Critical Issue Fast Path
Lessons Learned Subject Areas

January 24, 2022 Stakeholder Process Forum

At the January 2022 Stakeholder Process Forum, stakeholders anticipate discussing the 2021 implementation of the Critical Issue Fast Path (CIFP) process related to the Minimum Offer Price Rule (MOPR) issue. The purpose of the discussion will be to identify best practices for any future implementations of the CIFP.

- Pre-CIFP Sessions and Poll
  - Helpful, especially in the context of gathering stakeholder feedback before stage 1 and communicating expectations
- CIFP Stages 1-3
  - In the first use, could have benefitted from more time allocated to Stage 3. Something to be mindful of moving forward.
  - There was a disparity in package development. Many of the packages in the matrix did not provide enough information or context about the proposal. Stakeholders should consider hiring a consultant or advisor for the process to help in the development of proposals for future use of the CIFP.
  - Having a labeled PJM initial proposal at the start of Stage 1, hindered the options phase in matrix development before moving to the proposal development (recognizing that M34 requires PJM to identify its initial proposal in Phase 1).
- Stage 4 Final Meeting
  - Presentation Material (restriction to Matrix only)
    - Too difficult to get context from matrix only.
      - Use of short briefing documents or slides
    - Presentation material used should focus on context of the solution and key differentiation of the proposal.
- Stage 4 MC Meeting
  - Should be convened to vote only (no further presentation or debate).
  - Should allow for the flexibility to vote only or to allow for further debate depending on the scenario (this can be done with a vote as well).
- Overall Process
  - After the vote stakeholders would have appreciated more discussion and opportunity for review and input on the drafting of the governing document language. If time permits, include a page turn of the governing document language.
  - Expectations were accurately and clearly communicated at the start process, which helped set the stage for a successful process
- Manual 34 Language Clarification

- Clarification of Manual 34 language to reflect that the Stage 4 Member's Committee meeting is convened to vote and not for any further presentation or debate.
- When considering Manual language, don't be too prescriptive. Each issue will require flexibility to adapt to the scenario.
- Include language in the Manual that speaks to the vote on whether to move directly to vote in Stage 4 MC meeting, to allow for the flexibility to choose whether to have further debate.

- Others?