

# Western Energy Imbalance Market Regional Issues Forum Reevaluation

## Discussion Draft Prepared by the Regional Issues Forum Liaisons

The Regional Issues Forum (“RIF”) founding documents require reevaluation of the RIF commencing early in 2017. The RIF Liaisons have prepared this set of questions to stimulate stakeholder conversation and input from regional stakeholders in advance of the reevaluation process.

The Liaisons are targeting a robust discussion of this issue at the EIM Governing Body meeting on February 28-March 1, 2017, in Las Vegas, NV. The RIF meeting will be subsumed into the Governing Body agenda to allow maximum participation of Governing Body members.

The Liaisons request comments on this Discussion Draft by February 22, 2017. These comments should be submitted to the RIF liaisons at [EIMRIF@caiso.com](mailto:EIMRIF@caiso.com).

### **Introduction**

The governance documents for the Energy Imbalance Market (“EIM”) require that the efficacy of the Regional Issues Forum (“RIF”) be reevaluated to determine if the RIF should continue, and if it does, what improvements might be made. This reevaluation exercise is to be conducted as part of a stakeholder process. The EIM Governance Charter, Section 6.1.4, states the requirement for re-evaluating the efficacy and role of the RIF:

*After four to five meetings of the Forum or, even if the Forum has not met four times, beginning in April 2017, the efficacy and role of the Regional Issues Forum will be reconsidered through a stakeholder process, considering its performance and also any changed governance structures and regional market development as a whole.*

To fulfil the requirements of the governance documents, the RIF sector Liaisons request stakeholder feedback on several issues related to how the re-evaluation stakeholder process should be conducted. The Liaisons recognize that the RIF has been in limbo during its infancy. We are unanimous in our opinion that either the RIF finds a meaningful place within the EIM governance structure, with commensurate support, resource and time commitments, or it should likely be allowed to expire.

### **Stakeholder Process Questions**

1. The first question centers around the structure of the reevaluation process. It is the Liaisons’ understanding that the ISO will run a traditional ISO-driven stakeholder process for this effort. The Liaisons would like this to be a bottom-up process shaped by stakeholder input and that is one of the purposes of this initial

# **Western Energy Imbalance Market Regional Issues Forum Reevaluation**

## **Discussion Draft Prepared by the Regional Issues Forum Liaisons**

Discussion Draft. We would benefit from stakeholder feedback on the role of the RIF Liaisons in this process. Should we serve to channel stakeholder feedback? Should we be making affirmative recommendations? Should we go so far as the EIM Transitional Committee to develop comprehensive work products?

2. The RIF liaisons believe that the RIF reevaluation stakeholder process can be accomplished in a relatively short amount of time and with minimal process. As such, the RIF liaisons recommend that the RIF reevaluation stakeholder process consist of a combined issue paper/straw proposal developed by the RIF liaisons, followed by no more than two stakeholders meeting, and commensurate numbers of iterative comment and proposal rounds. Indeed, this could be accomplished with one round of comments and a meeting, followed by a final work product. Do you agree with this recommendation? If your response is no, please explain and provide your suggestion for what process should be used. For example, should there be multiple rounds of stakeholder input (written comments), multiple meetings or multiple revisions to proposal documents?
3. The RIF liaisons recommend that the RIF reevaluation final proposal and stakeholder feedback be presented to the EIM Governing Body for the ultimate decision and resolution under the current voting structure of the EIM Governing Body. Do you agree with this recommendation? If your response is no, please explain and provide your suggestion for what resolution process should be used.
4. The RIF liaisons recommend that the RIF reevaluation stakeholder process be completed by the July 13, 2017 meeting of the EIM Governing Body. Do you agree with this recommendation? If your response is no, please explain and provide your suggestion for what timeline should be used.

### **Relationship to EIM Governing Body/Other Topics**

5. Right now, the RIF meets 3 times per year. Suggestions have been made to align RIF meetings with the EIM Governing Body schedule. That would increase time and meeting commitment, but would regularize RIF input into the Governing Body. Input on this issue would be valuable. The Liaisons believe that the EIM Governing Body should have a strong role in setting the agenda for the RIF to ensure feedback into the issues on which they must deliberate. We would appreciate input on this initial recommendation.
6. The expectation is that, in addition to the EIM Governing Body, agenda development and RIF meeting discussions would be led by stakeholders, channeled through the Liaisons for the purposes of organizing meetings. This is consistent with the last RIF meeting in Phoenix on November 29, 2016, where

# **Western Energy Imbalance Market Regional Issues Forum Reevaluation**

## **Discussion Draft Prepared by the Regional Issues Forum Liaisons**

stakeholders led market issue discussions. It is expected that a primary role of the Liaisons will be to define a process for requesting agenda item. Meeting plans would establish deadlines for issue submissions or stakeholder presentations. Please provide thoughts on this general approach to RIF activities.

7. The existing documentation for the RIF contemplates the possibility of written work product as a means of capturing stakeholder views or RIF opinions. The Liaisons believe that if this function remains in any final recommendation, a process for triggering and producing written material must be developed. Stakeholder views on whether this function should remain, and how to execute upon it are appreciated.
8. Is the RIF delivering on all of the key functions described in the operating guidelines? If your response is no, please explain and/or provide suggestions.
9. What should be the primary focus areas of the RIF?
10. Are there, at this early stage, any provisions of the EIM Governance Charter or other RIF documents that stand out as needing reconsideration?