



Enhanced Liaison Committee

Lessons Learned Notes

June 22, 2015 Stakeholder Process Forum

At the June 22, 2015 Stakeholder Process Forum stakeholders discussed the 2014 implementation of the Enhanced Liaison Committee (ELC) process related to PJM's Capacity Performance proposal. The purpose of the discussion was to identify best practices for any future implementations of the ELC. The following subject areas for the discussion were identified at the February 23, 2015 Stakeholder Process Forum, and comments from stakeholders at the March 23, 2015 and June 22, 2015 Stakeholder Process Forum are captured.

Stakeholders determined that no changes were to be proposed to the Enhanced Liaison Committee process as described in Manual 34.

- Timing / Timeline (including consideration of the complexity/ potential cost of the issue)
 - Earlier notification that process may be necessary – and why
 - Add more informational meetings/ Webinars
 - Add 1 or 2 (full day) meetings to allow stakeholder discussion, not simply PJM presentation of current thinking (this facilitates coalition formation)
 - Meetings too short to cover volume of material and hear stakeholder reaction to PJM education/position
 - ELC timing outlined in M34 is not sufficient for wide-ranging and complex issues.
 - Consider having more steps in the process (rather than more meetings) – possibly two ELC meetings, or another prep step before the ELC meetings – to allow more stakeholder opinions to enrich the process
 - Process worked as designed
 - Had ample opportunity to understand the process. Market participants would benefit from more conversation
 - Process was expanded beyond ELC described in M34 – looked closer traditional stakeholder process. Consider that making significant modifications to the process will water down original ELC intent.
- Preparation Steps
 - More effort to ID issues – short vs. longer term. Send longer-term issues back to stakeholder process. (Steady state versus Implementation.)

- Separate out actual proposal from the implementation plan
- Build Business Rules (instead of FAQ's) by topic – with added change tracking, rather than in order the questions came in.
- Problem>Solution>Implementation details were jumbled. Bucketing them would have helped – deliberately separate out to better organize.
- Need to understand how all components work together – testing for unintended consequences
- Additional education in group setting
- Need detailed tracking of issues to be covered vs. those to be moved elsewhere
- PJM staff was very responsive to voluminous questions – tracking done well.

- Coalition Formation
 - Challenge was lack of transparency around positions – made it hard to find your potential coalition; required lots of behind-the-scenes phone calls and questions.
 - Sectors did not define coalitions – discovery was required – lots of 1:1 and small group conversations.
 - There is nothing PJM could have done to facilitate this in a better fashion
 - Increase time to allow for more discovery / more opportunities to find potential partners
 - Allowing states to participate in coalitions was appreciated

- Day of Meeting (11/4/14)
 - Good quality of engagement between Board and stakeholders – good opportunity to state position
 - Extensive education presented – outstanding opportunity to offer Board direct communication.
 - Education opportunity was a real success
 - Education was about the solution, not the problem – consider including in current CBIR process
 - Went well – day well designed, considering large number of coalitions
 - Consider length of meeting with number of coalitions
 - State-specific meeting – states appreciated the opportunity
 - Ensure sufficient time to allow all positions to be represented (members & states)
 - Location was excellent and allowed full participation

- Media Participation (not allowed at 11/4 ELC meeting)
 - Media should be allowed to hear conversation on a very significant issue
 - Media should not be allowed – security codes, etc. – stifles a very robust discussion.
 - Consider post-meeting media session that allows general Q&A
 - Some stakeholders expressed interest in media participation guidelines should be developed

- Post-ELC Meeting Process
 - Add another round of discussions on the FINAL (to be filed) version



- Stakeholders not aware of significant changes until after filing was made – another round of discussions on the FINAL version.
- Needed greater understanding of changes between October final whitepaper & what was actually filed.
- Additional learning opportunity may have resulted in additional ideas for the Board to consider.
- Triggering Mechanisms
 - Talk more with the stakeholders about the driving issue(s) before deciding on ELC process – add clarifying language in M34 outlining this part of the process.
 - Add a mechanism/process to determine if stakeholders truly will NOT agree on an issue, triggering ELC process (so as not to abandon the stakeholder process).
- Briefing Papers (including content and structure)
 - Page limit – good idea, made more focused, easier to read comments of others, limited volume for board.
 - Page limit - made more difficult to get all of your ideas out.
 - Structure with page limit on executive summary, and then allow appendices to flesh out detail.
- Problem Statement
 - Divide between concept statement (put out earlier) & implementation detail statement

*Compare and contrast elements of standard stakeholder process to ELC process.

Author: D.A. Anders