

Critical Issue Fast Path (CIFP) Process Lessons Learned

Stakeholder Process Forum

October 18, 2021

Dave Anders, Director - Stakeholder Affairs, CIFP Facilitator

Alex Scheirer, Sr. Client Manager I, CIFP Secretary

- **Critical Issue Fast Path (CIFP)**
 - Alternative stakeholder process to be used for contentious issues that would be difficult to resolve with the normal CBIR process
 - Documented in Manual 34 Section 8.6.4
 - Initiated by the Board
 - Members may also vote to request that the Board initiate the CIFP process for new or in-progress issues
 - In this case, the Board issued a letter on April 6, 2021 directing the use of the CIFP for the MOPR issue
 - First time the process was used

Process – M34, section 8.6.4

Stage 1 – Similar to the normal CBIR process. PJM will provide stakeholder education and its initial solution package and alternatives considered, including its option alternatives to stakeholders

Stage 2 – Stakeholders may discuss any previously considered and/or new alternatives, with row-by-row reviews of the CIFP matrix.

Stage 3 – Based on the row-by-row discussions, PJM will finalize its package, and stakeholders will create alternative packages as appropriate.

Stage 4 – “Final Meeting”: For the benefit of all meeting attendees, PJM will review its package proposal in the solution Matrix on a row-by-row basis to show how its solution addresses the PS/IC. At the conclusion of the PJM presentation, Members and invited non-Member stakeholders, whether individually or in self-selected coalitions, will provide feedback to the Board on the impacts, positive or negative on the option details contained within the solution Matrix.

Work Plan

Pre-CIFP		Posting
Discussions	April 7 (2:30-4:30) April 9 (9:00-12:00)	April 2 April 6
Poll	April 9-16	
Discussions (continued)	April 20 (8:00-11:00)	April 15
Formal Process		Posting
Stage 1: PJM PS/IC & proposal	April 28 (9:00-4:00)	April 23
Stage 2: PJM and stakeholder development of the matrix (options)	May 10 (9:00-4:00) May 17 (9:00-4:00) May 26 (1:00-5:00)	May 5 May 12 May 21
Stage 3: PJM and stakeholders finalize proposals	June 7 (9:00-4:00) June 16 (9:00-4:00)	June 2 June 11
Stage 4: Final meeting MC Meeting (MC vote)	June 30 (9:00-1:00) June 30 (2:00-5:00)	June 23 June 23
Board review		
Feedback to members		
Filing	July	

- Pre-CIFP (two meetings)
 - Educational sessions were held prior to the official kick-off of the CIFP
 - History of the MOPR
 - Discussed Design Components and the draft Problem Statement and Issue Charge
 - A poll was issued to gather initial stakeholder feedback
- Stage 1 (one meeting)
 - PJM presented the Problem Statement and Issue Charge as well as a pre-populated matrix that included PJM's preferred option and all options PJM considered.

- Stage 2 (three meetings)
 - Stakeholders had the opportunity to contribute options to the matrix
 - PJM had the opportunity to adjust their preferred options.
- Stage 3 (two meetings)
 - Stakeholder had the opportunity to contribute and present packages
 - PJM has the opportunity to finalize and present their package

- Final Meeting with the Board (one meeting - morning)
 - Package sponsors presented their proposals to the Board
 - Other stakeholders signed up for speaking timeslots to express their views on the packages to the Board
- Special MC (one meeting - afternoon)
 - Convened immediately following the Final Meeting
 - Stakeholders voted on packages
 - Sector-weighted vote on all packages, concurrently.

- Open only to Members, IMM, States, PJM and invited non-Members. The participation of non-Members at the discretion of the MC Chair in consultation with the Vice Chair and MC Secretary.
- Specifically time limited to 4 hours.
 - Strict time limited presentations enforced for all speakers.
- Allows for only matrix to be displayed, specifically prohibits slide presentations
- In person only meeting participation (no phone or video).
 - Requested a waiver of the in-person requirement
- Media rules are the same as for the Liaison Committee (no media).

Enhanced Liaison Committee	Critical Issue Fast Path
Members form self-selected coalitions that must include at least three voting members	No coalition structure, allows for participation of non-Member stakeholders
Uses whitepapers and briefing documents	Uses elements of CBIR (matrix, options, packages)
Board decision based on the briefing documents and coalition presentations	Board decision based on matrix package presentations, stakeholder feedback and an informatory MC vote
Defined condensed timelines	Condensed timelines, but allows for flexibility

- Final Meeting Details and Structure
 - Ambiguity around package sponsor and stakeholder speaking structure
 - ““Final Meeting””: For the benefit of all meeting attendees, PJM will review its package proposal in the solution Matrix on a row-by-row basis to show how its solution addresses the PS/IC. At the conclusion of the PJM presentation, Members and invited non-Member stakeholders, whether individually or in self-selected coalitions, will provide feedback to the Board on the impacts, positive or negative on the option details contained within the solution Matrix.”
 - “IMM will be offered a time-limited opportunity to speak during the meeting. If the IMM cannot support the PJM package, they may offer an alternative package focused on row by row concerns similar to Member CIFP meeting requirements.”
 - “The meeting will be conducted similarly to a Liaison Committee in that the purpose of the meeting is to facilitate discussion between the Members and the Board. The CIFP meeting may last up to 4 hours of Member-Board conversation (including time-limited comments from the IMM, invited non-Members and states).”

- Differing opinions on the intent of the language
 - Would PJM and the IMM be the only parties who had the opportunity to review packages in the final meeting or should other proposal sponsors have the opportunity of a row-by-row review?
 - Some felt the intended purpose of the final meeting was to facilitate stakeholder communication with the board and PJM staff should not present during the meeting.

- MC Meeting and Structure
 - “At the conclusion of the Final Meeting, an MC meeting will be convened to vote on the packages. Sector-weighted voting on all packages will occur concurrently. As with all MC sector-weighted votes, an MC level voting report will be prepared and posted and available to the Board.”

- Differing opinions on the intent of the language
 - Since the Stage 4 Final Meeting was focused on stakeholder to Board communication and specifically prohibited stakeholder to stakeholder debate, some felt the MC should allow for additional discussion on the packages prior to the vote
 - Others felt the intent was to convene to just vote on the packages.

- Clarify M34 language to eliminate ambiguity
- Pre-CIFP educational meetings were helpful. Include these moving forward or allocate additional education meetings in Stage 1.
- Allocate additional time to Stage 3 (and perhaps less time to Stage 2).
- If stakeholders choose to memorialize that the MC session is convened to vote only (no additional discussion), recommend to allow additional time for the morning Final Meeting.
 - Manual language specifies it is time limited to 4 hours, would recommend 5 or 6 hours to allow more flexibility.

- Manual 34 Language Clarification
- Pre-CIFP Sessions and Poll
- CIFP Stages
 - Timing/ Frequency
- Stage 4
 - Structure
 - Presentation Material (restriction to Matrix only)
 - Attendance and registration
 - Media Participation
- MC Structure
- Others?

Alex Scheirer
Alexandra.Scheirer@pjm.com

Dave Anders
David.Anders@pjm.com

Critical Issue Fast Path



Member Hotline

(610) 666 – 8980

(866) 400 – 8980

custsvc@pjm.com