

# 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