

RTO Responsiveness and Governance Working Group
April 1, 2009
Teleconference
Meeting No. 8 Notes

Summary Outline of Outstanding Issues/Agenda Items and Status

- Process enhancements to allow ratepayers/load/end users to better participate in stakeholder process and with ISO-NE (*set for further discussion on April 1 agenda*)
- Stakeholder process refinements, e.g., sector membership qualifications and voting, enhancing minority representation (*no further discussions planned*)
- ISO Mission Statement, including cost/economic analysis (*no further discussions planned*)
- Representation of consumers interests on the ISO Board (*no further discussions planned*)
- Transparency issues, e.g., meeting minutes, ISO actions (*no further discussions planned*)
- Role of the States, including consumer advocates, NESCOE and NECPUC, in stakeholder process (*no further discussion planned*)
- Evaluation metrics (*no further discussion planned*)

Process Enhancements

- Anne George from ISO and Kevin Conroy from the Massachusetts AG introduced the proposal to establish a Consumer Liaison Group (“CLG”) and designate a point-of-contact (“POC”) employed by ISO for this group. It was noted that no NEPOOL approval was needed for this proposal, although the proposal would be discussed by this working group and by the Participants Committee at its meeting on April 3, 2009.
- Ms. George explained that there were certain outreach and other responsibilities the ISO would be taking on with respect to the CLG and that the POC would be taking a lot of its direction from consumer groups and helping to assist that group, particularly in helping to get it established. She further stated that the CLG would be open to all and information from that group would be available publicly. There was further discussion on ensuring the CLG remained responsive to the consumers it was designed to serve, while still remaining transparent and open in its communications and information.
- Mr. Conroy reiterated that the CLG would be open for all to participate in its meetings but that it was focused on getting more consumers involved in the process and helping to facilitate the delivery of information back and forth from consumers and ISO.

- There were suggestions, which were agreeable to Ms. George and Mr. Conroy, to change the references in the draft proposal of “rates” to “prices” and to remove the reference to “important” in the sentence that refers to the PC providing information on important issues, as the word important could be interpreted to be a filter. It was noted that the CLG will evolve and will be able to determine over time the information that needs to be provided.
- A participant asked Mr. Conroy to explain what was meant by language that the PC would provide information “when as needed and appropriate.” Mr. Conroy explained that that language was intended to allow for reports to ebb and flow depending on the need at the time, which could mean times when multiple reports are made and other times with no reports.
- There were discussions regarding the ability of the CLG to get information before senior management at the ISO other than for ISO Board meetings. Ms. George noted that the POC will be employed by ISO and will report to her and that she would attend all of the CLG meetings and will remain involved in what is going on with the CLG.
- A participant asked about the language in the proposal relating to the ISO information policy and it was clarified that the POC would be an ISO employee and bound by the information policy. Mr. David Doot, NEPOOL Counsel, noted that the POC would be unable to share information that is protected by the information policy with the CLG, just as any other ISO employee. Mr. Doot also noted that if anyone from the CLG wants information, they can request it just like anyone else can under the information policy.
- A participant noted his disappointment with language in the proposal that referred to participation in the CLG by “consumer organizations, advocates and end users” as not capturing those entities, particularly distribution companies that advocate already for the interests of the consumers, in some cases better than those that claim to represent end users.
- There was further discussion regarding the desire to try and keep the CLG as open as possible in order to provide diversity in its interactions and also to allow utilities that represent end users the ability to participate in the CLG discussions, while at the same time encouraging those folks that are not already engaged in the stakeholder process to participate.
- There was a suggestion to swap the term end users in the proposal with the term “ratepayers.” There were then further suggestions to change the term to “ratepayers and consumers.” That change was generally agreed to among the working group.
- Mr. Doot noted that materials would be circulated based on this discussion to the Participants Committee, which would discuss this matter at its meeting on Friday.