals come out of the stakeholder process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12% state-authorized buyers (e.g., agencies or LSEs submitting buy bids under state mandate) • 12% competitive retailer buyers (e.g., LSEs submitting voluntary buy bids) • 12% public power, municipalities and local governments • 12% direct consumer buyers • 12% consumer advocates • 35% sellers qualified to offer attributes into the market • 5% environmental organizations 	<p>Support, would like the ability to further change/explore in development of final market rules.</p>
	<p>c. Filing Rights: the FEAM Board has sole decision making and filing rights over FEAM market rules.</p>	<p>Supports</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Market Monitoring: market monitoring will be in compliance with CFTC requirements, to be developed with a CFTC lawyer and input from PJM’s IMM.</p>	<p>My state is comfortable proceeding under this assumption and for more details on this to come down the line with market power mitigation and CFTC experts as we draft market rules.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Dispute Resolution: the FEAM will have a dispute resolution procedure, agreed upon by all market members upon initiating participation in the market, that allows disputing parties to have a claim and impartial review through FEAM procedures.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Funding: the FEAM will be self-funded by market participants, on a pro-rata charge on each attribute procured.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Start-Up Costs: Start-Up costs are to be determined by Participating States that opt-in to building this market.</p>	<p>Support, states should explore all potential funding sources/options.</p>