

Summary of Governance Task Force Conference Call #4
Thursday, Sept. 2nd, 9:00 – 11:00 PM ET

Official/designated Task Force members in attendance, and other speakers: Ryan Kind, Beth Soholt, Steve Gaw, Maryam Sharif, Tammy Linde, Herb Healy, Doug Nazarian, Rob Sinclair, David Meyer (DOE), Craig Glazer, and David Whiteley (EIPC), Catherine Morris, Caitlin Connelly (Keystone)

Overview of input received from TF members on Chair:

- Keystone presented a summary table collating task force members' responses on proposed chair roles and responsibilities and possible structure of the SSC leadership
- The sector representatives volunteered changes and/or additions to the table, issue-by-issue, and presented their reasoning behind each decision, as well as what they thought was most important about each issue.

Chair Discussion

- The roles and responsibilities of a proposed Chair that were agreed upon by this Task Force include:
 - serving as a point of contact for EIPC;
 - serving as a point of contact for WGs and assisting with communication and coordination among WGs, as appropriate;
 - helping to monitor the progress of the SSC and WGs and to ensure tasks/goals/objectives are met on deadline;
 - encouraging cooperation and supporting consensus-guilding;
 - assist with developing SSC meeting agendas;
 - helping to keep SSC on task during meetings
- The wording on the descriptions of these roles is not final, and additional limitations or elaborations on these items may be included in the final charter.
- Beth Soholt and Ryan Kind volunteered to work with Keystone to incorporate the changes to the Charter to reflect the consensus of the TF on Roles and Responsibilities of the Chair(s).
- Several sectors stated the Chair should not serve as a substitute for the SSC in substantive discussions and important administrative matters. EIPC clarified they do not intend to use the Chair as a shortcut for important decisions requiring approval of the SSC.
- There was discussion on the role of the Chair in SSC consensus-building. Multiple sectors had concerns about the Chair “cutting deals” with Sectors outside of SSC meetings. End Users brought up the importance of transparency to address this: discussions between sectors would be appropriate if they came back to SSC for approval, but it would be counterproductive to form a “hard-baked” proposal with some sectors, then present it to plenary and exert pressure for the proposal to be accepted as-is. Another check is that any SSC member can, at any time, voice their concerns about how the consensus-building is handled.
- There was not agreement on a chair being designated as the point person for outside communications. Several sectors were more comfortable with all SSC members

retaining ability to use their own judgement and not speak on behalf of the entire SSC.

- Discussion on how the chair should be structured centered on which sectors/ individuals would be in positions of leadership, whether they would be co-chairs or a chair and vice-chair, and how often or if the position(s) would be rotated. Concerns noted related to these various leadership arrangements included bias/ neutrality, equality (of role designation and of influence), and consistency.
- Some sectors expressed the importance of having actual names of individuals under consideration for chair(s). Others were concerned about putting names forward before details of structure and selection process were finalized.

Least-cost/ other planning criteria

- Some in the End Users sector want least-cost criteria to be noted as the primary criteria to be addressed in the project, but that Ryan Kind was unsure about whether the SSC Charter is the appropriate medium for dealing with this topic.
- Multiple sectors agreed with this sentiment, and that it would be more appropriate to discuss at the SSC level. No objections were made to excluding the proposed change.

Other issues:

- Transparency in EIPC Analysis Team (AT) activities
 - Questions: How is AT related to SSC? Is there a transparency requirement for EIPC AT meetings? Should the relationship be spelled out in the charter or another document? Who is able to attend PI meetings? Are there notifications? Are there summaries?
 - EIPC clarified that all AT interaction with stakeholders is at the SSC level (or WG level), and these are public. AT meetings being open and public is inappropriate, just as it would be for individual sector meetings.
 - Question about DOE funding linked to transparency
 - David Meyer of DOE stated that it was his understanding that all meetings supported by DOE grant money must be open, but that this question would be answered definitively by Alicia Dalton-Tingler of NETL
 - No changes were made to the draft charter related to this discussion.

Next Steps:

- Keystone will work with Ryan Kind and Beth Soholt on changes to SSC Charter related to proposed Chair(s) roles and responsibilities.
- Next call in 2 weeks to allow for inter-sector talk. (Keystone will send Doodle poll.)
- Agenda items for the next call:
 - Alternatives to consensus - addendum to May 14th SSC Description.
 - Results of further sector discussion of Chair structure and individual candidates