MISO Stakeholder Process Redesign Process Working Group
Recommendations for Advisory Committee
Finalized at November 3, 2015 Workshop #4
(with polling on SMWG & RECB Options added subsequently)

Note: All of the issues in this document but two have been supported unanimously by all the Sector and MISO Representatives. Consistent with the decisionmaking groundrule below, the two non-consensus options provide two alternatives, with the preferences of each sector listed herein.

A list of Sector and MISO representatives, including any participating alternates, is included in Appendix 1 of this document.

Dr. Raab, President, Raab Associates, Ltd. with Patrick Field, Managing Director, CBI, facilitated the Working Group Process.

**Decisionmaking Groundrule** (accepted by Sector/MISO Representatives on 8/27):
Sector Representatives, MISO representatives, and standing Parent Entity chairs, with the facilitators’ support, will aim to achieve consensus (unanimous agreement that the parties can “live with” the recommendation) on recommendations to the Advisory Committee. If consensus cannot be achieved, the representatives will put forward the least number of alternative proposals possible with clear explanations of the differences, pros and cons of each alternative, and who supports each alternative.

I. Structure/Organizational Chart/# of Meetings

- Revisit and endeavor to streamline the org chart structure periodically-review Stakeholder Redesign changes in a defined moment within one year
- Rigorously sunset Task Forces, and if Task Forces turn out to have ongoing work, change them to Working Groups or Subcommittees
- If there’s nothing pressing on a group’s agenda, could skip/cancel that month’s meeting
- Joint meetings between groups working on the same issues could reduce meetings
- Implement common issue processes for cross-functional issues. Some common issues would need to be at the parent level (for policy) and others at the working group level (for technical) but many at both
- **Frequency of Meetings**
  - Parent entities will determine the frequency of their meetings and the meetings of their subordinate entities [Note: Parent entities are assumed to meet monthly, unless determined otherwise (e.g., every other month). Subordinate entities are assumed to meet monthly or every other month, unless more frequent meetings are needed to accomplish the tasks within the set timeframe/milestones set by the parent committee.]
The Steering Committee will determine the frequency of its meetings
[Note: Assumed to meet monthly unless determined otherwise]

The Advisory Committee will plan to meet quarterly, face-to-face, with
additional conference calls/meetings as needed

MISO and Entity Chairs will determine the actual meeting dates, and
endeavor to cluster meetings appropriately and in the same location
to minimize travel time and capture other efficiencies

Meeting dates should be established well in advance, and should not
be changed without adequate notice

Description of Revised Org Chart Changes (see org chart diagram below):

Note: Will need a joint Stakeholder-MISO transition plan for phasing in changes to
the Stakeholder Process—including timing and sequencing, and monitoring
effectiveness

1) Advisory Committee, Planning Advisory Committee, Market and Reliability
Subcommittees, and Finance Subcommittee should all be retained
2) Form a new Resource Adequacy Subcommittee (RASC)
   a. Absorb the following working groups and task forces into the new
      Resource Adequacy Subcommittee:
         i. Supply Adequacy Working Group (SAWG)
         ii. Electric and Natural Gas Coordination Task Force (ENGCTF)
         iii. The Demand Response Working Group (DRWG) would be
discontinued, but the demand response issues would be
distributed between the RASC and Market Subcommittee as
appropriate
         iv. Note: Some specific tasks could be assigned to other standing
entities as these subgroups are absorbed, if appropriate
   b. The Loss of Load Expectation Working Group (LOLEWG) would be
      retained as a separate entity and moved under RASC (to ensure the
meeting scheduling dovetails with other appropriate/associated
groups)
   c. Note: This Subcommittee, would have a Stakeholder Chair and Vice-
Chair, and a charter
3) Market Subcommittee (MSC)
   a. Seams Management Working Group (SMWG)—[Note: Since no
      consensus was reached during the final meeting, Sector and MISO
Representatives were polled on two options subsequent to the
meeting, and the results are summarized below. In addition to the
polling some Sectors/Miso also submitted comments that can be
found in an accompanying Word document.]
      i. Retained as a Free-Standing WG under MSC [All of the Sectors
plus MISO indicated that this was an acceptable option (hence
meeting the consensus threshold). Eight of the Sectors also
indicated this option as their first choice (CA, CM, EO, EUC, IPP, OMS, TD, & TDU).

ii. Absorbed into MSC [All of the Sectors but four (CA, CM, EUC, & TD) indicated that this was an acceptable option. Three of the Sectors also indicated this option as their first choice (MISO, PM, TO).

b. Market Settlements Working Group (MSWG) and Credit Practices Working Group (CPWG) to merge as new combined WG under the MSC
c. Sunset the Trading Hubs Task Force (THTF)

4) Steering Committee
   a. Data Transparency Working Group (DTWG)—absorb into SC (will take in data requests and orchestrate/assign to the appropriate entities)
   b. Stakeholder Governance Working Group (SGWG)—absorb into SC
   c. Note: In addition to absorbing the work of the SGWG and DTWG, the SC would take the lead on overseeing the overall assignment process (not prioritization), and would also oversee enforcement of the Stakeholder Governance rules and procedures [see below under Assignment for more details]
   d. SC Members: Parent Entity Chairs and AC Vice-Chair and Chair

5) Use the existing Information Forum -- in consultation with Committee/Subcommittee Chairs for topics -- for presentations, report outs from committees and appropriate comments back from Stakeholders, and other informational activities. Detailed discussions and dialogue and resolution expected to take place in other forums [Note: New option added at meeting: Sectors will let it be known if they find it unacceptable—See comments in accompanying Word document]

6) RECB Task Force
   a. Change from Task Force to Working Group
   b. Location? —[Note: Since no consensus was reached during the final meeting, Sector and MISO Representatives were polled on two options subsequent to the meeting, and the results are summarized below. In addition to the polling some Sectors/MISO also submitted comments that can be found in an accompanying Word document.]
      i. Retain as it is with report directly to the AC -- [All of the Sectors (except for the PM Sector) and MISO indicated that this was an acceptable option. Six of the Sectors also indicated this option as their first choice (CA, CM, EO, IPP, TDU, & TO)
      ii. Retain but move under the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)-- [All of the Sectors (except the CM & TDU Sectors) and MISO indicated that this was an acceptable option. Five of the Sectors also indicated this option as their first choice (EUC, MISO, OMS, PM, & TD)
II. Prioritization

- Each Parent Committee (in consultation with the Steering Committee and Advisory Committee, as needed), should be responsible for prioritizing its workload and the workload of its subordinate entities, assisted through an annual work planning process and plan that is updated periodically during the year.

- The overall highest priorities of the Stakeholder Process should be set by the Advisory Committee in consultation with MISO and the Parent Committees and Steering Committee.
  - On an annual basis, the Advisory Committee should be responsible for identifying the most important issues for the Stakeholder Process to focus on during the forthcoming year. As input to the Advisory Committee’s process, it should consult with each of the Parent Entities to get their input and perspective. The Advisory Committee should
also consult with MISO to get its input reflecting MISO’s own strategic/management plans and views on industry changes.

- Once established, these overall priorities should be clearly conveyed to MISO, Parent Entities, Steering Committee, and all stakeholders.
- These highest level Stakeholder Process priorities should help guide the work of the Parent Committees and Steering Committee in prioritizing their respective work.
- These high-level priorities should be revisited by the Advisory Committee mid-year and adjusted, if need be.

III. Assignment

- **Problem Definitions, Templates & Assignment:** All new issues, issues that had previously been tabled/dropped, or ongoing issues with significant and substantial changes, require the completion of an issue assignment template (including a problem definition, type of issue, deadlines if any, etc.)
  - The issue assignment template needs to be submitted to the Steering Committee for assignment, unless it has already been pre-determined by the Steering Committee or Advisory Committee where that issue would be assigned—and then it can go directly to the Parent Entity.
  - The Parent Entity to which an issue is being assigned should help determine whether the issue should be taken up by that Parent Entity or by one of its subordinate entities.
  - No issue should be introduced directly into a working group or task force without the Parent Entity approval.
  - Certain types of issues (e.g., small issues or changes to ongoing issues) could be submitted directly to a Parent Entity for assignment and may not even require that an issue assignment template be completed.
    - If an issue comes directly to a Parent Entity, the Parent Entity should inform the Steering Committee by its next meeting.

IV. Enforcement

- Assignment procedures should be enforced by the Parent Committees, Steering Committee, and Advisory Committee (if need be).
- All Stakeholders should be familiar with the rules and procedures delineated in the Governance Guide.
- Stakeholder rules and procedures training is required for all Chairs and Vice-Chairs; expected of AC members; strongly encouraged for all stakeholders; and for all, refreshed periodically.
- The Chair and Vice-Chairs of each and every Stakeholder group are responsible for enforcing these rules and procedures within their entities.
- Parent Entities and the Steering Committee should be alerted to and should help resolve any issues related to enforcing the rules and procedures in the Governance Guide.
• The Advisory Committee is available to hear and resolve any issues that are not satisfactorily resolved by the Steering Committee

V. Working Through Issues
• The Stakeholder Process should generally use the following steps, including 1) a clear problem statement/definition; 2) education/background on the issue and Stakeholder perspectives; 3) exploration of a range of options to solve the problem (before a straw proposal is introduced); and 4) narrowing of options and development of a single proposal/recommendation if possible.
  o For certain types of issues (TBD) a more streamlined process may be possible
• Parent Entities need to be parent-like in supervising their subordinate working groups and task forces (i.e., they need to oversee their work plans and their subordinate entities’ ongoing work)
• Avoid providing the same presentations in multiple forums (through joint meetings or information forums)
• Final Advice:
  o Decisions/advice by working groups or task forces should not be considered final until they have been considered by their Parent Entities.
    ▪ The Parent Committee can review or approve explicitly, or the Parent Entity may pass on the opportunity to review and approve; and
    ▪ All issues that have been approved or defeated by a margin of 40/60% or closer go to their Parent Entity for consideration.
  o Major decisions/advice should not be considered final until they have been considered by the Advisory Committee
    ▪ The AC can review or approve explicitly or the AC may pass on the opportunity to review and approve; and
    ▪ All issues that have been approved or defeated by a margin of 40/60% or closer go to the AC for consideration.
    ▪ Note: “Major” to be determined by the Advisory Committee in consultation with the Parent Entities—but could include large new policy issues, issues with substantial dollars at stake, or major tariff changes)
• Tabling and/or Dropping Issues:
  o Issues that Stakeholders no longer wish to pursue should be tabled and/or dropped [Note: this may require the Stakeholder Governance Guide to be updated to have clearer rules and procedures in this regard]
  o Such tabling/dropping should be noted in the tracking system
  o Such issues should not be reintroduced without going through the formal assignment process (as noted above)
• On-Line Tracking:
  o MISO’s online tracking system should be maintained and improved (including keeping it up to date, noting where issues are assigned, as well as any deadlines), including, if possible, by topic/category as well as by entity (say, Demand Response as issue across more than one entity)
  o The Chairs and Vice-Chairs and liaisons of each entity are responsible for providing MISO with the necessary information on the issues taken up within its entity in a timely fashion, so that MISO can keep the tracking system up to date
### Appendix 1: Sector and MISO Representatives for Stakeholder Process Redesign Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Liskey</td>
<td>Consumer Advocates</td>
<td>Citizens Against Rate Excess</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Easler</td>
<td>Consumer Advocates</td>
<td>Office of Consumer Advocate (IA)</td>
<td>Sector Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Penner</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>Manitoba Hydro-Electric</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Neufeld</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>Manitoba Hydro-Electric</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWayne Todd</td>
<td>End Use Customer</td>
<td>Alcoa Power Generating, Inc.</td>
<td>Sector Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Soholt</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Wind on the Wires</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deral Danis</td>
<td>Independent Power</td>
<td>Clean Line Energy</td>
<td>Sector Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Volpe</td>
<td>Producers</td>
<td>Dynegy</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Kozyey</td>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Bloodworth</td>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>Sector Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Schug</td>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>MISO</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Talberg</td>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>Michigan PSC</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Jacobs</td>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>Iowa Commission</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Paslawski</td>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>Sector Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marka Shaw</td>
<td>Power Marketers</td>
<td>Exelon</td>
<td>Sector Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Plante</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Wisconsin Public Service Corporation</td>
<td>Sector Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Lacey</td>
<td>Transmission Owners</td>
<td>Great River Energy</td>
<td>Sector Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Jankowski</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>We Energies</td>
<td>RSC Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Advisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob McKee</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>American Transmission Company</td>
<td>PAC Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill SeDoris</td>
<td>Stakeholder Governance Working Group</td>
<td>Northern Indiana Public Service Company</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>