

Review of Stakeholder Process Super Forum Problem Statement & Issue Charge

Rebecca Carroll

Facilitator

Stakeholder Process Super Forum

January 30, 2019

- Group stakeholders' feedback from stakeholder process survey by theme
- Identify suggestions that can be addressed without a rule change
 - Stakeholders can pursue these reforms through the Stakeholder Process Forum
- Craft Problem Statement and Issue Charge language to capture stakeholders' concepts that require a rule change

- **Key Work Activity 2a: Prioritization, Stakeholder Meeting Management & Scheduling Logistics**
 - Prioritization [amongst different meetings]
 - Thoughtful about scheduling of meetings > find ways to ensure that we time to have offline discussions
 - Be thoughtful about cutting off meaningful discussions
 - Information overload
 - Ending discussions and setting aside time for Q&A
 - Meeting recording policy
 - Limiting number of topics stakeholders are working at a time
 - Appreciate the diversity of the Members and not schedule meetings on religious holidays

NOTE: grey text indicates feedback that can be addressed without a rule change

- **Key Work Activity 2b: Governance Process, Standards & Decision-Making Framework**
 - Consider a new type of process for issues that are big dollar issues or issues where consensus is unlikely to be reached or a tight timeline exists
 - More discipline in sector selection – oversight of the process
 - Interrelated issues being discussed at different groups in silos
 - Bifurcate smaller issues > batch similar topics and work together during the year (including staff/board action if necessary for expedited pathway)
 - Enhance CBIR process to deal with OATT/OA changes and legal issues
 - Consistent process when FERC has an ongoing proceeding
 - Upfront vetting of issues for operational and legal compliance with agreements (OA, CTOA, Tariff) as well as FERC and other legal precedents before stakeholder process goes down a wasted path.

- **Key Work Activity 2c: Information Management, Education, Participation, Debate & Transparency**
 - Consistent implementation of Robert's Rule in stakeholder process
 - Discussion on the role of PJM staff on proposing solutions versus the role of members
 - Real-time feedback from stakeholders regarding topics being covered and whether there is understanding of the issues
 - Start with more fundamental education
 - How to handle motions brought up for the first time at sr. committees
 - Cost benefit analysis for proposals
 - Greater judgment on when manual language is presented simultaneously at a standing and sr. standing committee
 - Allow multiple proposals to come up to sr. standing committees from to standing committees with a lower threshold
 - Develop motions of parody
 - Allow status quo to be an option on par with other proposals
 - Transparency of voting reports
 - Thoughts on how we operate with state interests
 - PJM staff reach out to thought leaders are member organizations between meetings

The initiative is expected to:

1. Provide education on the evolution and rules of the stakeholder process
2. Explore potential opportunities to modify current governance structure to address areas identified in the problem statement, such as:
 - a. Prioritization of issues to allow stakeholders to manage the volume of issues under consideration and the volume of meetings
 - b. Develop an additional pathway for vetting issues that are contentious or must be decided quickly
 - c. Enhance transparency throughout the PJM stakeholder process and decisional hierarchy