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SPP RE strives to continuously improve its performance of its NERC-delegated functions. Each year SPP RE asks its Registered Entities to provide anonymous input on the organization’s programs and customer service to stakeholders.

SPP RE issued the 2014 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey on September 18, 2014 to the 123 Primary Compliance Contacts who are registered in SPP RE’s compliance database (webCDMS). The survey had a 62% response rate (76 respondents), up from 57% in 2013. Of the 76 respondents, 16 opted out of the survey because they do not work with SPP RE enough to provide input.

Respondents were asked to assess six SPP RE programs on their importance, how well they meet expectations, and customer service/responsiveness. Stakeholders were also asked to assess SPP RE’s performance in relation to other Regional Entities, to rate overall performance, and to provide qualitative comments.

On a scale of 1-5 in which 5 represents the most favorable score, average ratings throughout the survey were between 3.3 and 4.5.

Of the 30 respondents who interact with other Regional Entities, none rated SPP much worse or somewhat worse, 38% rated SPP RE about the same, 31% rated SPP RE somewhat better, and 31% rated SPP RE much better.

When asked how well SPP RE’s programs and services meet expectations, respondents rated all with average scores in the meets expectations range between 3.3 and 3.6.

**How well program meets expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fails to Meet</th>
<th>Almost Meets</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Greatly Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-tools</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops &amp; Planning Monitoring</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked to rate employees’ customer service ability or programs’ responsiveness to needs, respondents rated all with average scores between good and excellent, from 4.1 to 4.5.

**Customer Service/Responsiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ops &amp; Planning Monitoring</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents rated the importance of SPP RE’s programs and services between important and very important, with average scores between 3.3 and 3.7.

**Importance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic tools</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops &amp; Planning Monitoring</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

Poor Below Average Average Good Excellent

Not Important Moderately Important Important Very Important Critical
The 2014 overall satisfaction rating of 4.1 is the highest rating in four years.

**SPP RE Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1-Poor</th>
<th>2-Below Average</th>
<th>3-Average</th>
<th>4-Good</th>
<th>5-Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=58 x=4.1
n=56 x=3.6
n=60 x=4.0
n=47 x=3.8

Respondents could answer open-ended questions regarding each program and SPP RE in general. There were 10 unfavorable comments related to multi-regional collaboration, dissatisfaction with being in the CMEP, the desire to allow audit observers from other Registered Entities, and the need for more information about changes at the NERC level.

Sixteen positive comments related to staff’s general excellence, proactive outreach efforts, responsiveness, and professionalism.

When asked what specific things staff could do to exceed expectations, respondents left 12 comments including improving multi-regional consistency, moving faster with NERC’s Reliability Assurance Initiative, and having a more transparent approach to compliance.

---

1 Stacked bar charts throughout this report indicate the number of respondents in each category, not the percentage. “N” represents the number of people who responded to that question, while “x” denotes the average response.
Demographics

I choose not to take this survey because:

- I do not work with SPP RE enough to provide input (87%)
- Other (13%)
- Just Got Done with 2nd SPP Audit
- No comment

Number reporting (n) = 16

How often do you interact with SPP RE?

- Rarely (12%)
- Weekly (13%)
- A few times per year (42%)
- Monthly (33%)

n=67
**Interaction with other Regional Entities**

Do you interact with other Regional Entities?

![Pie chart showing yes and no responses]

- Yes: 48%
- No: 52%

n=62

If "yes", how does SPP RE compare with the Regional Entities with which you interact most often?

![Pie chart showing comparison levels]

- Much better: 31%
- About the same: 38%
- Somewhat better: 31%

n=29
Operations and Planning Compliance Monitoring

How well does our Operations & Planning (693) program meet your expectations?

Self-Certifications

- 1 Fails to Meet: 1
- 2 Almost Meets: 28
- 3 Meets: 21
- 4 Exceeds: 8
- 5 Greatly Exceeds: 8
- n=58
- x=3.6

Self-Reports

- 1 Fails to Meet: 2
- 2 Almost Meets: 22
- 3 Meets: 12
- 4 Exceeds: 4
- 5 Greatly Exceeds: 4
- n=38
- x=3.5

Audits

- 1 Fails to Meet: 2
- 2 Almost Meets: 16
- 3 Meets: 15
- 4 Exceeds: 8
- 5 Greatly Exceeds: 8
- n=42
- x=3.6

Average = 3.6

Please rate the Operations & Planning (693) staff's customer service ability (responsiveness, professionalism, problem solving, and communication skills):

Customer Service

- 1 Poor: 11
- 2 Below Average: 20
- 3 Average: 33
- 4 Good: 1
- 5 Excellent: 2
- n=57
- x=4.5

How important is our Operations & Planning (693) program to you or your organization?

Importance

- 1 Not Important: 2
- 2 Moderately Important: 2
- 3 Important: 19
- 4 Very Important: 24
- 5 Critical: 13
- n=60
- x=3.7

Please share your suggestions for improving our Traditional (693) Compliance Monitoring program:

- In the last 12 months we are gone through a self report and audit. The SPP RE was great to work with!
- None at this time
- 1. Audit to the Standards. 2. Quality check your communications. (Make some attempt to get things right the first time, not the third or fourth try). 3. Stop trying to justify your existence by fabricating violations.
- Get us out of the System!
- not experienced enough to respond
• Keep up the good work. Your educational efforts help us do two things. First it helps us keep our "head in the game" by lessons learned, future events, and secondly the resource is critical to market participants.

• Most recent Audit interaction with O&P Group was positive and productive. Lead was proactive and open to suggestions. Focused on the more impactful reliability issues.

• Improved communications

• Possibly provide more indication of what the audit plan is going to be mid-year instead of waiting until early fourth quarter. Entities that have first quarter audits do not have as much lead time as the entities that are in third and fourth quarters.

• It would be helpful for the SPP RE to adopt the ISME program from SERC to allow Industry Subject Matter Experts the opportunity to participate in 693 audits.

• NA we are a PSE Only in SPP RE

• The 693 Compliance process has been reasonably stable and organized from audit to audit, with questions/interpretations that arise in the Standard drafting process fairly well answered for the entities.
Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)
Compliance Monitoring

How well does our CIP program meet your expectations?

![Bar chart showing self-certifications, self-reports, and audits with ratings and frequencies.]

Please rate the CIP staff's customer service ability (responsiveness, professionalism, problem solving, and communication skills):

![Bar chart showing customer service ratings and frequencies.]

How important is our CIP program to you or your organization?

![Bar chart showing importance ratings and frequencies.]

Please share your suggestions for improving our CIP program:

- They are doing a great job! I have no suggestions for improvement.
- We are a d.p. l.s.e. that receives from grid no transmissions at all WHY? do We Need to be in the system at all!!!!!! to Even be in system!!!!
- Words of encouragement: Keep up the good work. Your educational efforts help us do two things. First it helps us keep our "head in the game" by lessons learned, future events, and secondly the resource is critical to market participants.
• CIP V5 outreach and collaboration activities have been positive. There will need to be much more in 2015. SPP CIP needs to transition to focus on the impactful reliability and security issues much like the O&P side. SPP CIP needs to be careful not to let the RAI and Internal Controls evaluation process get out of control. If that happens, SPP entities will back away from RAI.

• Some CIP SPP compliance personnel are better than others. Others make up their mind and are very reluctant to change their opinion no matter what information is presented. Suggestion - Be more open to listen to others.

• The SPP RE CIP auditors should focus on enforcing the NERC's audit approach and interpretation while following NERC's RoP, rather than the auditors imposing their own interpretation and audit approach. This leads to situations where entities are not able to benchmark their programs.

• It would be helpful for the SPP RE to adopt the ISME program from SERC to allow Industry Subject Matter Experts the opportunity to participate in CIP audits.

• NA we are a PSE Only in SPP RE

• I rated the CIP Compliance staff customer service ability as "average" because the question does not lend itself to the components of audits versus outreach and approachability. The CIP Compliance team members are quite responsive in helping with approaches and problems; on the other hand audits are still quite uneven in the judgements made, not only from audit to audit, but even within a single audit event. These events should not be guessing games.
Enforcement

How well does our Enforcement program meet your expectations?

- FFT Processing
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 2
  - 2-Almost Meets: 16
  - 3-Meets: 8
  - 4-Exceeds: 7
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 3
  - n=35
  - x=3.5

- Violation (NOP) processing
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 3
  - 2-Almost Meets: 1
  - 3-Meets: 16
  - 4-Exceeds: 6
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 3
  - n=29
  - x=3.2

- Mitigation Plan processing
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 3
  - 2-Almost Meets: 15
  - 3-Meets: 15
  - 4-Exceeds: 7
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 3
  - n=41
  - x=3.5

  Average=3.4

Please rate the Enforcement staff's customer service ability (responsiveness, professionalism, problem solving, and communication skills):

- Customer Service
  - 1-Poor: 2
  - 2-Below Average: 3
  - 3-Average: 19
  - 4-Good: 24
  - 5-Excellent: 14
  - n=48
  - x=4.3

How important is our Enforcement program to you or your organization?

- Importance
  - 1-Not Important: 3
  - 2-Moderately Important: 16
  - 3-Important: 23
  - 4-Very Important: 9
  - 5-Critical: 3
  - n=51
  - x=3.7

Please share your suggestions for improving our Enforcement program:

- The enforcement personal have made themselves available to assist when possible and are very good to work with!
- 1. Stop covering for the Auditors mistakes. Dismiss NOPVs without merit. 2. Audit to the Standards. 3. Quality check your communications. (Make some attempt to get things right the first time, not the third or fourth try). 4. Stop trying to justify your existence by fabricating violations.
- same as above!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- Enforcement staff is very knowledgeable and professional. Good to work with.
- Focus on timeliness and promptness addressing violations and mitigation plans.
- More separation between audit and enforcement staff.
- The Enforcement staff is quite responsive and communicate well. They are somewhat limited by the poor rollout of programs, e.g. RAI, by NERC, which leave many questions unanswered.
Event Analysis/Lessons Learned and Reliability Assessments

How well do our Event Analysis/Lessons Learned and Reliability Assessment programs meet your expectations?

- Reliability Assessments:
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 2
  - 2-Almost Meets: 1
  - 3-Meets: 23
  - 4-Exceeds: 8
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 3
  - n=37
  - x=3.2

- Event Analysis/Lessons Learned:
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 2
  - 2-Almost Meets: 1
  - 3-Meets: 22
  - 4-Exceeds: 10
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 3
  - n=38
  - x=3.3
  - Average=3.3

Please rate our Event Analysis/Lessons Learned and Reliability Assessment staff’s customer service ability (responsiveness, professionalism, problem solving, and communication skills):

- Reliability Assessments Responsiveness:
  - 1-Poor: 2
  - 2-Below Average: 1
  - 3-Average: 23
  - 4-Good: 8
  - 5-Excellent: 9
  - n=37
  - x=4.1

- Event Analysis/Lessons Learned:
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 2
  - 2-Almost Meets: 6
  - 3-Meets: 16
  - 4-Exceeds: 15
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 3
  - n=42
  - x=3.3

How important are our Event Analysis/Lessons Learned and Reliability Assessment programs to you or your organization?

Please share your suggestions for improving our Event Analysis/Lessons Learned and Reliability Assessment programs:

- Got one IT cyber nut That has no Concept as to what little guys do. He was hell bent on getting us a fine if is wasn't for an educated an attorney on SPP staff We would have been up a creek with gators and no boat!
- haven't had any events to analyze
Outreach

How well does our Outreach program meet your expectations?

Please rate our Outreach program's responsiveness to your needs:

How important is our Outreach program to you or your organization?

Please share your suggestions for improving our Outreach program:

- we don't need any of this!!!
- Workshops have become sort of "ho-hum" with the many member entity presentations that are specific to their own systems or company. Simply put, if we wanted to know about how an entity does something we can just simply pick up the phone and call them. However what we would like to see with all the changes at NERC forthcoming is how is the RE going to embrace changing NERC programs such as the changing of RAI and the RE's Implementation Plans, What does the RE expect in the Internal Controls Evaluation (ICE) of an entity? The RE's Regional Implementation Plan in regards to risk assessment? The Inherent Risk Assessment (IRA) of an entity. These are all large topics which should be covered now but I do not believe that the Fall 2014 workshop has any of these topics listed. I would like to see the RE go back to more RE material being presented as to expectations of what's to come....
• More information about how to comply with standards. Less information about best practices regarding security and reliability.

• Especially when compared to other Regional Entities in the neighborhood, the SPP RE exceeds expectations regarding outreach, working with registered entities, and defining expectations for compliance. Some of the compliance expectations can be debated of course, but nonetheless, compliance obligations for the footprint are being defined.

• Many communications are too elemental and do not answer some obvious questions about programs/processes. That is understandable for communications at the beginning of a program, but there should be follow-up once the entities questions are known.
Electronic Tools

How well do our electronic tools meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>1-Fails to Meet</th>
<th>2-Almost Meets</th>
<th>3-Meets</th>
<th>4-Exceeds</th>
<th>5-Greatly Exceeds</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>webCDMS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFT Server</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE webpages of SPP.org</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average=3.3

How important are our electronic tools to you or your organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1-Not Important</th>
<th>2-Moderately Important</th>
<th>3-Important</th>
<th>4-Very Important</th>
<th>5-Critical</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please share your suggestions for improving our electronic tools:

- Access related issues and system performance take an enormous amount of time.
- As a new user to the webCDMS system in the past 3 months, I have struggled to find documentation to assist me in the process of completing quarterly reporting and other submittals. Contacting the RE Staff solved my problem, but I believe better online help tools are needed.
- Use WebCDMS. Stop creating a new submission process for every Standard.
- For the size organization we are do not need this!!!!
- I understand the benefit of the RAPA Misoperations CDMS feature. However, as it's currently designed, it adds a lot of work to our process. We have all the data in a spreadsheet then have to copy/paste it line-by-line into CDMS. An xml or csv feature would save us a lot of time.
- CDMS probably most important.
- Tools should be better designed for user friendliness. For example, the Misoperations reporting tool is unnecessarily tediness and almost unusable.
The 2014 overall satisfaction rating of 4.1 was the highest in four years.
Qualitative - Dissatisfaction

Please share other comments regarding your dissatisfaction with SPP RE

- Do not require any DPs LSE that use little Megawatts that are not even transmitting on grid with small number of customers even have to be in the system at all.

- Please allow entities the ability to invite other entities to their on-site audits. Although the SPP RE points to the NERC ROP as the reason for ending this practice, we believe it is up to the SPP RE if this is allowed. This would allow entities to learn from each other and ultimately produce a more reliable BES. If the SPP RE continues to believe the NERC ROP block this practice, than the SPP RE should work with the entities and NERC to change the rule.

- The main area of dissatisfaction is not SPP RE directly, but with the collaboration between entities. We are a multi-region entity and the difference between regions causes issues ranging from minor confusion to true frustrations. If SPP RE could better collaborate with the other REs and drive for consistency, it would be help us to free time devoted to dealing with inconsistencies and provide better focus on reliability issues.

- Have Ron C and staff provide more of "whats to come" with the changes happening and NERC.

- Have not been registered long to have had any dissatisfying experiences

- Seeming lack of participation, engagement and understanding of the NERC RAI. Shift in position on Entity Observers at Audits. Pro's outweigh Con's for all involved on this one. Appearance is that SPP RE is unwilling to have open transparent dialog on issues. There is an Entity involvement option currently being used in SERC that should be considered in SPP.

- CIP compliance leadership needs improvement.

- See above suggestions above. The SPP RE needs to continue to improve the process of resolving violations and communicating with the entities.

- WEbinars about how Kevin Perry believes NERC will implement RAI 8 months before the RAI documentation has even been created is not helpful and creates difficulties within the member companies.

- N/A

- CIP audits (interpretations of Standards) need improvement.
Qualitative - Satisfaction

Please share other comments regarding your satisfaction with SPP RE:

- Have gone through a self report and 693 audit in the last 12 months. The SPP RE was excellent to work with.

- Jeff Rooker, Mike Hughes and Daniel Haney have been excellent to work with. They take the time to really listen to the circumstances of your individual situation. They are reasonable and fair and will to share info in a non-threatening way to help educate you on the expectations of compliance so that I can make it right moving forward.

- Outreach videos have been crucial to bringing me up to speed with a number of topics. Staff is always very cordial when contacted, either by phone or in person at the RE Workshop.

- The head manager and upper management staff that have been their last 5 Years are Fantastic!!! the some new kids on staff have no clue about real world.

- SPP Audit staff have been outstanding to deal with regarding the upcoming November CIP audit. They’ve demonstrated responsiveness to the questions we’ve asked, they’ve done a good job of shielding us from having to interface with multiple REs, and they’ve been flexible with regard to the requests we’ve made. Fundamentally, they’ve been very professional throughout the whole engagement. We continue to value the support we receive from SPP regarding compliance guidance – including, but not limited to, the multiple meetings / workshops / webinars SPP has facilitated to help entities get ready for CIP Version 5.

- Audit staff are generally good people to work with.

- Very prompt responses to any questions we have had

- I appreciate the professionalism of the group. I will always get an answer and I can see your point of view.

- SPP staff have always been responsive to our questions or needs. They are very professional as well.

- O&P Audit interaction. CIP V5 outreach and collaboration. Enforcement staff interaction.

- 693 compliance staff very good to work with. Thomas Teafatiller and Jeff Rooker stand out.

- There is some positive change in the SPP RE organization; their more collaborative approach to improving overall reliability and customer service.

- SPP RE employees seem to have the best of intentions.

- N/A

- Being proactive in getting information out to the members.
• I found the auditors worked with our SME's to explain and clarify questions they had. The auditors went above my expectations to make sure the SME's understood what they were looking for in the evidence they were reviewing. Daniel also went above and beyond when he called and explained what evidence we were missing. Once he provided additional information of what they were seeking our facility was able to provide them the correct evidence. Daniel and Mike we polite and never got frustrated with our questions/inquiries. I really enjoyed working with them and their team.

• Outreach by SPP in general has been excellent and effective.
Qualitative - Improvement

What specific things could we do to EXCEED expectations?

- Their willingness to go the extra distance to be helpful.

- I expect to be able to view expectations at higher levels than I have marked within the next 6 months to a year. Being new to the position, I have not had enough exposure to the RE Staff to really be able to develop accurate expectations. I look forward to future opportunities to interact with the RE Staff.

- I think that the Generator Owner Operator registered functions needs to have more focus attention during the conferences.

- Listen to the little guy that has been doing this since 1973 Has Taught electrical Engineering at 2 Highly recognized University's. and Has worked with FEMA and Homeland Defense and was told I needed to be an engineer to understand how the system works! LOL.

- The most important aspect is for SPP and the other regions to be consistent about messaging and processes for Compliance, Monitoring and Enforcement as we all participate in the RAI program.

- See "Dissatisfaction" response.

- Start up a program similar to SERC's ISME program.

- Courtesy shown during any interactions thus far

- Incorporate a more open, transparent and collaborative approach to compliance. The RE and Entities share the same goals of reliability and security.

- Move faster into the RAI and to provide some level of consistency and clarity to the audit/compliance process to help reduce the burden of the processes on the registered entities.

- Focus on the mission of the RE as a part of the ERO.

- Outreach is comparatively good.