

The SETF posted the straw proposal for comment from October 19 through November 2. The task force received 40 sets of comments representing individuals, organizations, and WECC committees. The complete list of comments is available on the [SETF webpage](#). Below is a summary of the comments and changes made to the document.

Comments on Process

The SETF received a great number of comments on its process for developing the final proposal for restructuring the committees. The most common comments included concerns over the timing of opportunities to comment and concerns that the SETF would present a final proposal at the December Board meeting after a single two-week comment period. In addition, there were some comments on logistical issues, such as word limits on the comment form and the requirement for a WECC login to access the form. The SETF has addressed these concerns through the following changes:

- Altered project roadmap include multiple iterations of the proposal and extend the timeline for conversations to take place into 2021;
- Revised the straw proposal based on comments and opened a second comment period lasting 6 weeks (November 30, 2020 - January 15, 2021);
- Clarify and share more information about the process, roadmap, and background of the project; and
- Addressed logistical issues with comment period.

Comments on Substance

The task force received many comments on the substance of the Straw Proposal. The comments demonstrate stakeholder passion for and concern about WECC's committees and their value to stakeholders. A compilation of the first round of comments is available on the SETF page. What follows is a high-level summary of the comments that informed the creation of Version 2. In general, the comments:

- Showed a mixed response, with some supporting and others opposing the changes proposed;
- Reinforced the value stakeholders get from networking, sharing information, and discussing issues;
- Called for more detail in the next version to allow stakeholders more to react to; and
- Contained several ideas for refining the proposal.

Distilling the range of comments received to a short summary is difficult. The comments highlighted below represent common sentiments and/or insightful input that helped drive the second version of the straw proposal. The absence of a comment from this summary does not indicate the comment was ignored. For a compilation of comments, visit the SETF Site.

The following outlines specific issues and how the second version was changed to address them.

What is the problem we are trying to solve?

“Not being direct about the problem to be solved is a fatal flaw. I recommend adding an explicit problem statement that is specific.”

“There is a great amount of interpretation required to understand what specific problem is being resolved...”

The proposal provides clarification of the issues it is trying to resolve, as well as the guidelines and requirements outlined by previous groups working on this issue.

The proposal needs more detail to allow stakeholders to provide informed comments.

“With more details to be ironed out, the SETF straw proposal represents an excellent start to modernizing the methods and opportunities provided to stakeholders to participate.

“[Entity] does not feel the proposal has enough detail for the industry to support.”

“The OSMIC and PRB are concepts that the industry needs more detail on for the membership to be able to provide meaningful input”

The proposal provides more detail on structural elements, but avoids implementation level details, as those will be left to implementation phase.

The proposal to limit membership lacked detail and confused stakeholders.

“What does limited membership look like?”

“Limited membership would increase participation, commitment, and accountability, and thus an improved work product.”

“Limiting membership will put a large resource burden on [a] small number of SMEs [and] succession planning and engagement.”

The proposal does three things to address these comments:

- 1) Describes the problem the proposal is trying to solve;
- 2) Clarifies intention of limiting membership; and



- 3) Provides more detail and several options for stakeholder to react to.

Strong support for the value of networking, discussion, and sharing information, equal to that of producing work product. However, there was confusion and a mixed response to the proposed solution.

“Separating out the committees from the education and networking opportunities allows individuals to engage at the level and means they desire.”

“There is value added in networking and information sharing, but with the new structure, we are losing some of those conversations and are creating siloes.”

“I cannot quite imagine what that new mechanism would look like, but the appearance is that the effort is to pick and choose who will be allowed to participate on substantive issues...”

“[Entity] requests that the next draft of the proposal consider the value of increased collaboration through networking and relationship building.”

Addressing stakeholder confusion and considering the comments propelled the creation of two distinct substructures within the WECC committee structure. One structure would be dedicated to producing work product and the other to networking, information sharing, discussion, and other stakeholder interaction activities. The proposal outlines the issues being addressed and explains how this structure can address the issues.

There were many questions and mixed support for the Performance Review Board

“[Reviewing everything]...may be a heavy lift as they will review and oversee all the work products.”

“Further dialogue is required between the SETF and WECC members to determine the adequate level of oversight and guidance.”

“The title would benefit from something less focused on “performance review”

“I also have some concerns with the name as it sounds elitist/authoritative/auditing like” over maybe one that is intended at being “issue-driven and focused on reviewing the outcomes” for future improvement.

To address this topic, the proposal provides a reworked idea and better outline of the function of the group, which also has a different name.

There was a mixed response to the OSMIC, largely tied to its role as a group responsible for carrying out or overseeing work product.

“The combined OSMIC seems way too broad a scope to allow useful participation.”

“Compare the functions and roles of the RAC, OC, MIC to the role of the newly formed OSMIC.”

“Will the RAC be reviewed as well? How is an issue worked on by multiple groups today, and would this change if the RAC remains separate?”

The proposal provides a reworked idea for the committee structure that treats all three existing Standing Committees the same. This approach helps address issues of siloes, which may have persisted under the OSMIC + RAC proposed structure. The new Working Committee structure clarifies the roles of the committees, including the intent to retire any committee with no other purpose than to approve the work of other groups.

There were requests for more information on specific groups that may be retired.

This was not provided in V2 because the information is not available. The proposal was not drafted with specific groups in mind. Rather the proposal was drafted based on the concept that groups should provide value in the form of work product. Depending on the outcome of the development process, the decision to retire any group will be carefully weighed and discussed.

There is a desire for work products and processes be more inclusive and widely shared.

“The one thing we think needs to be added up front is a commitment to provide all stakeholders opportunities to review and provide comment[s] on work product development plans and [drafts] of the work products before they are approved”

This is addressed in the proposal both in the inclusiveness of the Reliability and Security Risk Committee and the requirements for approving work products.