2011 SPP RE Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey Report
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Executive Summary

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 2011 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey on September 26, 2011 to the 196 Primary Compliance Contacts and Authorizing Officers who are registered in SPP RE’s compliance database (webCDMS). The survey had a 38% response rate (74 respondents), up from 30% in 2010.

Respondents were asked to assess seven 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 performance in five categories from 2009-2011, and to provide qualitative comments.

The majority of respondents represent investor-owned or municipal organizations and work in compliance or operations. Almost half interact with SPP RE a few times per year; 23% interact monthly and 22% weekly.

On a scale of 1-5 in which 5 represents the most favorable score, average ratings throughout the survey were in the 3-4 range. No average ratings were unfavorable (below 3), yet none were in the extremely favorable range (above 4).

When asked how important SPP RE’s programs and services are, all received average scores between 3 (important) and 4 (very important). Electronic Tools was rated the most important at 3.77, while Event Analysis/Reliability Assessments were rated least important at 3.45.

### Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic tools</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693 Monitoring</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Under Development</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- 5 Critical
- 4 Very Important
- 3 Important
- 2 Moderately Important
- 1 Not Important
When asked how well SPP RE’s programs and services meet expectations, respondents rated all with average scores between 3 (meets expectations) and 3.5 (4 is exceeds expectations). The outreach program received the highest score of 3.44, while CIP received the lowest at 3.12.

### How well program meets expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Under Development</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-tools</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693 Monitoring</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked to rate employees’ customer service ability or programs’ responsiveness to needs, respondents rated all with average scores between 3.5 (3 is average) and just above 4 (good). Traditional (693) monitoring staff received the highest score of 4.14, while Event Analysis/Reliability Assessments received the lowest at 3.62.

### Customer Service/Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>693 Monitoring</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 43 respondents who interact with other Regional Entities, 44% rated SPP RE about the same, 37% rated SPP RE somewhat better, and 19% rated SPP RE much better. None indicated that SPP RE’s performance is worse.

---

1 The “meets expectations” scale used in this survey is different from the satisfaction scale used in the SPP Regional Transmission Organization survey, which is “1–Poor, 2, 3, 4, 5–Excellent”.
Ratings have annually increased in five major categories from 2009-2011. Again, all ratings are between 3 and 4:

Respondents could answer open-ended questions regarding each program and SPP RE in general. There were fewer responses to the qualitative than quantitative questions; respondents only provided 6-12 comments for each open-ended question.

Regarding dissatisfaction, three qualitative themes were noted approximately five times each: customer service problems, problems with electronic tools, and confusion regarding standards/program expectations. Also noted several times were inefficiencies and the injection of personal opinion into CMEP processes.

Regarding satisfaction, there were 22 positive observations regarding staff’s customer service. There were several other comments related to improvements in electronic tools and general positive observations.

---

2 Bar charts throughout this report indicate the number of people who responded in each category, not the percentage.
Demographics

My organization is:

- Investor-Owned: 28%
- Municipal: 24%
- Cooperative: 13%
- Independent Power Producer: 12%
- Governmental Agency: 7%
- Other: 15%

n=74

What is your role within your organization?

- Compliance: 39%
- Operations: 18%
- Executive: 16%
- Policy/Regulatory/Legal: 12%
- Engineering: 5%
- Investor-Owned: 18%
- Engineering: 5%
- Policy/Regulatory/Legal: 12%
- Executive: 16%
- Investor-Owned: 18%
- Engineering: 5%
- Other: 9%

n=74

How often do you interact with SPP RE?

- Weekly: 22%
- Monthly: 23%
- A few times per year: 46%
- Rarely: 9%

n=74
Traditional (693) Compliance Monitoring

How well does our Traditional (693) Compliance Monitoring program meet your expectations? ³

![Survey Bar Chart]

Please rate the Traditional (693) Compliance Monitoring staff’s customer service ability (responsiveness, professionalism, problem solving and communication skills):

![Customer Service Bar Chart]

How important is our Traditional (693) Compliance Monitoring Program to you or your organization?

![Importance Bar Chart]

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

- We have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.

³ “n” represents the number of people who responded to that question, while “x” denotes the average response. Respondents were asked to skip questions that were irrelevant to them or their organization rather than making a neutral selection.
• The compliance staff is very professional and audit according to the standard.

• Compliance utilizing industry proven practices that assure reliability is supported by all utilities. Sophisticated threats to reliability via CIPS is extremely important and should receive much attention for the looped grid. We have to protect the GRID from threats here to fore not considered and may have little or no defense. i.e. EMP (electronic magnetic pulse) I don't have an answer, just a concern that we may be unprepared and spending little effort towards safe guarding such threats.

• Consolidate quarterly exception, misoperation and vegetation reports into the quarterly Self-Certification program.

• I don't know that anything can be done to improve on what is being done today. I appreciate all of the effort being done to try and clarify what is required to meet compliance. I truly believe everyone involved with the SPP foot print wants to meet compliance. It is just the uncertainty of what that is at times. Such as with meeting analysis of your system during real time situations.

• The way SPP RE handles audits is very helpful to the entity being audited. The auditors are very professional and truly seem to be looking for evidence of compliance. Their questions are very directed to the proper areas.

• The SPP RE Staff remain generally quite helpful for audit purposes and when follow up questions are submitted.

• [ ] has not been audited yet, we are scheduled sometime in 2013
Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Compliance Monitoring

How well does our CIP Compliance Monitoring program meet your expectations?

- **Self-Certifications**
  - 5- Greatly Exceeds: 3
  - 4-Exceeds: 5
  - 3 - Meets: 42
  - 2- Almost Meets: 1
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 1
  - n=51, x=3.18

- **Self-Reports**
  - 5- Greatly Exceeds: 2
  - 4-Exceeds: 6
  - 3 - Meets: 41
  - 2- Almost Meets: 11
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 1
  - n=51, x=3.14

- **Audits**
  - 5- Greatly Exceeds: 2
  - 4-Exceeds: 8
  - 3 - Meets: 33
  - 2- Almost Meets: 4
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 3
  - n=50, x=3.04

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

- **Customer Service**
  - 5-Excellent: 9
  - 4-Good: 26
  - 3-Average: 12
  - 2-Below Average: 3
  - 1-Poor: 2
  - n=52, x=3.71

How important is our CIP Compliance Monitoring Program to you or your organization?

- **Importance**
  - 5-Critical: 9
  - 4-Very Important: 20
  - 3-Important: 22
  - 2-Moderately Important: 2
  - 1-Not Important: 2
  - n=55, x=3.58

Please share your suggestions for improving our CIP Compliance Monitoring program:

- The SPP RE Audit Team that we worked with had limited or no actual utility operational experience. In addition, the Audit Team Injected their own “criteria” which is not contained in the specific Standard.

- We have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.
The compliance staff needs to audit according to the current standards, not based on their personal expectations and what they want the standards to be.

In our experience, it has been very hard to reach a CIP expert a SPPRE to answer questions. Responsiveness has been slow if any response is provided at all - which shows either a lack of professionalism or excessive work load or both.

CIP Standards do not apply to our organization.

SPP's CIP program is the standard for others.

The rapid turnover of past and future Standard versions is disconcerting and creates a tremendous amount of confusion and the necessity for re-training of SMEs.

I really appreciate how involved the CIP Compliance Monitoring staff is with questions and concerns with meeting compliance. Again it seems to be a struggle to get clarity at times on what is expected to meet compliance developed by NERC.

Customer service is not a strength for this team. Numerous comments are received regarding the style used by this team (or some on this team). Some members of the team are generally well appreciated for their demeanor, while others are thought of in a poorer light. Additionally, comments are overheard regarding a lack of audit consistency, the use of "personal interpretations" during audits, and the "moving target" nature of many of the requirements.

We have not been audited on CIP, other that data submittal etc.
Enforcement

How well does our Enforcement program meet your expectations?

Violation processing

- 5- Greatly Exceeds: 3
- 4-Exceeds: 9
- 3-Meets: 23
- 2-Almost Meets: 4
- 1-Fails to Meet: 3

Mitigation Plan processing

- 5- Greatly Exceeds: 3
- 4-Exceeds: 12
- 3-Meets: 25
- 2-Almost Meets: 2
- 1-Fails to Meet: 1

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

Customer Service

- 5-Excellent: 15
- 4-Good: 22
- 3-Average: 6
- 2-Below Average: 1
- 1-Poor: 1

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

Importance

- 5-Critical: 7
- 4-Very Important: 28
- 3-Important: 14
- 2-Moderately Important: 2
- 1-Not Important: 1

Please share your suggestions for improving our Enforcement program:

- We have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.
- N/A.
- If some violations were not based on the auditor's subjective determinations, the violation process with Enforcement staff would be much better.
- My organization has not had any interactions with the Enforcement Program.
- SPP's Mitigation Program is well thought out, help is available and the process is sequential and understandable.

- Programs are well-meaning, but seem not to be well thought out prior to inception. There are always a number of questions and uncertainties when a new program is introduced.

- I know the back log of violations has created the issue, but at times the violation and settlement process gets repetitive; questions ask 6 months prior are addressed again to clarify issues with the violation specifics. This creates issues with administering time to dig up what was presented and agreed to back at that time.

- The enforcement staff has always been very quick to respond to questions etc. from the entity. They have also been willing to consider and discuss options, when possible.

- Comments are received regarding the use of the Monitoring Team staff during Enforcement activities. For example, the involvement of CIP audit team members during enforcement discussions has raised several concerns.

- I believe we are moving in the right direction with the f/t tracking.
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 have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.
- My organization has not had any interactions with the Outreach program.
- Excellent job, we also always get excellent and knowledgable response from SPPRE staff.
- SPP's Outreach Programs are and have been more valuable and critical to the entities participating that SPP could ever know. PLEASE, keep up the good work.
- Sometimes do not answer tough, critical questions.
- Request that presentations be made available prior to the webinar so that we (industry) can follow along rather than trying to take so many notes on everything being said.

- The workshops have really improved over the last couple of years. The topics covered seem more relevant the the speakers have improved. The webinars are beneficial when held, but sometimes they seem few and far between.

- The outreach efforts are fair, but could be improved.
Electronic Tools

How well do our electronic tools meet your expectations?

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

Please share your suggestions for improving our electronic tools:

- Many organizations including ours have had substantial problems with the electronic tools.

- We have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.

- I would humbly suggest that SPP, along with other regional entities, look at conforming all electronic media to same format. While not critical, there is a great deal of wasted effort on mechanics

- The CDMS is much better with the OATI platform.

- It is important electronic tools work like they're supposed to, when they're supposed to. We don't have time to beta test programs and tools. "SPP's stuff works."

- Electronic tools are a great help, but SPP website could be organized much better.

- It can still be a little difficult to find information on the webpages. There are quite a few links that don't work and it would be beneficial to be able to get phone numbers and email addresses from the website
- webCDMS is an overall poor tool and is not user friendly.
- We appreciate the improvement with the WebCMDS over the issues with the prior CDMS system.
### Standards Under Development

How well does our Standards Under Development program meet your expectations?

![Bar Chart](image1)

How important are Standards Under Development to you or your organization?

![Bar Chart](image2)

Please share your suggestions for improving our Standards Under Development program:

- We have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.
- N/A
- I'm not aware of any communication from the RE related to Standards Under Development.
- Information providing from the staff is spot on all the time. Couldn't do without them.
- There is just too much information for personnel responsible for both CIP and Reliability categories. I understand that the process itself is cumbersome, and there may not be an easy solution for this problem.
- It's an important topic and it doesn't seem to receive much attention from the SPP RE.
- The web conferences and weekly updates are greatly appreciated.

---

4 The weekly standards under development updates are issued by the SPP Regional Transmission Organization, not the SPP RE.
## Event Analysis/Lessons Learned and Reliability Assessments

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Assessments</th>
<th>n=51</th>
<th>x=3.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5- Greatly Exceeds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Exceeds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Meets</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Almost Meets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Fails to Meet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Analysis/Lessons Learned</th>
<th>n=54</th>
<th>x=3.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5- Greatly Exceeds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Exceeds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Meets</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Almost Meets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Fails to Meet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate our Event Analysis/Lessons Learned and Reliability Assessment programs' responsiveness to your needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
<th>n=53</th>
<th>x=3.62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Good</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Average</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>n=56</th>
<th>x=3.45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-Critical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Very Important</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Important</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Moderately Important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Not Important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- We have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.
- N/A
• Lessons learned is a good way for our company to reinforce good utility practice and hopefully avoid making the same mistakes. Out of all activities that the SPP RE performs, Lessons Learned has the greatest potential to improve reliability.

• This area will become more important going forward.

• It takes too long for Event Analysis/Lesson Learned to be shared with industry.

• I have been attending the programs and participating for quite some time and can honestly say the effort made by the SPP’s staff is evident at each level. Over time, they continue to come up with timely and relevant materials that are target interests in the audience time after time. It works for all of us, no matter what level you presently occupy.
Interaction with other REs

Do you interact with other Regional Entities?

Yes 59%
No 41%

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

Comparison to other REs

- 5-Much better: 8
- 4-Somewhat better: 16
- 3-About the same: 19

n=43
x=3.74
Importance and Satisfaction

This matrix plots average scores for importance and satisfaction (how well the program meets expectations). Standards Under Development, 693 Monitoring, E-tools, and Enforcement are clustered with similar importance and satisfaction scores; outreach is also clustered regarding importance but had higher satisfaction ratings. CIP Monitoring is considered less important with a lower satisfaction score. Event Analysis/Reliability Assessments are least important with the second-to-lowest satisfaction score.
Please help us gauge how satisfaction has changed from 2009-2011:

SPP RE Overall

Ratings have increased each year in all five major categories.
Qualitative - Dissatisfaction

Please share other comments regarding your dissatisfaction with SPP RE

- We do not get timely responses to TFE questions from the CIP Compliance Monitoring group. Use of the EFT server for data transfer should always be an accepted means of providing data. The CIP and Enforcement groups prefer (require) the use of the EFT while the 693 Compliance Monitoring group prefers the CDMS.

- I would like to have more coordination with other regions.

- I have had problems with the CDMS that were my problem, not the CDMS. I have never had a problem that went un-resolved. Each problem has been addressed in a professional timely manner.

- The Audit function is showing great improvement, but enforcement is still somewhat confusing and protracted.

- Inconsistencies with audits and varying standards interpretations continue to be prevalent. Registered entities are frustrated by what is perceived as a moving target. Additionally, many feel that SPP RE auditors should receive additional audit training, both on audit practices, and on the specific standards.

- I think more work could be done to create a more simplified schedule for the CMEP activities. A spreadsheet with all the deliverables clearly laid out would be helpful. Furthermore, scheduled updates to the schedule on a monthly basis would be good.
Qualitative - Satisfaction

Please share other comments regarding your satisfaction with SPP RE:

- We have only been registered for a few months and I am unable to accurately answer most of the questions.

- SPP has been quite helpful to me. I've taken over Reg. Comp. for our entity this year and SPP is good. I am simply overwhelmed with all the information from NERC, etc.

- As a smaller entity we don't have large amounts of dialog with RE staff, but when I do call I always get timely answers. Workshops are valuable.

- The staff has always been very responsive to my inquiries. They have handled issues with professionalism, promptly and courtesy.

- We appreciate the availability of the SPP Management and Staff. Enforcement Staff is very responsive and truly tries to understand the issues. I appreciate the automated reminder notices from CDMS. The 693 Compliance Monitoring group has been making reminder phone calls on upcoming reporting deadlines which is sometimes very useful. Good work on the RE Workshops. I know these are a lot of work to put together. They are extremely useful to the members.

- Greg Sorenson and Thomas Teafatiller are very helpful and should be commended.

- Staff is interested in answering questions and providing you with information such as where you can go to find the information you need. Excellent "customer service"

- Personnel are consistently helpful and responsive.

- Our footprint in SPP is smaller than in other regions but we are able to learn more from SPP because of the improved outreach efforts. The Compliance Update emails detailing Standards Under Development are a great tool to the Registered Entities - far better than the other regions. SPP compliance workshops consistently offer more substance than some of the other regions. We appreciate the efforts of SPP in enlightening your registered entities.

- Difficult to make comparisons year to year, however, generally believe there has been a trend of improvements and additional/worthwhile services.

- Customer service has clearly been a focal point, and some improvement is noted. Additional transparency by the organization is also a positive. Finally, outreach efforts that were sorely lacking in the past have been improved.

- The staff is very professional and willing to help. In general, they understand what is important for reliability while addressing compliance at the same time.