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Why do we need stakeholder engagement?
IRP is a powerful document which has material impacts on many stakeholders

- The IRP has significant implications for various stakeholders
  - Electricity sector actors (utility, IPPs, ITCs, IDCs)
  - Government agencies
  - Consumers

- IRP also has impacts extending beyond the electricity sector
  - Environmental impacts
  - Socio-economic impacts
  - Sectoral development
  - Macroeconomic impacts

- Stakeholders have an interest in the development of the electricity sector

- Many new IRPs fail to recognise the importance of comprehensive stakeholder engagement
  - Case study: Stakeholder engagement in the South Africa IRP planning process highlights how stakeholder consultations can be encompassed in the process
Stakeholder engagement is crucial to ensure the IRP is a success

- A successful IRP needs to be accepted by various stakeholders, not just the actor responsible for commissioning or developing the IRP

- Two key risks faced in implementing IRPs:
  - The document is not socialized and ends up at the bottom of a drawer
  - The document does not align with the needs and realities faced by different stakeholders and becomes unusable

- Stakeholder engagement is crucial to commitment to the IRP:
  - Creates buy-in to the IRP process
    - Crucial in countries where integrated resource planning is still in infancy
  - Ensures that the IRP is realistic and meets expectations of stakeholders
  - Provides transparency in the planning process
  - Helps facilitate the implementation of the IRP
    - Can encourage and facilitate investments
    - Attract private finance
What stakeholders to engage?

- Exactly what stakeholders to engage will depend on the local context and scope of IRP.
- What stakeholders are engaged in the planning process in your country? Why are these chosen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electricity sector stakeholders</th>
<th>Public stakeholders</th>
<th>Consumers and other interest groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>Domestic consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent power producers</td>
<td>Regional regulators</td>
<td>Unconnected households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry associations (e.g. coal or nuclear lobbies)</td>
<td>Ministry of Energy</td>
<td>Commercial and industrial consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission and distribution companies</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>Business groups (e.g. Chamber of Mines, Industry federation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Industry/Business</td>
<td>Environmental and social stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Trade unions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting stakeholder engagement right
How to engage stakeholders?

Different options to incorporate stakeholder engagement

Consultative committee
- Members from different stakeholders form a committee
- Committee collaborates closely with the consultant throughout the IRP development process

Consultation windows
- Invite comments on drafts at various points, e.g.
  - when finalising the scenarios for the load forecast
  - after the baseline scenario results are published

Consultation forums and workshops
- Opportunity to share the IRP planning process with stakeholders
- Collaborative, interactive engagement
- Can help share knowledge about IRP
Stakeholder engagement is not a box-ticking exercise

- Stakeholder engagement should not be done just for the sake of it
- Risk of undermining the credibility of the entire IRP if it is not clear how stakeholder engagement was incorporated into the IRP
- IRP should show how stakeholder comments have been acted on
When to engage?

- Successful stakeholder engagement should not be a one-off exercise.

- **Stakeholder engagement should occur throughout the IRP planning process**
  - Includes the pre- and post- development phases
    - Pre-development is crucial to ensure the IRP planning process meets the needs of stakeholders
    - Post-development engagement critical to ensuring successful implementation and collecting feedback for the next planning cycle

- Stakeholder engagement should not be rushed – a one day workshop is not enough.
  - Need to allocate sufficient time
Managing stakeholder engagement

- Although stakeholder engagement is important, it can be a tricky process:
- Vested and conflicting interests of stakeholders
  - Can be mitigated by being transparent about how stakeholder feedback has been incorporated
- Limited understanding of the IRP process by stakeholders
  - Facilitate workshops and forums which explain the IRP process
- Limited interest by stakeholders
  - Pursue active, not passive, stakeholder engagement.
Stakeholder engagement in power planning processes in SADC

**Eswatini:**
Electricity Industry stakeholders participated in the consultation process

**Malawi and Zimbabwe:**
Stakeholder workshops involving various in actors. In Malawi, particular focus on electricity sector stakeholders and ministries/other regulated entities

**Mozambique:**
EDM (Utility responsible for IRP) established a Joint Coordination Centre – consisting of representatives of public sector institutions to manage formulations of national power system development

**Namibia:**
Project Management Unit of ECB (Electricity Control Board), Nam Power and Regional Electricity Distributers, and MNE (Ministry)
Two stakeholder workshops
Draft reports circulated among key stakeholders
Case study: South Africa
Stakeholder engagement in South Africa

- Stakeholder engagement in common place throughout South African policymaking
  - Democracy underwritten by consensus politics
  - Established multilevel coordination mechanisms and vehicles
- Review of the 2019 IRP started in 2016
- Followed a well-established review process with formal stakeholder engagement
- Consultation period between December 2017 and March 2018
- 60 day consultation period following the release of draft IRP in 2018

Interested persons and organisations are invited to submit within 60 days of this publication, written comments on the draft Integrated Resource Plan 2018 to the Director-General of the Department of Energy for the attention of Mr Tshepo Madingoane:

By Post
Private Bag X 96, Pretoria, 0001

Or by hand:
Matimba House, 192 Corner Visagie and Paul Kruger Street, Pretoria

Or by email:
IRP.Queries@energy.gov.za
IRP update and review process

**Assumptions and Preliminary Basecase**
- Assumptions:
  - Demand
  - Existing Plant Performance
  - Technology Costs
  - Technology Parameters
  - New Commissioned Plants
  - Decommissioned Plants
  - Other Considerations

**Draft IRP 2018**
- Scenario tested:
  - Medium Growth (Reference case)
  - Low Growth
  - High Growth
  - No RE Annual Build Limit
  - Carbon budget
  - Market Linked Gas Price
  - Carbon Budget plus Market Linked Gas Price

**Policy Adjusted IRP**
- Test Cases
  - Draft IRP 2018 recommended plan
  - Eskom compliance with MES
  - Eskom non-compliance with MES
  - Eskom granted extension to comply
  - Koeberg 2024 end of life
  - Limited Gas to Power by 2030

**Public Consultations (Dec 2016 to Mar 2017)**
- Main changes
  - Demand
  - Renewable energy costs
  - Exchange rate

**Public Comments (Oct 2018 to Nov 2018) & NEDLAC Consultations**
- Main changes
  - Demand Assumptions
  - Battery Storage costs
  - Pumped storage costs
  - Hydro costs
  - Eskom Plant Performance
  - Eskom Plant Decommissioning

**Power System Modelling, Simulation and Analysis**
- Assumptions and Preliminary Basecase
- Draft IRP 2018 Report
- Policy Adjusted IRP 2019 Report
1. Consultation on inputs

- Consultation period between December 2017 and March 2018
- Focused on the input assumptions and base case

- **9 public workshops**
  - In 9 provinces
  - 63 presentations
  - 640 people

- **Bilateral discussions**
  - At request of organisation (e.g. Business Unity South Africa)

- **Written submissions**
  - 190 comments in 115 submissions
  - 89 from companies, government departments and entities
  - 26 from private individuals

**Assumptions updated in response to some comments made**

- Revised GDP growth and exchange rate
- Include details on relationship between GDP, electricity growth, and intensity
  - Revised technology costs
2. Consultation on draft

- Draft IRP report published for public comment period of 60 days
- Received various inputs
  - Brief opinion statements
  - Substantive inputs with support data
- 5,929 submissions – 242 substantive comments
- Eskom submitted revised system availability projections, plant shutdown schedule and compliance with emission
- Nedlac Consultation – Established tripartite (Government, Labour, Business) cooperation vehicle
- All comments considered and included in the Annex
2. Key issues raised in consultation on draft

- Assumptions regarding demand forecast
  - Impact of electricity intensity
  - Own generation installations
  - Suppressed demand

- Cost assumptions for technologies

- Capacity of gas to power

- Exclusion of nuclear capacity

- Inclusion of coal deviating from least-cost path and having a negative environment and health impact
Final IRP clearly shows response to comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY KEY COMMENTS FOR DRAFT IRP 2018</th>
<th>NO. OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The overall methodology of the draft IRP document was welcomed and deemed to be clear and concise. A proposal for future iterations of the IRP is to include independent experts (organisations and individuals) and international organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The publication of the IRP in English only and not in other official languages was raised as a concern as it limits participation by other members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Publication of documents electronically on the Department website and through government gazette was raised as a concern since not everyone has access to the Internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It was stressed that the IRP must be revised more regularly, at least every 2-3 years, due to technology advancements and changes in other assumptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Success factors

- Stakeholder engagement process is well-established – both in the sector and more broadly in South African democracy
  - Supports transparency
  - Stakeholders have predictability
- Different engagement channels
  - Written submissions complemented by workshops and meetings
- Stakeholder engagement cuts across sectors
  - Opportunity for stakeholders from a range of organisations and sectors to engage
- Submission outlines how public responses are dealt with
  - Provides credibility to the stakeholder engagement process
Limitations

- Highly political process
  - Characterised by positional lobbying and activism – results in ‘winners’ and ‘losers’
  - Able to please all lobbies some of the time and some lobbies all of the time, but not all lobbies all of the time
    - E.g. Anti-nuclear lobby will uncompromisingly criticise the IRP so long as any nuclear is included
- Did not include all data and analyses for stakeholders to review (e.g. did not include peak load forecasts, reserve margins)
  - Prevents interested stakeholders from providing a more detailed review
- Stakeholder engagement limited to 2 consultation windows
- The IRP 2019 is a sectoral resource plan for Electricity Supply Industry only
  - No Integrated Energy Plan/Policy which feeds into the energy demand profile
  - Electricity substitution dealt with as DSM/EE
  - Limits the voice of stakeholders in other related sectors relative to those in the electricity sector
Conclusion

- Stakeholder engagement is essential to the IRP process!
- The type and extent of stakeholder engagement will depend on the scope of the IRP, time and resource availability.
- South Africa has one of the most comprehensive stakeholder engagement processes in SADC
  - Stakeholder engagement is an established component of the IRP process
  - Clear consultation window, augmented by workshops and bilateral engagements with key stakeholders
  - Transparency on how stakeholder submissions have been acted upon
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