

Stakeholder Survey Feedback

Stakeholder Process “Super Forum”
July 25, 2018

Total Unique Responders 49
Total Companies 204
Voting Members 53
Affiliates 141

1. Rate what you see as the essential goal(s) of PJM's stakeholder process.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
To ensure PJM meets its mission regarding reliability; robust, non-discriminatory, and competitive markets; and efficient operations	3	2	1	3	47	148	0	5.61	5.6	0.8
To reach agreement among the members	12	8	75	61	39	9	0	3.66	3.7	1.1
To inform the Board about members' perspectives	4	0	25	28	86	61	0	4.84	4.9	1.1
Total									4.7	1.3

2. Rate what you see PJM's stakeholder process doing well with its members. -- learn about and gain an understanding of issues	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average
learn about and gain an understanding of issues	4	0	26	28	96	50	0	4.77
express their views and concerns	4	5	26	28	65	76	0	4.83
understand other members' views and concerns	4	18	41	68	51	22	0	4.03
develop and vet alternate solutions	5	28	65	35	57	14	0	3.75
reach agreement on solutions	26	61	38	37	40	2	0	3.05

	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	4.77	1.08
	4.84	1.24
	4.03	1.20
	3.73	1.26
	3.06	1.37
Total	4.09	1.40

3. Rate the efficiency of PJM's stakeholder process -- resolving issues related to the reliable operation of the electric grid.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average
resolving issues related to the reliable operation of the electric grid.	4	30	22	64	63	21	0	4.05
resolving issues related to the design of wholesale electricity markets.	9	83	28	63	21	0	0	3.02

	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	4.05	1.27
	3.02	1.15
Total	3.54	1.32

4. Overall, the stakeholder process reasonably balances competing interests.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	28	35	42	39	44	16	0	3.41	3.40	1.53

5. All things considered, the PJM stakeholder process is superior to the stakeholder processes of other RTO's.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	6	33	34	33	48	50	0	4.15	4.13	1.52

6. Overall, how satisfied is your organization with PJM's stakeholder process?	Strongly Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Satisfied 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	5	43	67	30	58	1	0	3.47	3.47	1.19

7. Do you think the current number of PJM stakeholder-related meetings needed to accomplish PJM's workload is ...	Too Few	Too Many	Just about right	No Response
	2	137	61	4

8. The PJM stakeholder process takes on more issues in a year than it can process and resolve	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average
	2	9	13	20	56	100	4	5.00

2018 Mean	2018 SD
5.08	1.19

9. PJM and its Members need to do a better job prioritizing the issues they do undertake each year	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average
	0	4	4	32	37	123	4	5.25

2018 Mean	2018 SD
5.35	0.96

10. PJM and its Members should set firm timetables for resolving each issue they undertake	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	0	25	42	61	53	19	4	3.92	3.99	1.17
11. Standing Committees need to better manage the scope and timing of the Subcommittees and Task Forces that serve them	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	0	15	29	33	90	33	4	4.40	4.49	1.16
14. The stakeholder process would benefit from greater direct participation by senior managers and executives of member organizations	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	12	65	29	49	35	9	5	3.21	3.31	1.36

15. Even when members can't reach agreement on a solution, it is still beneficial for issues to be fully vetted through the PJM stakeholder process.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	0	1	7	45	54	92	5	5.02	5.17	0.92
16. Committees and Task Forces should develop proposals that have a reasonable chance of acceptance at the committees above them.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	39	1	35	56	39	29	5	3.62	3.71	1.64
17. Where consensus on a single proposal is not possible, Committees and Task Forces should elevate multiple proposals to the Senior Standing Committees to which they report.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	1	41	0	65	44	48	5	4.17	4.31	1.39

20. PJM and its Members should more actively seek state regulator's views on issues so that PJM and its Members can address them during their deliberations.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	13	33	18	41	72	22	5	3.87	3.96	1.48

22. Overall, how satisfied are you with how the PJM staff provides technical expertise and analysis to support the stakeholder process? **poll mistakenly labeled with "disagree" range**	Strongly Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Satisfied 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	1	1	16	24	98	59	5	4.86	4.99	0.93

23. Overall, how satisfied are you with how the PJM staff chairs/facilitates Committee and Task Force meetings? **poll mistakenly labeled with "disagree" range**	Strongly Dissatisfied 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Satisfied 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	0	3	43	50	88	15	5	4.24	4.34	0.95

24. PJM staff and management's role within the stakeholder process should be to advocate for technically-sound reliability solutions.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	1	0	12	25	67	94	5	5.08	5.21	0.94
25. PJM staff and management's role within the stakeholder process should be to advocate for competitive and robust market solutions.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	1	19	9	23	74	73	5	4.74	4.85	1.27
26. PJM staff and management's role within the stakeholder process should be to broker agreements among its members.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average	2018 Mean	2018 SD
	20	32	60	52	27	8	5	3.21	3.30	1.29

27. If PJM staff and management have a strong opinion about how an issue should be substantively resolved, should they...	Keep it to themselves	State it clearly and continue to chair/facilitate	State it clearly but assign two PJM staff (one to represent PJM, another to chair/facilitate)	State it clearly but bring in a third party to chair/facilitate	No Response
	0	14	161	24	5

28. When Stakeholders do not reach agreement on significant matters (exceed 2/3 weighted vote threshold at the Members Committee), the PJM Board currently receives sufficiently clear and detailed information on the perspectives of members.	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Agree 6	No Response	Weighted Average
	24	9	80	48	8	30	5	3.40

2018 Mean	2018 SD
3.49	1.44