





Visualizing Results of PJM's Stakeholder Super Forum Survey

Christina Simeone, July 25, 2018






(3) Rate the efficiency of PJM's stakeholder process



(7) Do you think the current number of PJM stakeholder-related meetings needed to accomplish PJM's workload is ...



■ Too Few ■ Too Many ■ Just Right ■ No response


WORKLOAD

11. Standing Committees need to better manage the scope and timing of the Subcommittees and Task Forces that serve them

10. PJM and its Members should set firm timetables for resolving each issue they undertake

(9) PJM and its Members need to do a better job prioritizing the issues they do undertake each year


(8) The PJM stakeholder process takes on more issues in a year than it can process and resolve




■ 1 (Strongly Disagree) ■ 2 ■ 3 ■ 4 ■ 5 ■ 6 (Strongly Agree)



Consent Based Issue Resolution (CBIR)




STATES






PJM STAFF



27. If PJM staff and management have a strong opinion about how an issue should be substantively resolved, should they...





THE BOARD

28. When Stakeholders do not reach agreement on significant matters (exceed 2/3 weighted vote threshold at the Members Committee), the PJM Board currently receives sufficiently clear and detailed information on the perspectives of members.

