

**Summary of Scenario Planning WG Call #2**  
**Tues., August 24, 2:00 – 3:30 PM ET**

**Official/designated WG members in attendance:** M. Kresowik, E. Vancko, S. Popowsky, R. Weishaar, D. Boguslawski, M. Lacey, S. Gaw, M. Goggin, H. Healy, T. Noeldner, P. McCurley, Doug Nazarian, L. Fleming, R. Stein, C. Lyons., D. Hartman, D. Meyer (DOE), Joe Bryson (EPA), F. Flygt (EIPC), and C. Morris (Keystone Center)

1. Ground rules about speaking were revisited: Representatives above have speaking priority, then all participants can comment at intervals.
  
2. Discussion: Scenario Planning Approach
  - There was substantial discussion on how the Shell and Deloitte approaches differ. Some of the details will need to wait until after the Modeling webinar next week to be discussed, but a main point was that Shell starts off with 2 key drivers, whereas Deloitte starts off with 4-5 key drivers.
  - One point was confirmed: no matter which approach is chosen, the 8 futures developed must translate somehow into a range of values (numbers) as inputs to the CRA model.
  - CRA's role is not to advise on which key drivers to choose or to give input on ranges of values to employ. CRA has provided (on webinar, now posted) a list of the inputs to their model.
  - Another point was clarified: while these approaches are labeled Shell and Deloitte, using them does not imply hiring of consultants from those companies or purchasing of special equipment or software. The WG will simply be using the approach as a theoretical framework.
  - Flora described the Deloitte approach scenarios as deigned to have an equal probability of occurrence, which in total do not sum to 100% however. She believed Shell was also equal-probability, but is not experienced with it.
  - Several opinions were voiced:
    - use existing scenarios to save time (but being sure to delve into those scenarios enough to arrive at values needed for modeling)
    - make sure futures are sufficiently different from each other
    - not use a probabilistic approach
    - Shell and 2 drivers seemed too limiting
    - key to understand "micro-drivers" (as opposed to key drivers) since those are what will be varied for sensitivities
  
3. Discussion: Refining charge and goals of the WG
  - There are some differences of opinion in terms of what the charge of this WG is, even after having read what was agreed to as its charge by the SSC in July.
  - Before a lot of work is done to arrange face-to-face meetings, this WG should notify the SSC of its plan to start developing the scenarios.
  - There is some effort in the Modeling WG to think about how to work with this WG on shared responsibilities, but this idea was not taken up by this WG.

4. Discussion: criteria for determining the best scenario planning approach

- Some suggestions were:
  - variety of drivers
  - ease of communicating the results
  - time commitment required
  - likelihood of achieving consensus with method

5. Next Steps

- For WG volunteers:
  - Mark Kresowik, David Boguslawski, and Steve Gaw volunteered to draft a workplan of tasks going up to the October SSC meeting, including possible face-to-face WG meeting
  - Other WG members are asked to submit their important parameters, to get a list of potential key drivers (whether send to Keystone or listserv has not been strictly decided)
- For Keystone:
  - resend to WG listserv and post to web Resources sent out before Scenario Planning webinar
  - compile and send to contact info for WG Representatives, with information on how to use listserv email
  - conduct a Doodle poll to assess WG availability up to for possible in-person meetings Oct 8