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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 2013 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey on September 12, 2013 to the 122 Primary Compliance Contacts who are registered in SPP RE’s compliance database (webCDMS). The survey had a 57% response rate (70 respondents), up from 54% in 2012. Of the 70 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 2.9 and 3.9.

Of the 27 respondents who interact with other Regional Entities, none rated SPP much worse, 11% rated SPP RE somewhat worse, 63% rated SPP RE about the same, 7% rated SPP RE somewhat better, and 19% 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 3.0 and 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well program meets expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops &amp; Planning Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked to rate employees’ customer service ability or programs’ responsiveness to needs, respondents rated all with average scores between *average* and *good*, from 3.4 to 3.9

**Customer Service/Responsiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops &amp; Planning Monitoring</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>3.4</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 3.6.

**Importance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic tools</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops &amp; Planning Monitoring</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Monitoring</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Analysis/Reliability Assessments</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2013 overall satisfaction rating of 3.6 dropped from the 2012 rating of 4.0 and the 2011 rating of 3.8.

Respondents could answer open-ended questions regarding each program and SPP RE in general. Unfavorable comments related to process inconsistencies/inefficiencies, SPP RE staff applying personal interpretations to standards, the need for more independence between enforcement and compliance, and staff’s slow responsiveness/lack of knowledge. There were also a number of positive comments related to staff’s helpfulness, professionalism, responsiveness, and knowledge.

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. Respondents were asked to skip questions that were irrelevant to them or their organization rather than making a neutral selection.
Demographics

I choose not to take this survey because:

Registered as PSE only. SPP communication / response has been excellent.

Number reporting (n) = 16

How often do you interact with SPP RE?

- A few times per year (50%)
- Monthly (23%)
- Weekly (9%)
- Rarely (17%)

n=64
Interaction with other Regional Entities

Do you interact with other Regional Entities?

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

n=58

n=27
Operations and Planning Compliance Monitoring

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

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

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

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

- No suggestions for improvements. Overall, the SPP staff has been very responsive and supportive when responding to my inquiries.
- Bentonville provides almost no impact to the BES. We have no protective devices, no transmission relays, we have a contract with our BA to do most of the work. The standards that have been applied to Bentonville, for all intents and purposes, just cost Bentonville money with no real benefit. The only benefit is to not get fined.
- None.
• i have no suggestions at this time.

• More knowledge of operations on renewable energy plants.

• There are many occasions where SPP RE Staff are delivering presentations to SPP Working Groups. I suggest these presentations and information be delivered back to PCCs also to avoid miscommunications and misunderstanding in direction.

• Not so many e mails they dominate my system

• We always have a positive interaction with SPP RE staff. They are knowledgeable and provide helpful assistance.

• I would encourage the SPP RE to consider utilizing more periodic data submittals, like the annual reviews for TPL assessments, blackstart tests, etc. It is more efficient use of our time, as well as the SPP RE's, if we continue to reduce the requirements for the on-site audits. The annual reviews are also a control to ensure that we remain on track with the expectations of the SPP RE.

• Consistency among all NERC Regions for Self Cert Schedules would be every help. The MRO just adopted the same monitoring Self Cert Schedule as SPP. This helps alot.

• The Rat-stats provide the auditor a method for sampling the data but when provided with an alternative method, they are not interested.

• Eliminate the Neighboring Entity Survey. This provides no value and is a waste of time. Registered Entities are not going to wait until audit time to tattle tail on each other. We deal with issues promptly and directly.

• It is the compliance department's responsibility to interact with the SPP RE. Our compliance contacts would like to be notified PRIOR to SPP RE personnel speaking at other working groups to ensure a compliance point of view is taken into consideration when viewing the RE presentations.

• This program is not as successful as it could be due to inconsistencies in the processes and the application of Standards requirements. We are committed to reliability but cannot continue to dedicate resources to administrative items/actions that do impact/improve reliability.
Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Compliance Monitoring

How well does our CIP program meet your expectations?

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

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

Please share your suggestions for improving our CIP program:

- Bentonville has no critical infrastructure, so again, the CIP Compliance Monitoring Program has done nothing but cost Bentonville money.
- As a utility with no critical assets, the CIP program has much less effect on our organization that with other utilities.
- None.
- no suggestions at this time
• The auditors should audit to the standard and not their personal interpretation or expectation. They should also be consistent across companies, without changing expectations based on the size of the company being audited or upon their experiences or perceived 'best practices'.

• I feel that sometimes the auditing staff follows their interpretation of a standard instead of following the strict wording of the standard. We feel that being compliant is critical but if the RE doesn't follow the strict wording of the standard it is more detrimental.

• The SPP Compliance Enforcement staff responsiveness to inquire and/or guidance need improvements as it takes days sometimes weeks before a response is acknowledged. This can cause an issue due to the nature of compliance.

• We do not have very much interaction with CIP as we do not have critical assets.

• Inconsistencies in process and application of regulations are making this program extremely difficult to be successful. We are committed to success and take this very seriously but cannot dedicate resources to those items that matter for chasing administrivia as well as random thoughts of "helpful outreach".

• Inconsistencies in process and application of regulations are making this program extremely difficult to be successful. We are committed to success and take this very seriously but cannot dedicate resources to those items that matter for chasing administrivia as well as random thoughts of "helpful outreach". There are many occasions where SPP RE Staff are delivering presentations to SPP Working Groups. I suggest these presentations and information be delivered back to PCCs also to avoid miscommunications and misunderstanding in direction.

• Not critical to us we don't own most everything that is vulnerable

• We have no critical cyber assets so the CIP monitoring is not relevant.

• The CIP audit tend to be longer than most other audits. It would be nice to keep to audits lasting one week.

• We always have a positive interaction with SPP RE staff. They are knowledgeable and provide helpful assistance. Workshops are worth attending, never just a rehash of previous years' info.

• The SPP RE CIP compliance staff are not consistently auditing to the plain language of the requirements. Auditors frequently insert personal opinion or use external documents (FAQs, guidelines, FERC Orders, etc.) to expand the requirements. If we challenge these practices, then we are told by the auditors to "take it up with enforcement". The time and resources necessary to process these issues once they enter the enforcement process are not a good use of SPP RE or the entity's limited resources.

• The SPP RE CIP Audit team brings with them an agenda. They believe to know what the intent of the drafting team was when the standard was written. They disregard what is written and have decided what it should say. There is an additional burden of completing the RSAWs when they are not even used during the audit. The CIP Audit team uses a separate worksheet for data submittal. Also, why is the data files required to be hashed. This seems like an additional step that is really not necessary.
- Limit interpretations by the Audit team. Best practices, while good conversation, are not required for compliance and should be treated as such. The requirement to hash files needs to stop! This provides absolutely no value to the process and is a waste of time.

- As interpretations of the standards change (i.e. what types of equipment are included in CIP-006 R2.2), it would be helpful if the RE notified the entities instead of the entities learning about it in the audit. Ultimately, our entity wants to do the right thing to ensure compliance but it can be difficult if the target is constantly moving. The presentations posted on your website don't include the new interpretations. We would ask if the interpretations change, please update your presentations.

- This program is not as successful as it could be due to inconsistencies in the processes and the application of Standards requirements. We are committed to reliability but cannot continue to dedicate resources to administrative items/actions that do impact/improve reliability.

In our experience, at times, the auditors referenced documents outside of the Standards and RSAWs (e.g., expired CANs, 693 standards (during CIP audit), etc. which made the auditors appear less credible. Also, auditors are not credible when they use their own rules and interpretations. Examples include:

1. In order to avoid onerous/harsh requirements, devices that had no ability to impact the BES were moved outside of the ESP making them less effective.
2. To classify assets as Critical Assets, the auditor utilized 693 Standards, expired CAN-024, and SPP criteria during a NERC CIP Audit.
3. Auditors are more focused on compliance over security, as evidenced by finding a violation which resulted in an entity “dumbing down” a password, which resulted in a less secure environment. In addition, NERC and FERC both approved this violation.
4. For CIP audits, SPP requires all entity evidence to be hashed, purportedly to the benefit of the entity. But, the entity is not allowed to opt-out of this alleged benefit. Over forty hours of overtime were required for this process alone.
5. Auditor reversing their recommendations that were given in the previous CIP audit.
6. Use of a public source application Net APT required the entity to agree to allow firewall datasets to be analyzed using the public sourced Net APT tool.
7. Auditor applying personal interpretation when conducting a minimum performance standard audit.

The audit team does not appear to be prepared and/or organized to conduct the audit process. Examples include:

1) We provided the auditors completed RSAW’s and approx. 2,000 documents prior to the audit, but no compliance issues were indicated complete before the auditors came on-site. It did not appear that the auditors reviewed the RSAWs/information prior to the audit.
2) Auditors submitted a very large data request late on the last full day of a two-week audit, which made it difficult to show evidence of compliance in a short time period
3) The Auditor required the company to produce a 600mb+ file which was difficult and time-consuming to compile; but, after this task was completed, the auditor decided the information was unnecessary.

In some instances, the audit team does not adhere to established rules and processes. For example, the auditors referenced/utilized CAN-024, even though this document had already been retired. Also, the auditors used 693 Standards during a NERC CIP audit to determine Critical Cyber Assets, i.e. ICCP server was not classified as a CCA under the NERC CIP standard CIP-002 R3. In addition, the Auditors used onerous workbooks instead of our
completed RSAWs, which was burdensome and inefficient.

The post-audit activities of our most recent audit did not meet the guideline criteria regarding timeliness. The draft report was very late and we had very limited time to submit comments. Not only was the draft late, but we did not have the opportunity to review the draft after we submitted our comments, prior to the final draft issuance.

Regarding the self-reporting process, the tool used for this purpose, the CDMS, is cumbersome and not intuitive to use.
**Enforcement**

How well does our Enforcement program meet your expectations?

- **FFT Processing**
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 2
  - 2-Almost Meets: 1
  - 3-Meets: 22
  - 4-Exceeds: 14
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 1
  - n=40
  - x=3.3

- **Violation (NOP) processing**
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 5
  - 2-Almost Meets: 1
  - 3-Meets: 22
  - 4-Exceeds: 10
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 2
  - n=40
  - x=3.1

- **Mitigation Plan processing**
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 4
  - 2-Almost Meets: 1
  - 3-Meets: 22
  - 4-Exceeds: 12
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 2
  - n=41
  - x=3.2

Average = 3.2

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

- **Customer Service**
  - 1-Poor: 1
  - 2-Below Average: 4
  - 3-Average: 9
  - 4-Good: 21
  - 5-Excellent: 14
  - n=49
  - x=3.9

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

- **Importance**
  - 1-Not Important: 4
  - 2-Moderately Important: 1
  - 3-Important: 13
  - 4-Very Important: 27
  - 5-Critical: 4
  - n=49
  - x=3.5

Please share your suggestions for improving our Enforcement program:

- None.
- We feel the customer service is adequate if initiated from our end, but if moving through an enforcement process there is little to no communication for extended periods of time. We feel the Enforcement group is influenced by the audit team at times and needs to be totally separated from the SPP RE audit team influence.
- SPP Enforcement Attorneys have all been responsive, professional and willing to address any and all issues. They provide guidance within a timely manner.
- More knowledge of operations on renewable energy plants.
- Never had a violation we are a little guy.
• We haven't dealt with the enforcement side of the RE.

• The SPP RE enforcement staff overall are very responsive to our needs and conduct themselves in a professional manner. However, due to SPP RE CIP compliance staff getting involved in enforcement's "independent review" of the violations and Mitigation Plan requirements and approvals, some violations are not fully processed until years after the initial finding. Many times this is due to additional requirements or expectations being added to complete Mitigation Plans. If these issues are clearly a threat to reliability, then enforcement staff need to ensure these items are closed out in a timely manner. When we bring these problems to the attention of the SPP RE General Manager, we are told if we don't like it, we can take it to a hearing. This is not an efficient and effective way to process these disagreements.

• I would like to see Enforcement be totally independent of the CIP and 693 audit teams.

• SPP RE CIP auditors have identified findings during Audits that Registered Entities do not agree with and have specifically said - 'We will throw it over the fence to Enforcement to deal with'. Registered Entities have expected this to provide an independent view of the issue without the Auditor bias. In fact in many cases Enforcement, during their review, goes right back to the Auditor with questions thereby limiting the independent review.

• There should be a stronger division between your audit group and the enforcement group. Recommend adding more technical staff to your enforcement group in order to prevent using the audit group for technical expertise.

• Regarding mitigation plan submissions, we are expected to develop mitigation plans based on a PowerPoint presentation during the exit interview. We do not receive detailed information on what the violation is at that time, which at times makes it difficult to develop a mitigation plan.
  Audit Reports do not identify clear, definitive, and actionable items to address. The most recent audit report had references to previous versions of standards, which was confusing at times. The reports do not describe what they believe needs to be done to correct the issue. They do not explain why something is a violation. Also, it takes significant time (three months) to get the audit report finalized and the CDMS populated with PVs, yet we are expected to mitigate items on the report prior to receiving it.
  Communication of violations do not clearly or specifically describes the manner in which a requirement was violated; we are told only that a requirement is violated, not how. In addition, we have no visibility or transparency regarding the risk to the BES for any Potential Violation finding.
  Regarding the penalty process, the process is not transparent in that we do not know the actual criteria used to determine penalties and how they are applied.
  The "Enforcement Review" includes SPP enforcement staff as well as auditors. This does not allow for an “independent review” of the audit process and results. There should be a distinct separation between enforcement and audit staff to allow enforcement to conduct a true independent review of the audit.
  Regarding the settlement process, once negotiations with SPP RE are completed, we do not have a chance to further present our case. This is concerning since there are multiple layers that can change the settlement further down the process.
### 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: 2
  - 3-Meets: 28
  - 4-Exceeds: 4
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 1
  - n=36, x=2.9

- **Event Analysis/Lessons Learned**
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 2
  - 2-Almost Meets: 3
  - 3-Meets: 28
  - 4-Exceeds: 7
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 1
  - n=41, x=3.1

- Average: 3.0

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

- **Responsiveness**
  - 1-Poor: 1
  - 2-Below Average: 11
  - 3-Average: 22
  - 4-Good: 6
  - 5-Excellent: 1
  - n=41, x=3.8

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

- **Importance**
  - 1-Not Important: 3
  - 2-Moderately Important: 1
  - 3-Important: 19
  - 4-Very Important: 15
  - 5-Critical: 2
  - n=40, x=3.3

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

- None.
- no suggestions
- Again we are a small utility co.
- As an LSE we have no involvement with the event analysis.
Outreach

How well does our Outreach program meet your expectations?

- Videos
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 2 (n=48, x=3.2)
  - 2-Almost Meets: 30
  - 3-Meets: 11
  - 4-Exceeds: 2
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 2
  - Average: 3.3

- Webinars
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 1
  - 2-Almost Meets: 7
  - 3-Meets: 25
  - 4-Exceeds: 21
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 1
  - Average: 3.3

- Workshops
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 3
  - 2-Almost Meets: 4
  - 3-Meets: 23
  - 4-Exceeds: 16
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 5
  - Average: 3.3

- Newsletters
  - 1-Fails to Meet: 1
  - 2-Almost Meets: 3
  - 3-Meets: 24
  - 4-Exceeds: 21
  - 5-Greatly Exceeds: 4
  - Average: 3.5

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

- Responsiveness
  - 1-Poor: 1
  - 2-Below Average: 4
  - 3-Average: 12
  - 4-Good: 26
  - 5-Excellent: 12
  - Average: 3.8

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

- Importance
  - 1-Not Important: 3
  - 2-Moderately Important: 3
  - 3-Important: 21
  - 4-Very Important: 19
  - 5-Critical: 9
  - Average: 3.5

Please share your suggestions for improving our Outreach program:

- None.
- We feel that some information shared through the outreach was not follow during audits and the answer we received was we are better auditors now. The outreach should be used if items presented in the past were changed for future audits.
- All Outreach programs are helpful. The most beneficial are the workshops and webinars. Small entities would appreciate additional guidance on the development of internal controls and how other larger entities have set up their programs.
- We need to hear more from RE Staff on emerging issues, coordination with NERC and other regions as well as how items will be interpreted. We as peers speak all the time about process and response to compliance obligations. It is not necessary or helpful to have this done in the Workshop.
• We need to hear more from RE Staff on emerging issues, coordination with NERC and other regions as well as how items will be interpreted. We as peers speak all the time about process and response to compliance obligations. It is not necessary or helpful to have this done in the Workshop.

• Same we spend our time per size (small) than the (large)dose per Capata filling out reports for the spp one (person) me has 12 other jobs

• Could more information be shared on events that have occurred within and outside the region?

• The Workshops need to be focused on compliance guidance from SPP RE staff. The registered entities need to hear how auditors are going to interpret the requirements. Many times we don't learn this information until the audit. By that time it is an enforcement action that consume limited resources to process.

• Outreach should be able to provide specific answers to a compliance question. We do not need to hear from our peers at the workshops but need answers in writing from the RE.

• Would like to see more presentations by the RE staff regarding their interpretations of requirements and what evidence they will be looking for when they audit.

• There are many occasions where SPP RE Staff are delivering presentations to SPP Working Groups. PCCs should have advance notice of these presentations in order to attend and hear the same information as the SMEs. In addition, these presentations and information should be delivered to PCCs to avoid miscommunications and misunderstanding in direction. Including PowerPoint presentations and Q&A notes would be the most helpful information.

During SPP RE Compliance workshops, we would like to hear from RE Staff, instead of from our peers, regarding interpretations, audit focus areas, lessons learned, etc. We would prefer to use the RTO forum for Entity sharing.
Electronic Tools

How well do our electronic tools meet your expectations?

![Electronics Survey Chart]

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

![Importance Survey Chart]

Please share your suggestions for improving our electronic tools:

- I believe the electronic tools are critical to our needs because they streamline the self-certification and ability to provide information in a timely manner.
- None.
- Webcdms is a great tool and very easy to use.
- Insure large amounts of data can be transfered on the EFT. We have always had issues with this tool.
- The new format for the SPP web pages is difficult to maneuver and find specific topics of information.
- Same as above not important to us
- It would be beneficial if the RAPA (Misoperations) could be uploaded into the webCDMS rather than transposed field by field into the system.
- CDMS, where mitigation plans and reporting are required to be managed, is cumbersome and not intuitive to use.
All satisfaction (how well the program meets expectations) and importance scores fall within a small range of 3.0 and 3.6.
The 2013 overall satisfaction rating of 3.6 dropped from the 2012 rating of 4.0 and the 2011 rating of 3.8.

---

2 In this year’s report, we compared the 2013 overall satisfaction score to the 2012 and 2011 reports’ overall satisfaction scores. In previous years, the year-over-year comparison was generated by asking that year’s respondents to rate all three years. For instance, the 2012 report asked respondents to rate 2012, 2011, and 2010.
Qualitative - Dissatisfaction

Please share other comments regarding your dissatisfaction with SPP RE

- No dissatisfaction with the SPP RE
- Not so much satisfaction with SPP, just the overall FERC/NERC compliance program. Bentonville has no impact on the BES, and the compliance program has just cost Bentonville extra money.
- None.
- see above
- Audits should be limited to the applicable approved Standard requirements.
- Why is the self-cert quartley in SPP and no other RE has this?
- Adding a "Not Applicable" option would be very helpful to future surveys.
- Not so many e mails i delete 95% of them
- The SPP RE CIP compliance staff should separate their Section 2.15 NERC auditing function from their informal outreach efforts to encourage best practices. While it is beneficial to learn about new security threats and practices, we should not be required to address these threats or implement these practices until the NERC Standard requires it.
- Lack of separation/independence between compliance and enforcement in technical review of PVs and mitigation plans. Perhaps more technical staff in enforcement are needed, or a cooperative agreement with neighboring REs to review each other's PV cases. Workshops should not include audit lessons learned from entities - this should happen in the forum where entities (both presenting and listening) have more freedom to interact honestly and openly without concern. Entities need more information at these forums from the staff themselves - genericized examples of best practices on otherwise top violated standards, guidance documents, etc. There have been multiple times over the past couple of years that the RE manager doesn't appear to be knowledgeable about some very basic initiatives, concepts, etc. - this is worrying. There are many instances when CIP compliance staff will answer a question only to be contradicted immediately by another staff member - this not only provides uncertainty for the entities but makes it appear that the CIP team is somewhat dysfunctional.
- There is too much intermingling of resources between the RE and RTO. At times the RE is mandating compliance to the working groups when the working group is made up of mostly technical people who are not versed in compliance.
- I would like to see a more proactive and collaborative approach from the SPP RE with respect to finding solutions to compliance and reliability issues. Registered Entities have a wealth of knowledge, insight and understanding of these issues that if coupled with the SPP RE regulatory perspective prior to establishing a position would be beneficial to both sides.
The NERC RAI is a good example of such an opportunity. The ever evolving interpretation of some Standards is very frustrating. We want to do the right thing but it's difficult when the target keeps getting moved!

- See previous comments.
Qualitative - Satisfaction

Please share other comments regarding your satisfaction with SPP RE:

- Overall the staff has been professional and responsive to my inquiries.
- The staff is always easy to get ahold of and easy to speak with. They are very helpful and full of useful information.
- When we approached the RE with a question that would alter our CIP program, we were provided with unbiased and sound guidance that greatly assisted in our re-evaluating of our critical assets listing, resulting in removing all items from that list due to more clearly defined criteria for establishing such assets. It seems to be win-win, relieving some of the auditing burden from the RE and from our utility at the same time having no adverse effect on reliability in our territory.

- None.
- I feel that the SPP RE does a great job!
- see above
- Please add a Not Applicable response to the questions. Some items may not be used in a given time period (Event analysis, etc). Our responses should not reflect process is working if not used.
- u folks Ark had mabey 5 doing a good job why so many of you now I'm Sure we taxpayers are paying for all of this we come from the hills like duck dynesty getter Done!!!!!!!!!!
- I always know you're there if I need answers. Your workshops keep me current. It's easy to let things slide but if there is a workshop around the corner it's a wake-up call to refresh my activities in the compliance world.
- The staff at the SPP RE are very professional and qualified at what they do. In most cases, they are willing to listen to other perspectives on.
- SPP is viewed as reasonable and fair. Other Regional Entities vary greatly. SPP has earned our respect.
- The SPP RE 693 compliance staff have adequately separated their Section 2.15 NERC auditing function from their informal outreach efforts to encourage best practices. This is beneficial to the entity and to reliability.
- Staff are helpful and knowledgable. Auditors know their stuff and get down to soldi issues
- It is obvious that the staff are earnest and trying to perform to the best of their ability, and they are nearly always quite pleasant to interact with, with a few exceptions.
- Overall the SPP RE staff is professional, prompt and courteous.
- Some RE Staff are helpful.