W R I   NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC FINANCE AND POLICY   PRAYAS-PUNE

THE ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

Benchmarking best practice and promoting accountability in governance of the electricity sector

---

SUMMARY REPORT

THE FORUM ON ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE

29 - 31 MARCH 2006

BANGKOK, THAILAND

CONTENTS

About the Electricity Governance Initiative	3
Forum Report	4
Attachments	
Agenda	16
Forum Participant List	18
EGI India Team	20
EGI Indonesia Team	21
EGI Philippines Team	22
EGI Thailand Team	23

ABOUT THE ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

The Electricity Governance Initiative (EGI) is a collaborative undertaking of the World Resources Institute, the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (India), and Prayas Energy Group (India).We work with civil society, policymakers, regulators, and other electricity sector actors to promote the open, transparent, and accountable decision-making processes that are a necessary part of a sustainable energy future.

Since 2005, teams of NGOs and research organizations with experience engaging on electricity-sector policy issues in Thailand, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines have used our toolkit of research questions to generate governance indicators and assess governance in each country's electricity sector. Each coalition is guided by an advisory panel of sector officials and experts that serves as a policy outlet for the assessment's recommendations.

In March 2006, we organized a regional forum on electricity governance in Bangkok, Thailand. The purpose of this meeting was to facilitate information sharing and to exchange lessons learned and best practice in electricity sector governance. Participants in the pilot assessments focused on areas of best practice and key problem areas to further develop strategies for improving governance and bridging the gaps in governance identified by their assessments.

THE FORUM ON ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE

Frances Seymour, the Director of the Institutions and Governance Program at the World Resources Institute, welcomed participants to the forum noting the importance of governance in meeting challenges in the electricity sector. Electricity is critical for social and economic development, and accounts for more than 38% of global greenhouse gas emissions. Sector decisions have often been fraught with controversy. She also noted the timeliness of the Electricity Governance Initiative in the Asia region, given recent decisions to slow and halt privatization efforts, the urgent need to attract investment, and the importance of maintaining affordability, social equity, and environmental sustainability particularly in the context of rapid economic growth.

The Electricity Governance Forum was opened by Mr. Veerapol Jirapraditkul, Deputy Director of the Energy Policy and Planning Office of the Thailand Ministry of Energy. Mr. Jirapraditkul reflected on the importance of the governance initiative from his personal perspective as a member of the Thai Assessment's advisory panel, and the timeliness of this forum.

EGI GOALS AND APPROACH

Shantanu Dixit and Navroz Dubash led the opening presentation on the electricity governance initiative. "Electricity restructuring" has been adopted as a model in Asia and worldwide. But this approach has had limited success: the investment deficit continues, and many independent power projects have been enormously controversial. There has been a lack of attention to social and environmental issues such as rural electrification and integrated approaches to renewable energy. The failure to win political and public acceptance of restructuring initiatives has meant that reforms have been challenged, slowed, and even halted.

Good processes are necessary if not always sufficient to ensure good outcomes. The mixed record of experience with electricity reform shows that without a more inclusive and transparent process by which the goals and objectives of policy and regulatory initiatives are set, it will not be possible to reach these "good outcomes".

EGI focuses on public interests in policy and regulatory processes.[1] We seek to create a new and constructive dialogue between civil society and sector officials – where relations have often been strained – in order to:

- Develop a common understanding and metric to assess governance;
- Establish benchmarks for good process;
- Build civil society capacity to enforce accountability and participate in policy and regulatory processes in the technically complex electricity sector; and
- Draw attention to principles of good governance, and build government capacity to include citizens in electricity decision-making.

[1] Although corporate and financial governance are also extremely important, there is a well developed body of work and dialogue around those issues.

In 2004, EGI developed a toolkit of research questions that generate indicators of areas of relative strength and weakness in electricity decision-making processes. The indicators address a comprehensive range of issues related to policy and regulatory processes in the sector, with an emphasis on environmental and social issues. Without formal space and measures to ensure public participation, access to information, and accountability, citizens and consumers cannot ensure that a full range of considerations and perspectives are taken into account.

The EGI toolkit provides a framework to bring the good governance debate from abstract to specifics, using a diagnostic tool to identify specific strengths and weaknesses, and to create space to discuss electricity in a broad, positive context.

Over the past year, the Electricity Governance Initiative has been working to try and create a new dialogue and dynamic between sector officials and civil society groups in India, Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines. Coalitions or teams of NGOs with expertise in various social, economic and environmental issues collaborated to use the EGI Indicator Toolkit to conduct an assessment of governance in the electricity sector. Each coalition did so in close consultation with an advisory panel that included government, utility and other private sector representatives. The toolkit metric to measure good process in the electricity sector helps civil society organizations collect substantiated information as a basis for constructive dialogue with officials and government representatives to improve governance.

EGI focuses on public interests in regulatory and policy processes, rather than on utility operations and corporate governance. While these issues are very important, a great deal of work and attention has been paid to governance from a corporate or investor perspective. The EGI approach therefore focuses on public concerns rather than investor concerns. We have actively engaged the private sector in the assessment process, particularly through representation on the advisory panels.

THAILAND

Chuenchom Sangarasri Greacen of Palang Thai presented the Thai assessment findings. The Administrative Court of Thailand was found to be of high quality, independent and impartial, and accessible. Civil society organizations were found to have strong capacity to monitor the sector, challenge decisions, and propose alternatives, and have sought redress on environmental and social grounds. Another strength identified was that the Thai government has begun an initiative to consider Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) taking a holistic approach to sector planning. Credible external forums to provide input into policy-making exist in the form of a National Economic and Social Advisory Council, and a Senate Extra-ordinary Committee on State

THAI ASSESSMENT RECCOMMENDATIONS

- Promulgation of draft Electricity Industry Act
- To set up an independent regulatory body
- To legislate power sector reform
- To institutionalize governance principles in decision making processes
- Need to emphasize sector reform
- (as opposed to privatization with no re-organization of sector)
- Need to adopt holistic approach (e.g. SEA)
- Capacity building of CSOs, Regulatory Body, legislative committees

Enterprise Reform that conducts public hearings. In addition, efforts to establish an Interim Regulator for the electricity sector present a significant step forward, but a much more effective regulatory system is needed.

Indeed, the interim regulator is an inherently weak institution as it was established through a low-level law (the Prime Minister's Office Regulations). It lacks legal authority, sufficient jurisdiction, independence, and autonomy. In addition, there is a pervasive lack of formal space for public participation which presents a major bottleneck in policy and regulatory processes and project planning. This has resulted in conflicts, street protests and court cases. There are also trends toward declining transparency with crucial information that would inform major policy or regulatory decisions being withheld, and the release of one-sided "Public Relations" information in order to manufacture consent. Environmental and social considerations tend to be treated as external to electricity sector priorities, and believed to be the job of the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment.

The lack of an independent regulator in the Thai electricity sector remains a significant barrier to balancing the interests of EGAT (which is run on a for-profit basis) against the needs of Thai citizens and consumers. In addition, parliamentary involvement in the privatization efforts has been bypassed through the Thai corporatization act, leading to inadequate scrutiny and consideration of decisions. The assessment team noted that upcoming planning processes for the Thai power sector present an important opportunity to ensure that these plans are developed in an open and transparent manner, so that environmental and social considerations are integrated.

Efforts to privatize the Energy Generation Authority of Thailand have been underway since the early 1990s. Despite protests by labor unions and civil society opposition, the privatization process continued. In 2005 in response to a petition submitted by the Confederation of Consumer Organizations, the Supreme Administrative Court ordered an injunction of the planned EGAT Public Offering. In response the government began to take steps to put in place an "interim regulator" for the power sector. Advance drafts of the Thai Electricity Governance Assessment Report were submitted to the Thai Supreme Administrative Courts to consider in its review of the process to corporatize EGAT. The assessment demonstrated that the corporatization process did not protect against abuses of power. In particular, the lack of a strong regulatory body to balance the interests of EGAT and its shareholders against those of the public (and particularly the poor) is a serious governance challenge, particularly in the context of corporatization. In response, the court decided to reverse the EGAT corporatization and privatization efforts.

Dr. John Byrne of the University of Delaware Center for Energy and Environment noted that the team had completed a commendable research task in conducting the assessment and putting it to use in this manner. The Thai Team reflected that the assessment process had created a framework within which to document the strengths and weaknesses of governance in the Thai power sector in a manner that had built their credibility, and helped advance a public interest agenda.

Forum participants observed that the Thai team had been able to successfully advance a public interest agenda even in the absence of formal space for civil society and the public to be included in decision-making.

INDIA

Sudha Mahalingam, coordinator of the India EGI Team presented the findings and recommendations of the India assessment. She noted that conflicts of interest are a significant governance challenge at all levels from the selection of parliamentarians, regulatory members, to staff in the Ministry of Power, and consultants. The selection process for regulators in particular is not transparent and the criteria are vague in practice. There is an urgent need to mainstream environmental considerations into the power sector, and build a closer connection between the Environment and Power Ministries. Such collaboration would be particularly beneficial to adopt an integrated approach to resource planning. Another major challenge is the failure to fully consider the impacts of policies and measures before they are adopted, such as the impact of Independent Power Policies on utilities, the impact of tariff policies on consumers, the impact of sector planning on the environment, the impact of tariff policies on the consumer, or of sector planning on the environment. A particular problem is that the Central Electricity Authority, which conducts rigorous technical analyses of all power sector policies and measures under consideration, only plays a low level "advisory role" to the Ministry of Power.

INDIA ASSESSMENT RECCOMMENDATIONS

POLICY
- Clarify the jurisdictions of institutions
- Clarify procedures & timelines to be adopted
- Public access to background data & expert inputs
- Proactive dissemination of draft policies to collect public input
- Greater transparency about the role of consultants

REGULATION
- Build civil society capacity to participate in regulatory processes
- Training & capacity building for regulators & their staff
- Operationalize transparency mechanisms

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL
- Integrate considerations in Sector Reform
- Internalize in the mandate of Electricity Institutions
- Build capacity to consider environmental and social aspects
- Expand regulatory mandate to factor in trade-offs
- Monitor job impact of power reforms
- Strengthen EIA laws & procedures
- Protect rights of project-affected peoples

The assessments also identified several strengths and good practices. The legal framework for regulation at the state level in India is relatively strong, and regulatory commissions have clear channels of authority, autonomy, and structural independence, and there is continuity of staff through overlapping tenures. There are well defined consultation procedures and tariff setting procedures for the State Electricity Regulatory Commissions assessed, with open public hearings. Despite these considerable strengths in the regulatory structure, implementation of these procedures is inadequate. For example, selection processes for regulators remain weak, procedures for transparency are followed only in the breach, and public participation is limited. On the policy front, transparency in policy processes is improving, with draft policies now available on websites, government initiated seminars and workshops to debate policies, and efforts to consult with stakeholders and get public feedback on policies. In addition Tariff Philosophy papers are now available to the public. There is greater transparency about rules for business conduct, revenue requirements, and transmission and commercial losses. In addition, there is greater attention to quality of service and consumer concerns.

Members of the India assessment team suggested that "the fact that the Electricity Governance Toolkit prompts us to rigorously document and justify our assertions in the assessment report and produce such a comprehensive review of electricity governance considerations has enhanced our credibility."

PHILIPPINES

The Electric Power Industry Reform Act (EPIRA, or Republic Act No. 9136) was passed in June 2001. EPIRA privatized the state-owned National Power Corporation, initiated the restructuring and unbundling of the industry, deregulated generation and supply, and introduced regulation for distribution and transmission. It also allowed for the creation of a limited competitive market for electricity. The goals of reform were to address the high costs of electricity, the over-contracted excess capacity, and the financial losses and debts carried by the National Power Corporation. It was also hoped that reform would address the widespread allegations of corruption and fraudulent debt in the sector, and the fact that over 50% of Filipino households did not have access to electricity.

The Philippines assessment, presented by Maitet Diokono, found governance principles and provisions to be weakest in the policy process. The regulatory process was found to be relatively strong particularly in accountability and redress mechanisms, since the Electricity Regulatory Commission of the Philippines is a legally mandated, structurally independent quasi-judicial body. While there are relatively clear-cut procedures, standards and rules in place for tariff setting, licensing, generation, distribution and transmission, electricity consumers' rights, implementation of principles of good governance is weak particularly with regards to the practice of transparency and meaningful public participation.

While there are relatively strong provisions for access to information about environmental and social aspects of electricity decision making, there is a disconnect between environmental and social objectives and power development goals. Energy security is a key driver for the prioritisation of renewable energy in the Philippines (as in most countries), but low-quality coal which causes local air pollution and contributes to global warming is also emphasised in the same context. Despite the fact that NGOs in the Philippines were found to have high capacity, the absence of enabling structures for their participation in decision-making processes is a serious governance challenge.

The policy process is key to achieving good governance, but reforms have been driven by donor organizations and have favored industry players over the public, and provisions for transparency and accountability have not been sufficient. Groups that are opposed to reforms

PHILIPPINES ASSESSMENT RECCOMMENDATIONS

- A comprehensive effort to overcome the information asymmetry in the electricity sector particularly with regards to:
  - allocation of subsidies
  - analyses, process of policy reform
  - bidding and privatization processes
  - contracts with IPPs
  - the role of consultants
- Greater transparency about the role and influence of donor organizations, particularly with regards to financial assistance, policy advice, technical assistance, and consultants financed
- Build the capacity of stakeholders in electricity market processes and policy processes
- Ensure that government responds to inputs by the public on all these aspects

have been perceived as a "nuisance" and often been excluded from decision-making processes.

While it is important to have the right rules and legal structure, this is not enough to ensure effective regulation. In the case of the Philippines, enforcement of rules is weak in practice, and the threat of punitive action is not enough to compel compliance from private sector actors in the sector. In effect, it is sometimes easier to break or change the "regulations" than comply with them, even if the impacts might be detrimental to the public. It is also necessary to recognize that industry players have much greater incentive to participate in the regulatory process than consumers do, so it is important to build the capacity of consumer groups and NGOs to act as a balancing force in the regulatory process. Regulators need to understand the interests of all stakeholders in the electricity sector, particularly weaker groups.

INDONESIA

Electricity reform was initiated in Indonesia in the 1990s through the introduction of independent power production; in 1998 efforts to restructure the sector were initiated in the context of an IMF economic bailout program for Indonesia following the Asian Financial Crisis. In December 2004, the Indonesian Constitutional Court overturned the 2002 Electricity Reform Law on the grounds that it was unconstitutional. While efforts are underway to develop a new legal framework for the sector, there has been a lack of government initiative to convene a clear and open process to this end.

INDONESIA ASSESSMENT RECCOMMENDATIONS:

- Develop a clear shared vision on national energy and electricity development policy
- Address conflicting roles and functions at the executive level
- Clarify jurisdiction of authority in government
- Improve coordination among government bodies and across sectors
- Establish an Independent Regulatory Body
- Establish a distinct planning body
- Improve transparency and disseminate information on policy and regulatory process to the public
- Establish a strong legal basis and mechanism to ensure public participation
- Develop a roadmap to improve governance and build awareness of the elements and practice of good governance at the operational level
- Establish codes and standards including good business conduct and ethics
- Assess governance implementation on regular an ongoing / regular basis

Dr. Ami Indriyanto of the Indonesian Institute for Energy Economics, the lead coordinator of the Indonesia EGI Team, presented the findings and recommendations of the assessment.

The Indonesia EGI assessment reviewed the process for developing the Electricity Law 20/2002, and found that while the elements and procedures of reform were clearly defined both at the legislative and executive levels, information about this process was not available to the public. However, there was reasonable lead time to develop and debate the electricity law. Information about the role of donor agencies during policy reform was available, including donor positions on policies, binding conditions on loan disbursement, financial disbursement, and technical assistance projects. The assessment also found the legislative committee to have strong capacity, including expert staff, access to documents, budgetary allowances for research, and authority to call in the representatives. CSOs in Indonesia have strong organizational and analytical capacity to address environmental and social considerations, as evidenced by the case study of CSO engagement in the Pemaron Combined Cycle Gas Plant Project. The executive was also found to have adequate capacity to evaluate environmental and social issues, with a special division with environmental and social expertise, an annual budget available for additional training, and resources to fund new research.

But there is a lack of awareness of the principles and requirements of good governance among stakeholders. Understanding of the role of transparency, public participation and accountability are evolving-- both within the government and within civil society. There are no legal provisions to ensure access to information, public participation in regulatory and policy processes, or compliance with policy and regulatory decisions.

The Indonesia EGI Assessment Report has been submitted to the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR) and the team is planning a formal presentation of these research findings to the DPR in the coming months. The report has already had the positive impact of prompting an improvement in the DPR website, which now features the agenda for the DPR, a list of work in progress, and a list of legislation passed. The website also features a message board for public input, as one improved procedure for public participation and input in to the policy process.

Mr. Endro Utomo Notodisuryo of the Indonesia Advisory Panel reflected on his experiences as Director General of Electricity and Energy Utilization during the reform period, and the pressure exerted by external forces – particularly the international donor community – to initiate electricity sector restructuring within a narrow timeframe, thereby leaving little time for adequate consideration of the public interest. Restructuring was tied to a $400 million loan from the ADB, with $400 million in co-financing from the Japan Bank for International Cooperation. The fact that there was so much pressure to follow this externally directed path without allowing space to consider the needs and priorities of Indonesia, meant that the reform efforts were destined to fail. He reiterated that Indonesia welcomes private sector participation in the power sector, but that is not contingent on the wholesale privatization and unbundling of the power sector as a whole.

Fabby Tumiwa of the Working Group on Power Sector Restructuring, a member of the Indonesia EGI Team noted that "The assessment process has allowed us to start building a relationship of trust with people within the government and within the utilities through our interactions with the advisory panel. It is also shaping future directions of work for our organization."

INCORPORATING SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS INTO DECISION-MAKING

Following the presentations and discussion of the four country assessments, the forum broke out into three groups to discuss approaches and challenges for incorporating social and environmental considerations into electricity sector decision-making.

In the report back from these group discussions, teams reflected on the need to create and establish an environmental mandate at the policy level, and build environmental considerations into the mandate of electricity sector institutions, particularly regulatory bodies. Environmental considerations need to be a mainstream part of the institutional design. Participants noted that the capacity of ministries and regulators to this end needs to be built, recognising that the environmental ministries and departments are almost always weaker from a political-economy perspective than the energy ministries.

Participants emphasised the importance of the national energy planning process, and the need to have a stakeholder process at all levels of development of a national energy strategy with a view to building consensus and prioritising environmental considerations. There is a need for a strong and independent authority to make final, binding decisions (particularly in the event that consensus cannot be reached) – although it is also important to retain an appeal mechanism to allow for reconsideration of decisions that may compromise public interests. A clear legal process was considered key to the success of the planning process. Integrated Resource Planning and Strategic Environmental Assessments, undertaken through open and transparent processes, were also identified as useful tools to integrate environmental and social considerations in to decision-making.

Yet at the same time, there is a need to build civil society capacity to engage on these issues, and exert pressure on authorities and ministries to consider environmental and social impacts. Participants noted that intergovernmental agency processes may present one avenue to advance the mainstreaming of environmental considerations, and that there are also opportunities to influence the role of donor agencies.

A GOVERNANCE LENS ON THE ELECTRICITY SECTOR

Dr. John Byrne of the Center for Energy and Environment Policy at the University of Delaware was the first speaker on a panel discussion of how a "governance lens" can help us understand the electricity sector. He reflected on the value of the electricity governance approach in enabling a critical evaluation of neo-liberal political economy. He suggested that the restructuring of the electricity sector in California and the track record of the Enron Corporation, which was able to profit immensely by gaming systems for private sector participation, calls for attention to decision-making processes. The Electricity Governance Toolkit and its benchmarks for good process allow a framework for scrutiny of such processes, and a means to insert a broader set of perspectives into decision-making and promote accountability. Better governance of the power sector will allow for better management of "the commons" impact of the power sector. He noted that the EGI toolkit and approach had allowed civil society to organize around public interests in the electricity sector, noting the accomplishments of the Thai EGI team in particular.

Jerrold Oppenheim, co-author of the book *Democracy and Regulation*, reflected on the complex nature of regulation in the power sector. He noted that it was heartening to see that there was attention being paid to public interests in electricity sector regulation through this project, particularly since in the United States many recent initiatives and reforms have been undermining public interests in electricity sector governance through de-regulation.

Davida Wood made closing remarks for the first day of the forum, noting that the Electricity Governance Initiative work is part of a new program of work that she has been developing at USAID about building meaningful public participation into sector decision making. In the context of privatization, consumers are regarded as "customers" rather than as citizens who should have a place at the table during decision-making. The Electricity Governance Toolkit and approach present a useful and practical framework for how to incorporate civil society perspectives more fully into electricity sector decision-making.

USING AN ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE APPROACH TO EFFECT CHANGE

Honorable Member of the Indian Parliament Mr. Suresh Prabhu, the former Minister of Power of India, made opening remarks on the second day of the Electricity Governance Forum. He started by noting that the same model has been imposed on all countries for electricity reform. But if all countries are different, then the model for improving the sector cannot be the same – and cannot be replicated. Mr. Prabhu noted the importance of deciding on the objectives of a reform process before "reform" begins, and of agreeing on a starting point. Reform should not be defined as privatisation – there are many approaches to reform that need not involve standard approaches to deregulation, privatization or restructuring.

A key objective of electricity sector reform is to ensure reliable and affordable energy supply. He further noted that we live in a world of fossil fuel dependency, but the existence of climate change means that our fuel and energy mix will have to change and we will have to make way for alternative sources of energy. Governance has a fundamental impact in facilitating this paradigm shift. Regulation is a new and important area for governance. It is vital to select competent staff who can realize this "stakeholder balancing" role. He noted that regulation is a new area of work and that "regulators are not born" but rather must develop a complex set of skills and competencies. In addition, regulators derive their authority from the judiciary, legislature and the executive. There also need to be provisions to regulate the regulator. This can be an extremely difficult process.

It is important to recognise that governance is different from government. Governance is also critical to a well-functioning state-controlled electricity sector. Governance should not merely be relevant in the context of privatisation – to the contrary, good governance is a critical consideration under all circumstances in the power sector.

Mr. Witoon Permpongsajaroen of the Project for Ecological Recovery was the first speaker on a panel discussion on how the electricity governance approach can be used to effect change. He reflected on the need to make technical issues accessible to the public – a "street issue." When we talk about electricity reform, it cannot be separated from political and social reform movements. Mr. Permpongsajaroen reflected that in Thailand many inside the sector are quite content with the *status quo* and conditions in EGAT, and have profited from the present system, but at the cost of the public – electricity tariffs were raised every two months. Very few people have the knowledge or information to understand the issues at hand, or to influence the outcomes. The concept of governance is very new; in fact, there is not even a word for "accountability" in the Thai language. Everything is based on confluence of interests, and the notion of preventing conflict of interest is new.

Mr. Permpongsajaroen observed that the civil society movement in the Thai power sector was based on the fight against dams and coal fired power plants. Civil society has an important role to play in questioning projects and decisions, and it is important to link EGI more closely to social concerns. It is still not easy to talk to the general public using a governance framing.

While the EGI toolkit can present a useful framework to advance public interests, it may be necessary to select particular areas of focus and make the issues and questions at hand more concrete in order to advance change. Athena Ronquillo Ballasteros of Greenpeace International reflected that civil society movements in the Asia region have learned a great deal from the experiences of the Thai movement around dams and hydro power.

Mr. Ashley Brown of the Harvard Electricity Policy Group presented his thoughts on how a governance approach can help us understand the electricity sector in other regions and areas. He started out by observing that NGOs and environmentalists had a hand in the restructuring of the California electricity system, and that the "process" in California had actually been quite open. In fact, civil society groups had been focussed on narrow or particular interests, such as renewable energy, rather than addressing the overarching impacts of the restructuring process from a general public interest perspective. While corporate interests may seek to game decision-making processes for their own interests, civil society groups can be equally guilty of the same phenomenon. Mr. Brown then discussed regulatory experiences in Brazil, where there is one national regulator for a vast country with significant regional differences. It took the regulator a very long time to actually develop the capacity and the experience necessary to be effective. Mr. Brown also noted the need for regulators to send the right signals to consumers about how to use electricity, particularly from a consumer efficiency and demand-side management perspective. Once people are accustomed to using electricity in wasteful or inefficient ways, it can be very difficult to send the correct market signals.

Mr. Brown also reflected on the tendency to export or impose independent regulatory models on developing countries without paying adequate attention to the particular characteristics of different countries, when most of the population may be in rural areas, or when there are large numbers of unconnected households. He reflected on his discussions with an IMF official regarding the debt restructuring package imposed on Zambia, which included the creation of a "functioning market" for electricity, making little sense in the Zambian context given the small size of the consumer base, limited grid coverage, and limited opportunities for revenue generation.

Liam Salter, Director of the WWF Asia Climate Change Program shared his views on using a governance approach to effect change in the electricity sector. WWF Asia has run a number of campaigns addressing multi-stakeholder planning in the Philippines, promoting the uptake of renewable energy in Asia and consumer interests in reform, and has also been working to build consumer-environment coalitions. WWF has also launched the "Our Power" campaign, which draws on the work of Prayas and EGI.

The strength of a governance approach is that everyone agrees that governance is important, and the need to address governance is universally applicable. But most people don't know what we are talking about when we say "governance." We need to get people to understand that transparency, public participation and accountability are integral to the success of any reform effort. However, the benefits of improving governance are not always clear. The merits of a governance approach need to be communicated better, and clearly show how emphasising governance can lead to positive outcomes.

Reform tends to be driven by outputs and outcomes – achieving financial viability, improving the quality and reliability of service, etc; a governance approach may not work as a paradigm for reform. We can see clearly see that a focus on governance holds the possibility of unseating the vested interests that currently control sectoral decision-making, and bringing new voices to the table that will represent social and environmental concerns. There is a need to build the empirical case showing that there is a significant constituency behind the governance message, and demonstrate that an emphasis on good governance works everywhere. To this end, the WWF Our Power Campaign has been trying to develop simpler messages to communicate the "governance message."

INSIGHTS FROM THE EGI PILOT PHASE

Smita Nakhooda presented some preliminary analysis of the four assessments as a basis for further discussion by conference participants in break-out groups. The assessments show that in both India and the Philippines the "right rules" are often in place. The regulators have an independent institutional structure and adequate authority, acting as quasi-judicial bodies with punitive powers. There is certainty about the regulatory process in that there are clear rules and guidelines for how the regulator should function, and transparency about these rules. But having the right rules is not always enough to ensure effective regulation. The indicators show that when it comes to questions of practice, there is significant room for improvement. In both India and the Philippines there are provisions to allow public disclosure of documents in the possession of the regulator, but in practice these documents are not easily accessible to members of the public. Notably, the lack of any sort of indexing or cataloguing system for regulatory documents and orders makes it very difficult for people to find information that is "publicly available."

The assessments show that planning processes for the electricity sector do not adequately integrate social and environmental considerations, and that there is very limited public input and participation in these planning processes. It is important to create space for a broad range of interests in these processes. Electricity planning process can potentially be a lever to incorporate public interests, but there are serious challenges in ensuring public accountability and effective action.

The assessments also show that there is limited space for public participation in policy processes, and little commitment from the government and decision-makers to accommodate meaningful participation. Participants in the forum discussed how we can begin to change the mindset, and create an effective and useful process. There is a need to improve the quality of hearings and consultations, ensure transparency about the role of consultants in policymaking, and ensure that input, once collected, is actually taken into account.

For civil society to advance good governance in these areas requires a variety of approaches. To promote accountability in the planning process and better public participation in regulatory processes to provide stakeholder perspectives will require public interest groups to closely monitor and engage in sector processes. Creating a rigorous planning process, or demanding transparency of the regulatory process may require more a proactive campaign-based approach. And groups will also need to work to encourage smaller incremental changes (e.g. indexing of documents, better disclosure of information through websites, etc.) that will pave the way for larger systemic change in electricity governance.

The regulatory process tends to rely excessively on consultants, who are not accountable to the public despite the major impacts of their work and recommendations on public interests. There is an urgent need for more transparency around the role and function of consultants in the regulatory process, and a break from the "development template" which builds reliance on consultants for regulatory functioning. New approaches to setting up regulatory bodies need to be explored.

There is also a lack of civil society participation in the regulatory process, and this is a critical governance challenge. Having formal space for participation and accountability means little if stakeholders do not take advantage of this space to represent public interests.

It is also very difficult to ensure that a competent, independent staff is selected to the regulatory process – staffing is critical to the success of the regulatory process. There are also major questions around the jurisdiction of regulatory institutions, and in practice there is often a lack of independence and enforcement of legal authority. Environmental and social capacity are especially lacking in electricity regulatory bodies. Regulation is a new concept and we are still learning how to react to needs and responsibilities. Citizenry have limited faith in sector actors, and regulators need to be proactive and build the trust of consumers and citizens.

Electricity plans should consider social issues including displacement of populations affected by transmission and generation infrastructure development. There is a need to build public awareness of the nature of the planning process and the stakes at hand. Planning processes often lack both credibility and resources, and civil society can play an important role in creating demand for both of these elements. In the Philippines, WWF has been involved with several integrated energy sector planning initiatives in partnership with local governments and authorities. WWF has found much more room for broader debate about how to meet energy needs at the local government level. There is still confusion about which government departments are actually responsible for environmental and social aspects of electricity decision-making, and electricity institutions seldom have explicit mandates. Bridging the disconnect between environmental and energy department tends to get left to the environment department – energy ministries are rarely proactive in this regard.

Participants also noted that the "national champion" model – where state owned utilities are involved in electricity sectors beyond their national boundaries – is increasingly pervasive. EGAT, EDF (France), Eskom (South Africa), and NTPC (India) are all increasingly invested and active beyond their national borders. These enterprises have been able to use their domestic consumers as a captive economic base to fund investment in foreign countries and regions that often incur high economic, social and environmental risks. For example, Ontario Hydro bid for a thermal generation project in the Philippines but pulled out when their Canadian consumer base found out about the circumstances in which Ontario Hydro would be operating. It is difficult for these enterprises to operate in countries where they do not write the rules. This raises questions about the adequacy of national-level planning processes, given that national actors are involved in countries beyond national jurisdiction.

NEXT STEPS:

The Electricity Governance Initiative approach and results to date were recently showcased at the recent meetings of the United Nations Convention on Sustainable Development (CSD) 14th Cycle on Energy during the first week of May 2006, where Honorable MP Suresh Prabhu of the Indian Parliament helped launch EGI as a new CSD partnership. We also look forward to participating in the Asian Development Bank's upcoming Clean Energy Week.

In the coming months we will be working to produce an analysis of the results of the pilot phase of the EGI, and produce a revised version of the Electricity Governance indicator toolkit methodology. We look forward to continuing to work with our partners in Asia to build on the results of the electricity governance assessments, and identifying new partners and next steps for the Initiative. Our goal is to conduct scoping meetings with groups in Asia, Latin America and Europe to explore how the EGI approach can be useful in effecting positive change in new regions with new challenges.

W R I

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC FINANCE AND POLICY

आरोग्य, ऊर्जा, शिक्षण आणि पालकत्व या विषयांतील विशेष प्रयत्न

PRAYAS-PUNE

THE ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

Benchmarking best practice and promoting accountability in governance of the electricity sector

AGENDA | THURSDAY 30 MARCH 2006 | BANGKOK, THAILAND

OBJECTIVE: Introduce the Electricity Governance Initiative and its Results in Asia

9:00 – 9:30	Welcoming Remarks and Goals of the Forum
9:30 – 9:45	Opening Remarks *Mr. Veerapol Jirapraditkul* *Deputy Director, Energy Policy and Planning Office, Thailand Ministry of Energy*
9:45 – 10:30	The Electricity Governance Initiative and Approach *Followed by clarifying questions and discussion* *Shantanu Dixit, Navroz K. Dubash, Smita Nakhooda*
10:30 – 11:15	Thailand: Establishing an Open Reform Process *Presentation by Chuenchom Sangarasri Greacen with comments from team* Discussion
11:15 – 11:30	Break
11:30 – 12:15	India: Turning Promise into Practice *Presentation by Sudha Mahalingam. Comments from team.* *Discussion*
12:15 – 1:00	Philippines: Upholding Public Benefits from Electricity Reform *Presentation by Maitet Diokono. Comments from team.* Discussion
1:00 – 2:00	Lunch
2.00 – 2.45	Indonesia: Open Processes vs. Inclusive Processes *Presentation by Dr. Asclepias Indriyanto. Comments from team.* Discussion
2.45 – 3.45	What are the key governance barriers to including environmental and social considerations in the sector? Break out groups
3.45 – 4.00	Break
4.00 – 5.00	Panel Discussion: How does a “governance diagnosis” help us understand the electricity sector? *John Byrne and Jerrold Oppenheim*
5.00 – 5.15	Summary and Wrap Up
5.15 – 5.30	Closing Remarks *Davida Wood*

7.30 – Group Dinner

WRI

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC FINANCE AND POLICY

प्रयास

आरोग्य, ऊर्जा, शिक्षण आणि पालकत्व या विषयांतील विशेष प्रयत्न

PRAYAS-PUNE

THE ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

Benchmarking best practice and promoting accountability in governance of the electricity sector

AGENDA FRIDAY 31 MARCH 2006 BANGKOK, THAILAND

A GOVERNANCE APPROACH TO ELECTRICITY FRIDAY 31 MARCH

OBJECTIVE: Discuss Lessons Learned from the EGI Approach and Next Steps

9:00 – 9:30	Opening Remarks *Surest Prabhu, Former Minister of Power for the Government of India*
9:30 – 10:30	Using a Governance Analysis to Bring about Change *Ashley Brown – Electricity Reform in Latin America* *Witoon Permpongsacharoen – Insights from the Thailand Experience* *Liam Salter – "Our Power" Campaign* Discussion
10:30 – 10:45	Break
10.45 – 11:15	What Have We Learned from the EGI Approach? *Questions for Discussion* *Shantanu Dixit, Navroz K. Dubash, Smita Nakhooda*
11:15 – 12:15	Break Out Groups: How do we use a governance analysis of electricity to effect change?
12:15 – 12:45	Report back from break out groups
12:45 – 1:15	Wrap up and Next Steps
1:15 – 1:30	Closing Remarks. *Grish Sant, Prayas* *Frances Seymour, WRI*
1.30 – 2.30	Lunch

W R I

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC FINANCE AND POLICY

आरोग्य, ऊर्जा, शिक्षण आणि पालकत्व या विषयांतील विशेष प्रयत्न

PRAYAS-PUNE

THE ELECTRICITY GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE FORUM

PARTICIPANT LIST MARCH 2006 BANGKOK, THAILAND

Alberdi, Facundo	National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (USA)
Brown, Ashley	Harvard Electricity Policy Group
Buakamsri, Tara	Greenpeace Southeast Asia (Thailand)
Bureekul, Thawilwadee	King Prajadhipok's Institute (Thailand)
Byrne, John	Center for Energy & Environmental Policy, University of Delaware
Charoenpolpiriya, Nongnard	Metropolitan Electricity Authority (Thailand)
Chaweing, Suntaree	Graduate school of Electrical Engineering, Thamasat University)
Chawana, Saichit	Energy Technology Program Thamasat University
Co, Eileen	Green Independent Power Producers Inc (Philippines)
De La Paz, Dean	Ateneo de Manila University School of Management (Philippines)
Diokno, Maitet	Green Independent Power Producers Inc, Kuryente (Philippines)
Dixit, Shantanu	Prayas Energy Group (India)
Dubash, Navroz	National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (India)
Greacen, Christopher	Palang Thai
Greacen, Chuenchom Sangarasri	Palang Thai
Herliana, Lena	Indonesian Institute of Energy Economics
Indriyanto, Asclepias	Indonesian Institute of Energy Economics
Jairaj, Bharat	Citizen Consumer and Civic Action Group (India)
Janashia, Nana	Caucusus Environmental NGO Network:
Janchitfah, Supara	Bangkok Post
Jirapraditkul,.Veerapol	Energy Policy and Planning Office, Thailand Ministry of Energy
Julian, Roberto	Electricity Governance Philippines Advisory Panel
Kanitpun, Preeyapa	Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board
Kedprasert, Peerapon	Graduate School of Electrical Engineering, Thamasat University
Leeprechanon, Nopporn	Graduate School of Electrical Engineering, Thamasat University
Loajirachunkul, Wichit	National Institute of Development Administration (Thailand)
Limsatit, Paisan	Thailand Environment Institute
MacGregor, Theo	Democracy and Regulation (USA)
Mahalingam, Sudha	Center for Policy Research (India)
Mahomed, Leila	Sustainable Energy Africa (South Africa)
Malaluan, Nepomuceno	Action for Economic Reforms (Philippines)
Maurer, Crescencia	Consultant, International Institute for Education
Abdullah, Mostafa	National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (Bangladesh)
Nakhooda, Smita	World Resources Institute (USA)
Nicro, Somrudee	Thailand Environment Institute

Nikomborirak, Duaenden	Thailand Development Research Institute
Noraheem, Usanee	Palang Thai
Notodisuryo, Endro Utomo	Electricity Governance Indonesia, Advisory Panel
Nuntavorakarn, Suphakij	Health Systems Research Institute (Thailand)
Oppenheim, Jerrold	Democracy and Regulation (USA)
Padungwech, Wasan	Graduate school of Electrical Engineering, Thamasat University
Paramita, Dyah	Indonesian Center for Environmental Law
Patkoh, Rangsima	Energy Policy and Planning Office (Thailand)
Permpongsacharoen, Witoon	Towards Ecological Recovery and Regional Alliance (Thailand)
Pozon, Ina	Coal Trail (Philippines)
Prabhu, Suresh	Electricity Governance India Advisory Panel
Promchittipong, Chaiwatchara	King Prajadhipok's Institute (Thailand)
Ronquillo, Athena	Greenpeace International (Philippines)
Sachan, A. K.	Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (India)
Salter, Liam	Power Switch! Campaign, WWF International
Sant, Girish	Prayas Energy Group (India)
Seymour, Frances	World Resources Institute (USA)
Sohn, Jon	World Resources Institute (USA)
Sirasoontorn, Puree	Faculty of Economics Thammasat University
Sugihartho, Puguh	Electricity Governance Indonesia, Advisory Panel
Tappasut, Jitmanee	Energy Policy and Planning Office
Thantivejkul, Nichasil	Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board
Thitinan, Watchara	King Prajadhipok's Institute
Thongplon, Sairung	Confederation of Consumer Organisations (Thailand)
Tumiwa, Fabby	Working Group on Power Sector Restructuring (Indonesia)
Vassanadumrongdee, Sujitra	Thailand Environment Institute
Vorapeboonpong, Chaiwat	PSI-Thai Affiliates Council International Labour Union of Metropolitan Waterworks
Wood, Davida	United States Agency for International Development
Zerriffi, Hisham	Stanford Program on Energy and Sustainable Development

The Electricity Governance Assessment in India

Research Team	
Organization	**Experience**
Centre for Policy Research (CPR) *Delhi* http://www.cprindia.org	CPR is an autonomous institution and a think tank. The Centre is one of the 27 national social science research institutes recognized by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, Government of India. CPR was established with the objective of studying major policy issues before the nation to help develop a body of knowledge about policymaking and to suggest alternative policy options. Sudha Mahalingham is leading work on the electricity governance initiative at the Center for Policy Research.
Center for Environment Concerns (CEC) *Andhra Pradesh*	The Center for Environment Concerns undertakes public interest and work on environmental issues, and has an established record working to advance the interests of rural communities in Andhra Pradesh. CEC also houses the People's Monitoring Group on Electricity Regulation, which is led by Dr. M. Thimma Reddy. CEC has been actively involved with promoting transparency and accountability at the Andhra Pradesh regulatory body. CEC will conduct a state level assessment of governance in Andhra Pradesh.
Praja, *Haryana*	Praja is an NGO working on promoting public accountability in the electricity sector. Dr. Surinder Kumar , a Professor, and Mr. Rajesh Kumar, a Ph.D. student at the Maharishi Dayanand University in Haryana, are affiliates of Praja and will be leading its contribution to the Electricity Governance Assessment in India. Dr. Kumar's research group at the University has developed a scope of work focused on regulatory economics and has a track record of engagement with regulators in the state. The group has made numerous submissions of public interventions before the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission. Ph.D. candidates in this program will be contributing researchers for the electricity governance assessment in the state of Haryana.
Citizen consumer and civic Action Group (CAG) *Tamil Nadu* http://cag.org.in	CAG is a non-profit, non-political and professional citizens group that seeks to make critical policy changes through strategic interventions to benefit the citizen-consumer. CAG has been involved in regular advocacy with the Tamil Nadu Electricity Regulatory Commission (TNERC) in response to proposals submitted by the State Electricity Utility and through participation in the public hearings. In addition, CAG has an established track record on environmental issues. CAG will conduct state level governance assessments in Tamil Nadu and will also coordinate the completion of the environmental and social indicators.

Advisory Panel

Dr. Madhav Godbole, *former Home Secretary of the Government of India*
Mr. Ajay Shankar, *Additional Secretary of the Ministry of Power of India*
Mr. J. L. Bajaj, *Distinguished Fellow, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) and former Chairman of the Uttar Pradesh Regulatory Commission*
Mr. Nasser Munjee, *former director of the Infrastructure Development Finance Company of India*
Dr. Pratap Bhanu Mehta, *Director of the Center for Policy Research*
M. G. Ramachandran, *Senior Advocate, National Thermal Power Corporation, Power Grid Corporation and Power Trading Corporation*
Mr. Suresh Prabhu, *former Minister of Power of India*
Vedamoorthy Namasivayam, *Executive Director, Price Waterhouse Coopers Associates Private Ltd., India*
Rachel Chaterjee, *Chairman and Managing Director Transmission Corporation of Andhra Pradesh*

The Electricity Governance Assessment in Indonesia

Research Team	
Organization	**Experience**
Indonesian Institute for Energy Economics http://www.iiee.or.id	The Indonesian Institute for Energy Economics (IIEE) was established in 1995 in Jakarta as a non-profit, non-government and independent organization. The primary objective of IIEE is to enhance energy economics studies that motivate and support national policies for prudent development and utilization of energy resources in Indonesia. IIEE has been actively involved in the development of public awareness and capacity building to convey the importance of optimal and efficient energy resources management.
WWF Indonesia www.wwf.or.id/	The World Wide Fund for Nature in Indonesia has been engaged in work on climate change and renewable energy. It is also part of WWF Asia's "Our Power" campaign, which looks to promote democratization in the electricity sector.
Indonesian Center for Environmental Law (ICEL) http://www.icel.or.id	Indonesian Center for Environmental Law specializes in research and capacity building, advocacy, and community empowerment. It seeks to defend the public interest by pursuing the recognition of their rights with respect to the environment and natural resources. ICEL also endeavors to enhance the capability of environmental NGOs and the Government of Indonesia with respect to good environmental governance, i.e., establishing the sustainable management of environment and natural resources on a democratic basis by maintaining human rights values, democratization, and the rule of law. ICEL led work on the Access Initiative Assessment of Environmental Governance in Indonesia.
People Centered Economic and Business Institute (IBEKA) http://ibeka.port5.com/	The main objective of IBEKA is to work in rural areas with village communities to make environments more conducive to the growth of people-centered economic systems in their areas, with an emphasis on energy and electricity services. IBEKA has extensive experience setting up micro-hydro systems for rural communities in Indonesia.
Working Group on Power Sector Restructuring (WG-PSR)	Working Group on Power Sector Restructuring (WGPSR), established in 2001 in Jakarta, is a group of NGOs conducting advocacy in the energy sector in Indonesia, particularly the power sector. WGPSR aims to enhance transparency and accountability in the Indonesian energy sector as well as increase public participation in the decision-making process. WGSPR works on providing alternative policy and ideas through campaigns, lobbying, and education. WGPSR has 8 members: INFID, ICW, YLKI, PIRAC, IGJ, DebtWatch, LBH Jakarta, Yayasan GENI.
Pelangi http://www.pelangi.or.id/	Pelangi is a global environmental think tank that seeks to form a society that self-governs and secures the quality of its natural resources and environment while pursuing equitable and democratic socio-economic well-being. It has a longstanding program on climate change and energy. Pelangi has undertaken work on power sector policy, energy efficiency, public benefits in electricity sector restructuring, and renewable energy, and is part of the Global Village Energy Partnership.

Advisory Panel

Dr. Bambang Brodjonegoro, *Independent Commissioner PT PLN Persero and Dean of Economic Dept, University of Indonesia*
Mr. Endro Utomo Notodisuryo, *Transparency International and Former Director General of Electricity & Energy Development*
Mr. Faisal Basri, *Commissioner, Oversight Comission for Business Competition and Lecturer at University of Indonesia*
Dr. Irwan Prayitno, *Legislator, House of Representatives and Member of Comission VII (Energy, Environment, Research and Technology)*
Mr. Puguh Sugiharto, *Former Chairman of the Working Group for Good Governance in the Electricity Sector, Member of the Renewable Energy Society and Director of PEN Consulting*
Dr. Umar Said, *Former Secretary General of the Ministry of Energy and Mining and Lecturer at the University of Indonesia*

Dr. Bambang Adi Winarso, *Deputy Director of Social Electricity Development, Directorate General of Electricity and Energy Utilization – Ministry of Energy*

The Electricity Governance Assessment in the Philippines

Research Team	
Organization	**Experience**
Green Independent Power Producers Inc	Green Renewable Independent Power Producers Inc (GRIPP) is a collaborative undertaking of various local and international stakeholders including Preferred Energy Incorporated, Greenpeace-Southeast Asia Energy Campaign, Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement and Solar Electric Company, Inc. It aims to facilitate multi-stakeholder inputs into power sector decision-making to develop green energy. GRIPP seeks to demonstrate that renewable energy can present a viable alternative to grid-based fossil fuel power, through a mix of energy options linked to the local economy and livelihood generation such as biomass cogeneration plants and wind farms for on-grid applications, off-grid electrification and energy efficiency. Maitet Diokono, Eileen Chi Co, and Dean La Paz led work on the EGI assessment, with the support of Athena Ronquillo Ballasteros.
Action for Economic Reforms http://www.aer.ph	Founded in 1996 by a group of progressive scholars and activists, Action for Economic Reforms (AER) is an independent, reform-oriented public interest organization that conducts policy analysis and advocacy on key economic issues. AER undertakes research to obtain information, deepen knowledge, and generate resources. Such information, resources and knowledge are used to develop policy proposals and alternatives. AER emphasizes the complementariness of the market and state planning. Market instruments, when appropriately used in a particular context, can serve progressive goals. The market, however, is one side of the coin. The other side is a government that works for the public good. The market is not all opportunities; its ugly side having far more disturbing consequences in terms of intensifying inequities and further marginalizing the poor. With this in mind, development planning, social regulation, and institutional intervention have to compensate for the market's weaknesses and limitations.
Development Academy of the Philippines http://www.dap.edu.ph/	The Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) was established in June 1973 to assist in the country's development efforts as change catalyst and as capacity-builder. It has assisted in shaping new government policies, crafting innovative development programs, and modernizing the management of government agencies and private enterprises. As change catalyst, DAP has played the role of "think tank" of government. A good number of DAP's programs and social technologies have been institutionalized as well. As capacity-builder, it has enabled people and institutions, especially those in public and community service, to carry out their tasks effectively. DAP is a World Class National Development and Productivity Organization that builds capacities and partnerships among the key sectors of Philippine society; generates innovative, value-adding, and synergistic solutions to national and local concerns, and seeks to promote sustainable human development and global competitiveness.

Advisory Panel

Rufino Bomasang *Former Under Secretary of the Department of Energy*
Antonio del Rosario, *Former Chairman of the World Energy Council*
Maria Concepcion Pabalan, *Managing Director, Development Academy of the Philippines*
Bobby Julian, *Finance Director, Preferred Energy International*
Crisanto Laset, Jr., *Cagayan Electric Power & Light Co. (CEPALCO)*

The Electricity Governance Assessment in the Thailand

Research Team	
Organization	**Experience**
Health Systems Research Institute www.hsri.or.th	The Health Systems Research Institute is an autonomous branch of the Thai Ministry of Public Health, with a longstanding research program exploring the environmental health implications of the energy sector. The Health Systems Research Institute led the Thai Electricity Governance Assessment.
Palang Thai http://www.palangthai.org	**Palang Thai** is a Thailand-based non-profit organization that works to ensure that the transformations that occur in the region's energy sector are economically rational, and that they augment, rather than undermine, social and environmental justice and sustainability. Palang Thai conducts works with Thai NGOs, universities, businesses and government agencies to analyze electricity planning and policy from a public interest perspective. Its programs of work also include the Thai Net Metering Project (VSPP), which promotes the implementation of small-scale grid-connected renewable energy projects and the Border Green Energy Team (BSEP) which provides hands-on solar and micro-hydro training for villages on both sides of the Thai / Burma border.
Thailand Environment Institute http://www.tei.or.th/main.htm	The Thailand Environment Institute (TEI) is a non-profit, non-governmental organization focusing on environmental issues and the conservation of natural resources in Thailand. Founded on the belief that partnerships are the most effective approach to achieving a more sustainable way of life, the Thailand Environment Institute advocates a participatory approach to shared environmental responsibility. By working closely with the private sector, government, local communities, other civil society partners, academia, and in international circles with international organizations, TEI helps to formulate environmental directives and link policy with action to encourage meaningful environmental progress in Thailand. TEI is a core team partner in The Access Initiative, a participatory global coalition.
King Prajadhipok's Institute http://www.kpi.ac.th	King Prajadhipok's Institute (KPI) is an independent, academic public organization under the supervision of the National Assembly. The institute undertakes academic work including research, training, and seminars, disseminates information on development of democracy and governance and provides consultation on effective governance at the local and national level. KPI coordinates and cooperates with local, foreign and international agencies with the common goal of creating sustainable democracy.
Confederation of Consumer Organizations	The Confederation of Consumer Organizations of Thailand is comprised of twenty-one member organizations from around the country that represent such areas as labor, farmers, health, and women's rights. Members convene monthly to review successes and challenges, and outline next steps in promoting consumer education and protection through an existing local network that reaches consumers at the grassroots level.

Advisory Panel

Mr.Cherdpong Siriwit, *Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Energy*
Mr.Veerapol Jirapraditkul, *Deputy Director, Energy Policy and Planning Office, Ministry of Energy*
Dr.Chanin Thongthammachad, *Deputy Permanent Secretary, Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning*
Ms.Ratchanee Aemaruji, *Director, Bureau for Public Participation Promotion*
Mr.Sophon Supapong, *Senator*
Mr.Gaewsan Atipo, *Senator and Chair of the Senate Committee on the Environment*
M.L.Apimongkol Sonakul *MP and member of The MP Energy Committee*
Mr.Jane Namchaisiri, *Federation of Thai Industries*

Mr.Suvin Laohaprasit, *Electricity System Research and Development*
Mr.Charit Ruengwiset, Governor, *Metropolitan Electricity Authority*
Dr.Wichit Loajirachunkul, *School of Applied Statistics, National Institute of Development Administration*
Prof.Dr.Wanchai Wattanasub, *Director, Center for Peace and Good Governance*
Dr.Praipol Kumpsub, *Faculty of Economics, Thammasat University*
Dr.Duaenden Nikomborirak, *Thailand Development Research Institute*
Dr.Piyasawasti Amranand, *Energy for Environment Foundation*
Mr.Witoon Permpongsajaroen, *Project for Ecological Recovery*
Mr.Pairoj Polphet, *Union for Civil Liberty*
Mr.Amporn Duangparn, *Local community leader*
Mr.Lek Kudwonggaew, *Local community leader*
Ms.Parichart Siwaraksa, *The Sub-Committee on Industry and Energy, The National Human Rights Commission*