

**Enhancing the JCM Process –
Report of Ad Hoc JCM Working
Group**

JCM Meeting

March 21, 2013

Overview

- Update on work of sub group on process/governance issues
- Identification of proposals for enhancing the JCM process – many with consensus to move forward
- This slide deck = a resource and reference on the work group's process

Summary of JCM Process Work Group

- December 14 letter to MISO and PJM requesting increased role for state regulators
- Generally positive feedback with this concept
- January 29 JCM meeting – developed work group idea for process/governance proposals
- Interested parties self-identified interest in participating in work group
 - A group of 54 identified interest, distributed broadly among different stakeholder sectors and across RTOs

Summary of JCM Process Work Group

- First work group call held on 3/1
- Stakeholder discussion on:
 - JCM Agendas
 - Moderating Discussions
 - Format for Discussion and Timelines
 - Prioritizing Issues
 - Moving Proposals from JCM to RTO Processes
- Feedback used to develop more specific proposals

Summary of JCM Process Work Group

- Initial proposals developed
- Initial proposals sent to stakeholders on 3/11
- Second workgroup call held on 3/18
- Generally positive feedback on issues discussed and State Commissioner involvement

Setting the Agenda

- Currently, MISO and PJM staff work together to establish the agenda based on their views of stakeholder feedback
- Agenda content and order is determined collaboratively by the RTO staffs
- Questions presented:
 - Has this been a workable method for stakeholders?
 - Are there other ideas for setting the JCM meeting agendas?

Setting the JCM Agenda

- Stakeholder feedback:
 - Agendas have typically included the important issues, but discussion can wander
 - MISO and PJM have done a good job in accepting feedback
 - Stakeholders should drive the agendas
 - JCM should have set meeting schedule for 2013
 - Meetings should stick to agenda items rather than jumping around
 - Agendas could identify specific categories (i.e., operations/markets/planning) for each item; it may be helpful to have meetings planned around each of these categories to have the right people in the room
 - Could post a draft meeting agenda well in advance of meetings and get feedback

Setting the JCM Agenda

- Initial Proposal(s):
 - MISO and PJM will continue to work together to develop agendas. Going forward, MISO and PJM will also include the State Commissioners involved in the process who will assist in the agenda development
 - State Commissioners must consider many stakeholder views, and will therefore keep stakeholder input as a primary consideration
 - MISO and PJM, with input from the State Commissioners will identify the JCM meeting schedule/locations for remainder of 2013

Setting the JCM Agenda Stakeholder Feedback from 3/18

- Under either proposal, stakeholder feedback for the “next” agenda would be sought at the end of each JCM
- **Proposal 1:**
 - ~ 20 days prior to mtg., PJM, MISO and State Regs. develop draft agenda
 - Draft agenda posted for stakeholder comment
 - PJM, MISO and State Regs. incorporate feedback into final agenda
- **Proposal 2:**
 - ~ 20 days prior to mtg., Agenda Committee (PJM, MISO, State Regs. And 1-2 representatives from JCM stakeholder groups) develop draft agenda
 - Draft agenda posted for comment
 - Agenda committee convenes to discuss stakeholder feedback
 - Agenda committee finalizes agenda

Moderation of Discussion

- Currently, MISO and PJM staff identify the subject matter experts that will facilitate and moderate the discussion of any particular agenda item
- Questions presented:
 - Have discussions been viewed as efficient, beneficial and informative?
 - Have subject matter experts always been available at the meetings?
 - Are there other ways to moderate to move discussions forward?

Moderation of Discussion

- Stakeholder feedback:
 - Having a chair/vice chair may be helpful
 - Given their unique position, state regulators may be good moderators – they are “not just another stakeholder” in the process
 - PJM stakeholder process focuses on professional facilitators since there are not a lot of “neutral parties”
 - State regulators may not be neutral; they are like other stakeholders and can provide input as others do
 - Any moderator needs to understand the linkages between issues to direct discussion to the right places
 - Moderators from outside the process may be helpful, like those used in the EIPC process
 - It can be difficult to be both the subject matter expert and the discussion moderator at the same time

Moderation of Discussion

- PROPOSAL:
 - MISO and PJM will identify (for each agenda item) a moderator and subject matter expert for discussion items
 - State Regulators may also assist in the moderation of discussion on a case-by-case basis

Discussion Format

- Currently, MISO and PJM identify the agenda items and format for discussion on an topic-by-topic basis; some items include specifics, others do not
- Questions Presented:
 - Would a specific format for discussion be helpful?
 - If yes, what should that format include?

Discussion Format

- Stakeholder Feedback:
 - As a matter of practice, identifying a format for discussion will be helpful
 - In general, it seems that participants have followed a general format – however, that format has not been specified
 - It will be helpful to have a format to move discussion/issues along

Discussion Format

- Proposal(s):
 - Use the following format for all agenda items on a JCM agenda
 1. PRESENTATION PURPOSE: agenda will identify a type of presentation for each agenda item (i.e. “informational,” “proposal for consideration,” etc...)
 2. FEEDBACK/DISCUSSION: agenda will identify specific time for stakeholder feedback/discussion pertinent to agenda item
 3. NEXT STEPS: agenda will specify time for discussion of the next steps for the item, including timelines for future actions
 - Each agenda item will have specific times for each step in the process (i.e., presentation will be 30 minutes; feedback will be 30 minutes; next steps will be 15 minutes)

Issue Prioritization

- Currently, MISO and PJM use various stakeholder surveys and, in some cases, RTO analysis, to prioritize issues
- Questions presented:
 - Is issue prioritization a one time event, or should issues be re-prioritized as an ongoing endeavor?
 - Do stakeholder surveys provide consistent and comparable results?
 - How often should issues be prioritized?

Issue Prioritization

- Stakeholder feedback:
 - Surveys are valuable, but need to do one specific to the JCM; separate MISO and PJM surveys are not directly comparable
 - There is a lot of commonality in the survey responses
 - More frequent surveys could be burdensome
 - Prioritization could be done when stakeholders ask for reevaluation
 - Prioritization helps when there is an understanding of potential costs and benefits

Issue Prioritization

- PROPOSAL(S):
 - MISO and PJM will jointly develop a current priority list of JCM issues for 2013
 - A survey of these issues will be used to create a baseline for issue prioritization in 2013
 - Issues will be reprioritized on a periodic basis when stakeholders request it and with significant stakeholder input on changes

Issues Status Report

- Currently, the issues status report is done at the start of meetings (at least this was true for the last JCM meeting)
 - Is this a good thing at the start of a meeting?
 - Does this result in side tracking discussions?
 - Should this report be done at the end of meetings (for items not otherwise discussed at the meeting)?

Issues Status Report

- Proposal:
 - Issues status report will be done at the END of each JCM meeting to identify the status of any issues NOT discussed at that meeting

JCM Recommendations

- Currently, issues are presented to the individual RTO stakeholder processes in an ad hoc manner
- Questions presented:
 - Should issues include more formal recommendations from JCM stakeholders?
 - Should a template be developed to provide background information to put context around proposals?
 - Should JCM quantify the level of support for proposals?

JCM Recommendations

- Stakeholder Feedback:
 - This is a critical piece of the JCM process; if it would help to make this more formal, it should be done
 - We need consistency in recommendations and messages coming out of the JCM stakeholder process
 - Having a JCM report on issues (including a minority report) would be helpful [identified as being similar to the processes in each RTO stakeholder process]

JCM Recommendations

- Proposal(s):
 - The JCM process workgroup will develop a templates/format for reporting issues “out” of the JCM process to the stakeholder processes of MISO and PJM
 - Reports will attempt to quantify the amount of support that a proposal had in the JCM process
 - Each RTO will report back to the JCM on the status of issues moving through the RTO stakeholder process

Meeting Logistics

- Currently, the RTOs work through the meeting logistics (location for meetings, etc...)
 - Has this generally been efficient for stakeholders?
- At the last meeting, minutes were taken and in one case, real time notes were taken for review
 - Should these practices continue?

Meeting Logistics

- Stakeholder Feedback:
 - More advance notice will help everyone
 - Meetings at airport hotels are easier for travel
 - Meetings at RTOs are easier for AV and technical needs
 - “Host” RTO will take meeting notes/minutes

Meeting Logistics

- Proposal:
 - As part of the agenda setting, State Regulators will assist in the identification of meeting locations
 - Implement real-time meeting notes (taken care of by “host” RTO)

Issues for Further Discussion

- Should a Chair/Vice Chair be identified for each JCM meeting?
- Does the JCM need a formal voting/polling structure?