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**Description:** Regional Transmission Organization Governance (RTOGov) is a research initiative to evaluate how decisions are made in U.S. electricity markets and whether these governance processes impact real-world outcomes such as price, customer choice, air quality, and innovation. In the New York ISO, the Management Committee (MC) is the senior standing committee involved in this governance process. Amendments to New York ISO tariffs requires MC approval and New York ISO Board agreement in order to file to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as outlined in the Federal Power Act Section 205. This file organizes the 36 issues voted upon by the stakeholders of the MC from 2010-2018. The vote reports (entitled: Final Motions) and presentations were found at the MC web-page: <https://www.nyiso.com/management-committee-mc->. Unless otherwise stated, all information in this data set is taken directly from the MC voting reports (Final Motions) published by New York ISO.

**'Vote Data - Item Detail'**

**Description:** Inthe New York ISO MC, the vote scoring and outcome is determined in a sector-weighted voting procedure. Stakeholders of the MC choose a sector affiliation upon membership. The sectors and weights include Generation Owners (21.5%), Other Suppliers (21.5%), Transmission Owners (20.0%), End-Use Consumer (20.0%) and Public Power (17.0%). Additionally, the End-Use Consumer and Public Power sector contain sub-sectors which take the weight of inactive sub-sectors within their sector.

End-Use Consumer:

1. Large Consumers (9%)
2. Large Consumer Government Agency (2%)
3. Small Consumers (4.5%)
4. Government State-wide Consumer Advocate (2.7%)
5. Government Small Consumer & Retail Aggregator (1.8%)

Public Power:

1. State Power Authorities (8%)
2. Muni’s and Coops (7%)
3. Environmental (2%)

If all sectors and sub-sectors are active, k = 11 and the sector weights above are applied to Equations (2) and (3). The below formula roughly reflects the calculation for sector vote weight:

In Equation (1), indicates if sector *k* is inactive. If a sector is inactive, its default vote weight will be re-distributed to active sectors. The above formula for reflects an even re-distribution of the vote weight to active sectors. The Generation Owners sector vote weight is adjusted without re-distribution of weight (for simplicity, this is not included in the above equation). Section 7 of the New York ISO Agreement specifies the process of vote weight sector re-distribution.

For each issue, PC participants can choose to vote yes ( quantified as 1, quantified as 0) or no ( quantified as 0, quantified as 1), or can choose to abstain. For each sector *k* a voting score is calculated as the proportion of present voters in that sector voting yes, calculated as a proportion of voters who voted yes or no (i.e., abstentions are not counted in the calculation of the voting score). The affirmative proportion is then multiplied by the sector weight. Similar to the notation in Yoo and Blumsack (2019), a mathematical representation of the sector affirmative and negative components of the voting score are:

In Equation (2) and (3), *nk* is the number of present voters in sector *k*, is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the j-th voter in sector *k* voted yes, and zero otherwise, *ak* is the number of present voters in sector *k* who abstained, and is the sector weight determined in Equation (1). The sum of the sector affirmative and negative components of the voting score should equal . Note that stakeholders not present are not counted at all (in the numerator or denominator) of the sector voting score.

The voting scores for each sector are summed to yield an aggregate voting score *V* for each voting item:

Lastly, this voting score is normalized to 100% for the item’s final voting score to be used to determine the outcome of the proposal:

The aggregate voting score ranges from 0 to 100. A voting item passes if *V* ≥ 58.

The New York ISO publishes voter-level data for each voting item in the MC. The ‘Vote Data – Item Detail’ data is aggregated vote data. The issue features include vote outcomes, categories, and descriptions and are based mostly on issue presentations, stakeholder voting reports (Final Motions) and relevant web-pages available at the time of compilation.

**Annotated Columns:**

1. **Meeting Date:** date of the monthly New York ISO Management Committee meeting.
2. **Issue Category:** broad categorization of issue topics based on author’s interpretation of information from New York ISO. The issue categories for New York ISO (terms defined by New York ISO) include:
   1. **Ancillary Services** – NERC-defined ancillary services including reserves, regulation, reactive power and black start.
   2. **Capacity Market – General** – the Installed Capacity (ICAP) market serves to maintain reliability of the bulk power system by procuring sufficient resource capability to meet expected maximum energy needs plus an Installed Reserve Margin (IRM).
   3. **Energy Market** – day ahead and real time spot markets in which wholesale electric energy is sold or purchased for immediate delivery.
   4. **General Admin** – covers procedural issues within the New York ISO & MC.
   5. **Out-of-Market Payments & Fuel Costs** – transactions that are exceptions to the usual New York ISO markets mechanisms (such as uplift payments).
   6. **Transmission System Planning, Owner Rev Requirements, and Cost Allocations** – costs related to operations and upgrades to transmission system.
3. **Issue Description:** detailed description of the issue. The description often references direct phrasing from New York ISO MC issue presentation documents or other relevant information.
4. **Management Committee Recommendation Statement:** direct statement from New York ISO MC to the New York ISO Board of Directors.
5. **Item:** New York ISO MC title of the issue.
6. **Yes:** number of affirmative votes cast by all present stakeholders.
7. **No:** number of negative votes cast by all present stakeholders.
8. **Abstain:** number of abstentions by all present stakeholders.
9. **Transmission Owners:** average sector vote score calculated for the Transmission Owner sector (% of votes in favor of the proposal excluding abstentions for the sector, as described in equation 2).
10. **Generation Owners:** average sector vote score calculated for the Generation Owner sector (% of votes in favor of the proposal excluding abstentions for the sector, as described in equation 2).
11. **EUC:** average sector vote score calculated for the End-Use Customer sector (% of votes in favor of the proposal excluding abstentions for the sector, as described in equation 2).
12. **Public Power/ Environmental:** average sector vote score calculated for the Public Power/Environmental sector (% of votes in favor of the proposal excluding abstentions for the sector, as described in equation 2).
13. **Other Suppliers:** average sector vote score calculated for the Other Suppliers sector (% of votes in favor of the proposal excluding abstentions for the sector, as described in equation 2).
14. **Normalize to 100%:** indicates if vote is normalized to 100%.
15. **Voting Score:** the sum across all sectors taken to calculate the overall vote score, as described in equation 2.
16. **Voting Score (2):** adjusted voting score if the vote requires normalization to 100%, as described in equation 5. The vote score can be between 0-100% and the item passes if the vote score is ≥ 58%.
17. **Outcome:** if the vote score is ≥ 58%, a voting item passes; otherwise the vote fails.

**'Vote Data - Company Detail'**

**Description:** The ‘Vote Data – Company Detail’ data is disaggregated stakeholder-level vote data. In addition to vote choice, company features include sector, line of business, and grouping by the size of their generation, transmission and/or load serving operations. This information is indicated in the MC Final Motions report published by New York ISO. Note that not all stakeholder entities are represented for all votes. A particular stakeholder may be missing from a particular vote because that entity was not a recognized voting stakeholder at the time the vote was taken; was not present for the vote; or was recognized as a non-voting “affiliate member” at the time the vote was taken.

**Annotated Columns:**

1. **Meeting Date:** date of the monthly New York ISO Members Committee meeting.
2. **Date:** date of the monthly New York ISO MC meeting (alternate format).
3. **Item:** New York ISO MC title of the issue.
4. **Issue Category:** broad categorization of issue topics based on author’s interpretation of information from New York ISO. The issue categories for New York ISO (terms defined by New York ISO) include:
   1. **Ancillary Services** – NERC-defined ancillary services including reserves, regulation, reactive power and black start.
   2. **Capacity Market – General** – the Installed Capacity (ICAP) market serves to maintain reliability of the bulk power system by procuring sufficient resource capability to meet expected maximum energy needs plus an Installed Reserve Margin (IRM).
   3. **Energy Market** – day ahead and real time spot markets in which wholesale electric energy is sold or purchased for immediate delivery.
   4. **General Admin** – covers procedural issues within the New York ISO & MC.
   5. **Out-of-Market Payments & Fuel Costs** – transactions that are exceptions to the usual New York ISO markets mechanisms (such as uplift payments).
   6. **Transmission System Planning, Owner Rev Requirements, and Cost Allocations** – costs related to operations and upgrades to transmission system.
5. **Voting Score (2):** adjusted voting score if the vote requires normalization to 100%, as described in equation 5. The vote score can be between 0-100% and the item passes if the vote score is ≥ 58%.
6. **Present:** indicatesstakeholders’ attendance in the monthly New York ISO MC meeting.
7. **Yes:** affirmative vote; = 1 if vote is yes.
8. **No:** negative vote; = 1 if vote is no.
9. **Abstain:** indicates stakeholders’ attendance and abstention from a vote.
10. **Vote:** stakeholders can vote in favor of a proposal (Yes), against a proposal (No), or abstain from voting.
11. **Company Name:** name of the MC stakeholder.
12. **Company Sector:** stakeholders of the MC choose a sector affiliation upon membership. The sectors and weights include Generation Owners (21.5%), Other Suppliers (21.5%), Transmission Owners (20.0%), End-Use Consumer (20.0%) and Public Power (17.0%). Additionally, the End-Use Consumer and Public Power sector contain sub-sectors listed above.
13. **Buyer/Seller**: stakeholder designation with respect to the sale of wholesale electricity based on author’s grouping of the stakeholder’s generation, transmission and load server operations. Stakeholder is considered a buyer unless the generation grouping is similar to or greater than its transmission and load server operations.
14. **Generation:** groups based on MW Installed Capacity on December 31, 2018. Each company is categorized as Small, Medium, or Large based on a snapshot of MW of capacity installed as indicated in the EIA 860 - 2018 Report. The author validated the stakeholder/plant mapping using the New York ISO Gold Book. The author established the linkage between the EIA 860 - 2018 Report and the stakeholder. The category scale is consistent with the PJM Interconnection stakeholder grouping process.

Zero: 0

Small: <500

Medium: >=500 and <=3,000

Large: >3,000

1. **Transmission:** groups based on Revenue Requirements ($MM) on December 31, 2018. Each company is categorized as Small, Medium, or Large based on the annual expenses found in financial statements of the company. The category scale is consistent with the PJM Interconnection stakeholder grouping process.

Zero: 0

Small: <50

Medium: >=50 and <=150

Large: >150

1. **Load Server:** groups based on Avg Real-Time Metered Load (MW) over all the hours of the year. Each company is categorized as Small, Medium, or Large based on the average real-time metered load served over all hours of the year as indicated in the EIA 861 - 2018 Report. The EIA 860 – 2018 Report quantifies Sales (Megawatthours). The Avg Real-Time Metered Load (MW) over all the hours of the year is calculated by dividing the Sales (Megawatthours) by 8,760 hours. The author established the linkage between the EIA 861 - 2018 Report and the stakeholder. The category scale is consistent with the PJM Interconnection stakeholder grouping process.

Zero: 0

Small: <1,000

Medium: >=1,000 and <=5,000

Large: >5,000
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