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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report reflects the analysis Ariel Strategic Communications was commissioned to conduct on the Organizational Group Surveys that Southwest Power Pool (SPP) fielded of its committees and working groups.

Analysis of the data was performed to highlight how the groups assessed themselves rather than how all respondents rated each attribute of their committee/working group experience. This reflects the information shared with Ariel Strategic by SPP regarding its purpose for the study. The objective is to give each organizational group direction for improvement, so the entire SPP organizational group structure can operate more efficiently and effectively.

Most attribute categories tested well, with all of the four main categories, Meeting Preparation, Membership, Meeting Conduct and Chair, averaging ratings over 4 (agreement with positive statements); however, the overall item “effectiveness” averaged a rating of 3.45, which is a “neutral” rating, and, compared to the other items, seems to be an area of concern. While participants see the committees doing well overall, they don’t feel they are as effective as they need to be.

The open-ended question responses should be closely examined by each organizational group for specific action items; however, a theme emerges quickly among these comments, and that is that organizational group members are dissatisfied with the length of time it takes to get meeting materials from Southwest Power Pool, and they feel they do not have enough time with the materials before the meetings. Communication with SPP also seems to be a concern for some participants of the study.

There is a fair degree of correlation this year between the following attributes and the overall effectiveness attribute (which means this is a relation, but not that there is causation): Meeting preparation’s “accurate agenda” attribute and “accurate minutes” as well as the overall Meeting Preparation score, Membership’s: “members prepared,” “members committed” and “members supportive” attributes as well as the overall Membership score, Meeting Conduct’s “members focused,” “action recommended,” “dissent heard” and “feeling of accomplishment”
attributes, as well as the overall score for Meeting Conduct. The Chair attributes with a fair degree of correlation to the working group or committee’s overall effectiveness rating are “seeks input” and “supportive and respectful.”

Year-over-year results for comparison with overall 2008 results are presented in commentary after each group’s ratings chart, where overall scores are also listed. For 2009, the group with the lowest self-rating is the Generation Working Group (3.81) and the group with the highest score is the Operations Training Working Group (4.67).
INTRODUCTION

Ariel Strategic Commissioned was commissioned by Southwest Power Pool (SPP) to analyze the results of its Organizational Group Survey, which was designed and fielded by SPP itself. A report to the company’s Strategic Planning Committee states, “The Organizational Effectiveness Task Force was established to develop a process for an annual assessment of SPP’s organizational groups.” The report continues:

“The survey component of the process will be directed to all members of the specific organizational group. This will allow us to review feedback on each working group/committee, but still provide an overall assessment for the organization.”

Because the focus of the survey seems to be the group members’ assessment of their own groups, this analysis focuses primarily on group assessments by group rather than aggregating all responses by attribute or item. Also, because the number of respondents to each survey was small, analyzing the results by percentages or proportions of those who rated each item at a certain level (one through five) would have been misleading. The small sample sizes for each survey indicate that a “directional” focus for the analysis is appropriate, which means that the focus is on real numbers, and, for our purposes, an average of the ratings each sample provided on their group experience. As part of an overall analysis, averages of the group assessments are presented with discussion in the Detailed Findings section of this report.

Methodology

Southwest Power Pool sent an invitation to take the Zoomerang survey to each person listed as a member, chairman, vice chairman or staff secretary of each committee or working group. There are six committees and 12 working groups. Following is a list of the committees/working groups with whose members the survey was fielded, the number of members each committee/working group has listed on Southwest Power Pool’s Web site and the number of people who responded to the survey:

- Business Practices Working Group: 11 members, 5 respondents
• Change Working Group: 18 members, 11 respondents
• Corporate Governance Committee: 8 members, 6 respondents
• Cost Allocation Working Group: 8 members, 3 respondents
• Critical Infrastructure Protection Working Group: 16 members, 6 respondents
• Economic Studies Working Group: 16 members, 10 respondents
• Finance Committee: 7 members, 3 respondents
• Generation Working Group: 10 members, 6 respondents
• Human Resources Committee: 6 members, 4 respondents
• Markets and Operations Policy Committee: 51 members, 25 respondents
• Market Working Group: 16 members, 10 respondents
• Model Development Working Group: 12 members, 11 respondents
• Operating Reliability Working Group: 13 members, 8 respondents
• Operations Training Working Group: 11 members, 9 respondents
• Oversight Committee (Formerly Compliance Committee): 4 members, 4 respondents
• Regional Tariff Working Group: 23 members, 17 respondents
• Strategic Planning Committee: 12 members, 9 respondents
• System Protection and Control Working Group: 13 members, 8 respondents
• Transmission Working Group: 23 members, 16 respondents
Members took the online survey and Zoomerang compiled spreadsheets of the answers, which were sent to Ariel Strategic for analysis. Each survey included four areas of attributes for respondents to rate on a scale of 1 to 5. Each area allowed for comments.

An open-ended question was included in which respondents were asked to list three or more suggestions for their group. These comments are included for SPP to consider along with the detailed numerical findings.

The final item, “effectiveness,” was not a category, but an overall assessment of how well the committee or working group is doing with its charged work. This item was rated meaningfully lower than the other attributes tested, indicating that while participants may feel the other items are satisfactory or above, they still have some concerns about how the group is doing its work.

For each group’s results, averages of the scores were calculated to indicate how each item was rated by the group, collectively. Then, the standard deviation was calculated from the average. (Standard deviation is the square root of the variance of data points in a set.) Any item rated more than one standard deviation from the average by the group members was considered “meaningful” for that group.

For relationship analysis, correlations were run between the effectiveness ratings (averages) and the averages for each item tested.

On the question about other committees or working groups whose meetings respondents attend regularly, many respondents apparently didn’t understand that this question was asking about committees and working groups other than the one they were responding as a member of. As a result, quite a few identified their own group as an "other" group. Due to this inconsistency, Ariel Strategic did not analyze these results.
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

In the “Detailed Findings” section of this report, a chart representing the averages for each group’s responses is presented along with as a brief discussion of meaningful findings and representative qualitative responses to the open-ended questions asked in the survey instrument. In this section, significant findings of the overall report will be highlighted and evaluated.

First, it is useful to discuss the correlations that exist between data sets (these indicate that a relationship may exist between attributes tested). It is important to remember that correlation is not causation. The survey results merely tell us that variables seem related, not that one causes the other. More study would be necessary to understand how and why they are related. Correlations with effectiveness are examined because that overall measurement was lower than other attribute categories tested. A conservative rubric for assessing relationship is used in this study and it is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Range</th>
<th>Relationship Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 to .25 (or -.25)</td>
<td>Little to no relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26 to .50 (or -.26 to .50)</td>
<td>Fair degree of relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51 to .75 (or -.51 to -.75)</td>
<td>Moderate to good relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.75 (or -.75)</td>
<td>Very good to excellent relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Effectiveness**: Of particular interest is the correlation that exists between average group scores on some attributes and the overall effectiveness rating by those same group members of the committee in general. Please note:

  - A correlation exists indicating a *fair degree of relationship* between the working group/committee effectiveness rating and the following attributes:

    - Meeting Preparation overall as well as the following attributes:
• Accurate agenda
• Accurate minutes

✿ Membership overall as well as the following attributes:
  • Members prepared
  • Members committed
  • Members supportive

✿ Meeting conduct overall as well as the following attributes:
  • Members focused
  • Action recommended
  • Dissent heard
  • Feeling of accomplishment

✿ Attributes of Chair that correlate include:
  • Seeks input
  • Supportive and respectful

A correlation indicates that as the effectiveness rating increases, for example, the attribute rating also increases (and vice versa). This seems to indicate that the respondents relate the group or committee’s effectiveness to these specific attributes. So while respondents may increase their score of their feeling of accomplishment, they would simultaneously increase their assessment of the group’s effectiveness overall, which makes sense.

The strongest correlation (.47) exists between the Members Committed attribute and the overall effectiveness attribute. In terms of categories, the Membership category has the strongest correlation (.41) to effectiveness.
**Detailed Findings**

The following discussion provides the basis for this report’s major findings and executive summary. An explanation of terms is warranted:

- **Correlation**: The correlation is the relationship between two sets of variables. In this analysis, correlation is used to establish a link between sets of ratings by the group members. A negative correlation means that there is an inverse relationship between variables. For example, a fair to good correlation means that there is .26 to .50 result of a correlation formula; it also means that it is more likely that as one set of variables increases, so does the second set of variables. An inverse correlation means that as one set of variables increases, the other decreases.

- **Directional Findings**: This refers to numbers that are “real” rather than “proportional.” As this survey asks small groups to rate various attributes of their experience, it is wise to use those real numbers rather than percentages to indicate results. In the group findings, results are averaged and respondents totaled in each chart.

- **Standard Deviation**: Standard deviation is the square root of the variance. In this analysis, standard deviation is calculated so that average ratings that lie outside of one standard deviation from the average can be pointed out and examined. Statistically, 75 percent of all values in a “population,” or set of data points, lie within two standard deviations of the average. For this report, the group findings are analyzed for data points outside of one standard deviation from the average.

- **Meaningful ratings**: In the group findings, “meaningful” ratings indicate that rating averages for that item for the group were equal to or greater than one standard deviation from the group’s average. This terminology is used so that attention can be drawn to specific attributes significantly beyond the average; however, this should not be confused with “statistically significant” figures. (Given the small data sets of
respondents, such terminology would imply greater numbers and a higher confidence rating than is warranted in a “directional” survey.)

- **Least Satisfied:** The Generation Working Group was the least satisfied overall, with the lowest average for all attributes tested; however, Economic Studies, Markets and Operations Policy, Market Working, Model Development and System Protection all had averages for all attributes below 4.0.

- **Effectiveness:** The Generation Working Group and the Model Development Working Group gave the lowest rating for group effectiveness of all the committees/working groups assessed, both with 2.8 ratings out of 5.0. Critical Infrastructure and Economic Studies had the highest overall effectiveness scores with 4.30 out of 5.0. No other groups rated 4.0 or higher than these two.
Detailed Findings by Committee/Working Group

Chart 1: Business Practices Working Group
Within the Business Practices Working Group, the mean score for the group’s aggregate ratings is 4.33 on the scale of 1 to 5. This translates as an overall rating of agree to strongly agree with the favorable assessments offered for respondents’ consideration. Scores that are more than one standard deviation above or below that mean are considered meaningful for our purposes.

This draws our attention to the 3.8 average rating for “Effectiveness,” for which the group gave a collective rating of neutral. Also rated meaningfully low by this group were Meeting Preparation’s “timely material” and Membership’s “members prepared.” Rated meaningfully high were Meeting Preparation’s “useful information,” Membership’s “members committed,” “members supportive” and Chair’s “seeks input.”

The Business Practices Working Group, overall, was most satisfied with Chair attributes (4.5 for the group), and least with Meeting Preparation and Meeting Conduct attributes, though at 4.3 for each group, this is not concerning.

The mean score for the group’s aggregate rating went up over last year (to 4.33 from 4.18). The effectiveness rating went from 3.50, however, to 3.80, which also indicates some improvement.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- Meeting Preparation
  - This is not due to SPP staff but individual members that do not get materials to the other members in a timely manner.
  - Would you expect me to say anything less!
- Membership
  - Great group
- General
  - Please provide three or more recommendations for improvement of this particular group and/or SPP’s overall organizational group structure.
Chart 2: Change Working Group

Change Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate agenda</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely material</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful information</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate minutes</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents diversity</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary expertise/skills</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members prepared</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members committed</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members supportive</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members focused</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient facilitation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent heard</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of accomplishment</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks input</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and respectful</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps group on task</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures follow-through</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of responses = 11
This group had no meaningfully high or low ratings, except the meaningfully low score members gave the overall “effectiveness” rating (3.3).

The Change Working Group is most satisfied with Chair attributes (4.45) and least satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes (4.25).

The group’s mean score for all attributes is 4.25, which is up over 2008’s rating of 3.99. Its current “effectiveness” score of 3.30 is down from 2008’s “effectiveness rating of 3.63.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - The timely question is too subjective, what I believe is timely others may think is not timely.
  - Always prefer to have WebEx available. Much easier to follow along.
  - If action needs to be taken on agenda items I would like to see materials provided as early as possible for review. Many times there is not anything available or it is provided the day before or day of the meeting.

- **Membership**
  - I believe the CWG could benefit from more representation from SPP’s members. As a full representation group, we should determine if we can seek representatives from the respective MOPC representatives.
  - Not all CWG members actively engage in the meeting conversations although this aspect of membership has improved over the last year.

- **Meeting Conduct**
  - We've just recently added WebEx for all meetings; this has been very effective at sharing visual information with the group.

- **Chair**
  - Jessica is a "strong" chair and effectively leads the meetings. Some other working groups that I have participated in the secretary basically leads the meeting. This means they cannot effectively perform their secretary duties.
  - Jessica Collins (XCEL) is a very effective and efficient chair. I believe her most valuable asset is her work across other working groups - MWG, BPWG that she incorporates into the CWG.

- **General**
  - This comment relates to ALL the groups that I have participated in. It seems that lately we have had a need for a LOT more ad hoc meetings (mostly teleconferences) than we have had in the past. This frequently causes conflicts with other Working Group meetings. I have begun checking the SPP calendar each Friday to make sure I have all the meetings on my calendar for the
upcoming week. My only recommendation would be that we (all WGs) work to
do a better job of scheduling to reduce the ad hoc meetings.

- I think a bit of an educational process needs to take place between CWG and
  other groups. I feel that it is not entirely clear to others the purpose of the
  group. This was evident to me most recently during discussions about the New
  Ops Center and the High Availability proposals. Neither of these projects would
  fall under CWG but some of our other company representatives on other groups
  believe that CWG is involved in all SPP IT efforts.
Chart 3: Corporate Governance Committee

Corporate Governance Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful Information</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents Diversity</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary Expertise/Skills</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members Prepared</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members Committed</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members Supportive</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting Conduct</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members Focused</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Recommended</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient Facilitation</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed Heard</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Accomplishment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks Input</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and Respectful</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps Group on track</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures Follow-through</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of responses = 7
Those rating the Corporate Governance Committee only rated one item below the standard deviation from the mean for all attributes tested: “effectiveness” (3.2). Overall, this group’s ratings were high, so there were no meaningfully high ratings for single attributes.

The committee was most satisfied with Membership attributes (4.70) and least satisfied with Chair attributes (4.58), which is still a very high rating.

The Corporate Governance Committee’s average rating for all attributes in 2009 is 4.57, which is up from 4.48 in 2008. Its “effectiveness” rating, 3.2, is down slightly from 3.50 in 2008.

Following is the response to the prompt for suggestions for general improvement (no comments were provided for the group attributes):

- No changes needed for CGC.
- Believe that CGC accomplishes its work in an efficient and effective manner.
Chart 4: Cost Allocation Working Group
The Cost Allocation Working Group rated one item more than one standard deviation below the group’s mean item rating score, which was "effectiveness" (3.3). Two items were rated meaningfully high, both under the Chair attributes, “seeks input” (5.0) and “supportive and respectful (5.0).

This working group was most satisfied with Chair attributes (4.85 mean score for the group) and least satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes (4.25).

This group’s mean score in 2009 is 4.40, which are up somewhat from 4.21 in 2008, but its “effectiveness” rating is down to 3.3 in 2009 from 3.50 in 2008.

Following is the response to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- Meeting preparation
  - Typically, minutes are not produced for CAWG. I take my own notes, so I am not suggesting that minutes should be produced. At least one member records the meeting.

- Membership
  - The SPP state commissions are fully represented in CAWG meetings, but not all industry segments choose to attend the meetings.

- Chair
  - The CHAIR's PowerPoint [presentations] is sometimes hard to follow.

- General
  - 1) provide teleconference but mute voice input to avoid interruptions from unmated conversations, "Hold" music, etc.
  - 2) provide Web conferencing to allow orderly input and questions from those participating remotely via the comment/questions field feature.
  - Encourage the CAWG states to continue participating and supporting this collaborative effort.
Chart 5: Critical Infrastructure Protection Working Group
Only one item was rated meaningfully low, and that was Membership’s “represents diversity” (4.2) attribute. Meaningfully high attributes include Meeting Preparation’s “accurate agenda” (5.0), Membership’s “necessary expertise/skills” (4.8) and Chair’s “seeks input” (5.0).

This group was least satisfied with Meeting Conduct attributes (4.42) and most satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes (4.73)

This group’s overall rating in 2009 is 4.57, slightly up from 2008’s rating of 4.31. It’s “effectiveness” rating in 2008 was 3.33, and is up notably to 4.3, which “ties” for the highest rating in “effectiveness” any committee gave itself in the 2009 survey.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- Meeting Preparation
  - The CIPWG is somewhat unique in that much of what we discuss in any given meeting is sensitive information (e.g. presentations from the FBI or DHS that may not be publicly disclosed) and therefore not reflected in the minutes. Otherwise, our minutes are, indeed, an accurate reflection of what takes place in the “open” portions of our meetings.

- Membership
  - The CIPWG would benefit from representation from a larger segment of the SPP membership. With 17 voting members, we have representation from about 1/3 of the total number of entities in the Region. However, our current membership is a good cross-section of the types of entities in SPP (large/small, IOU/Coop/Muni, etc.).
  - I would like to see more participation from other SPP member companies. I believe this would improve the value of the CIPWG and provide additional support opportunities.

- Chair
  - Robert McClanahan does an excellent job before, during, and after CIPWG meetings by keeping staff up to date on industry activities, by correlating these activities with member needs, and by providing updates from alternative NERC-based meetings.

- General
  - Nothing to add
  - 1. CIPWG needs representation from a larger segment of SPP.
  - 2. CIPWG may need to meet more frequently going forward, with regular teleconferences between quarterly face-to-face meetings.
1. Increased membership.
2. Increased technical discussion for security-based technologies.
3. Increased outreach between and among other SPP working groups.

CIPWG plays a critical role in the electric sector and in the SPP Organizational structure. More and more emphasis is being placed on electric sector security by Congress, FERC and NERC. CIPWG provides a secure forum for SPP Members to discuss these security- and policy-related matters without them being disclosed publicly.

This group is very active on a very active topic. The CIP standards are still changing and I feel this group is very effective at keeping us updated as well as providing input to the standards bodies.

I think the CIPWG is a great forum for SPP staff, members, and industry experts to gather and discuss current and pending security compliance requirements. It also provides an opportunity to discuss security best practices, and current security trends.
Chart 6: Economic Studies Working Group Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Studies Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accurate agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accurate minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represents diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary expertise/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>action recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissent invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling of accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeks input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportive and respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeps group on task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensures follow-through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of responses = 10
This group had a number of items that were a standard deviation or more outside the average rating. Those items rated that were meaningfully low include Chair attribute “ensures follow-through” (3.6), and Meeting Preparation attributes “useful information” (3.4) and “timely material” (3.2). Items rated meaningfully high include “effectiveness” (4.3), the Membership attributes of “members supportive” (4.3) and “represents diversity” (4.4).

This group was least satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes and most satisfied with Membership attributes.

The Economic Studies Working Group was not tested in 2008, so there is no comparison data.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - Information for the meeting should be sent out a week ahead of time if possible so members can adequately prepare.
  - Agendas are a bit open ended or nondescript
  - Group has been on a very quick schedule. Multiple conference calls per month. Has been difficult occasionally securing materials in time for conference call deadlines.
- **Membership**
  - Members could be better prepared if information was issued a week in advance. Too many short deadlines to fully vet out issues.
  - Good, diverse group of well rounded and highly technical individuals.
  - Alan Meyers has been a very effective chair and prepares for the meetings.
- **Meeting conduct**
  - I put neutral on the “members are focused” because there are times when one member seems to dominate the discussion. Though at times he offers good input other times he tends to ramble on and on.
  - I’ve been impressed with group’s ability to quickly turn around tasks assigned to them.
- **Chair**
  - Alan has done a great job chairing the group.
- **General**
  - 1. Routine Meeting established for 2010.
  - 2. It appears 2-3 members do most of the heavy lifting, need more participation
  - 3. SPP should provide insight to how their PROMOD is set up and educate the Members.
  - More timely posting of meeting materials
  - Need to seek more outside professional expertise on complex issues/matters.
1. Communication of initiatives and status
2. Limit the amount of time members can offer their opinions.
3. Coordination between groups. Seems as though the ESWG and WITF are working towards the same end from different directions.

1. More educational sessions
2. Time for long-range goals
Chart 7: Finance Committee

Finance Committee

**Meet 'n Greet Preparation**
- Agenda: 4.3
- Material: 4.3
- Information: 4.3
- Minutes: 4.3

**Membership**
- Represents diversity: 4.0
- Necessary expertise/skills: 4.3
- Members prepared: 4.3
- Members committed: 4.7
- Members supportive: 4.7

**Meeting Conduct**
- Members focused: 4.0
- Action recommended: 4.3
- Sufficient facilitation: 4.0
- Dissent heard: 4.3
- Feeling of accomplishment: 4.0

**Chair**
- Seeks input: 4.7
- Supportive and respectful: 4.7
- Keeps group on task: 3.7
- Ensures follow-through: 3.7
- Effectiveness: 3.7

# of responses = 3
The Finance Committee rated only one item meaningfully lower than the other attributes tested, and this is “effectiveness” (3.7). The group rated several attributes meaningfully higher than others tested: "seeks input" in the Chair category received a 4.7, and "members committed" and "members supportive" were both rated 4.7 by respondents.

The Finance Committee was most satisfied with Membership attributes (4.40 averages) and least satisfied with Meeting Conduct attributes (4.12).

This committee’s mean score for all items in 2009 is 4.23, which is down slightly from 2008’s 4.36. It’s “effectiveness” rating of 3.7 is essentially the same as last year’s 3.80.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - Occasionally, the quality of the analysis could be improved. There is a perception (mine) that staff presumes that the Committee should simply take Staff’s recommendation for certain actions without providing underlying support.

- **General**
  - Linkage needs to be established between initiatives recommended by the strategic planning committee and the budgeting process within the finance committee.
  - A pre-budget development session should be held as part of the July Finance Committee meeting to outline key assumptions and to develop templates for use in presenting budget information.
  - The risk management process needs to be more formalized with a specific session of the Finance Committee to consider an “annual report/assessment” of the risk management function.
  - The Finance Committee needs to undertake and oversee an organizational initiative designed to focus on improving the cost effectiveness of key SPP processes.
Chart 8: Generation Working Group Results
The Generation Working Group rated no items meaningfully higher than others, but they did rate two items meaningfully lower, including “effectiveness” (2.8) and the “seeks input” attribute under the Chair category (3.5).

This group’s averages were all under 4.0, which may merit some further inquiry. It was most satisfied with Meeting Preparation (3.93) and Membership (3.92) categories and least satisfied with Chair attributes (3.78)

The Generation Working Group’s overall score is 3.81, which are down slightly from 2008’s score of 3.97, and its “effectiveness” rating is down slightly from 3.00 to 2.8.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - A couple of meetings were cancelled.
  - Since joining this committee there has been an overall lack of meetings, largely due to lack of issues to discuss. When we do have meetings they are productive but for no more than we meet there is the possibility this group could be merged with another.

- **Membership**
  - I would offer that those most interested in participating in process are those that are participating in the process with regards to the diversity question. This does not necessarily ensure diversity in the process.

- **Chair**
  - Edmund Toro from SPP was helping organize this group. It is my understanding he is no longer with SPP. I don’t believe the GWG members were notified which is of concern.

- **General**
  - 1. Should probably have meeting more often.
  - 2. Review what other RE’s are doing to shape their markets.
  - 3. Anticipate the market shape based on pending Federal legislation and NERC requirements and get ahead of the game so to speak with operational recommendations.
  - A couple of times this year a question was asked and in lieu of a GWG meeting, the question was sent out to the members for their input. There was little response to these questions. I’m not sure as to the criteria used to determine when the question is sent for response vs. a meeting. In the future, if a question is sent to the members to comment on in-lieu of a meeting, the reasons for this method needs to be stated and someone needs to organize the responses to insure that a coordinated response is provided to the question.
- A better understanding of what SPP's expectations are for this group would be beneficial.
- There has only been one GWG meeting this year.
Chart 9: Human Resources Committee Results

Human Resources Committee

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - Agenda: 4.3
  - Material: 3.8
  - Information: 3.8
- **Membership**
  - Diversity: 4.0
  - Experience/Skills: 4.0
  - Prepared: 4.0
  - Committed: 4.7
  - Supportive: 4.3
- **Meeting Conduct**
  - Focused: 3.8
  - Recommended: 4.0
  - Facilitation: 4.0
  - Heard: 4.0
  - Feeling of accomplishment: 3.8
- **Chair**
  - Seeks input: 4.3
  - Supportive/respectful: 4.3
  - Keeps group on task: 3.3
  - Ensures follow-through: 4.0
- **Effectiveness**: 3.30

*Number of responses: 4*
The Human Resources Committee rated two items meaningfully low, "effectiveness" (3.3) and "keeps group on task" (3.3) under the Chair category. One item was rated meaningfully high, "members committed" (4.7) under Membership.

Group members participating in the study were most satisfied with Membership attributes (4.20) and least satisfied with Meeting Conduct (3.92).

The Human Resources Committee's aggregate mean score in 2009 is 4.00, which is down slightly from 2008's rating of 4.11, while its 2009 "effectiveness" score is virtually the same at 3.3, vs. 2008's score of 3.29.

Following is the response to the prompt for suggestions for improvement (general):

- 1. The group should take the lead in the development of a better thought-out incentive program with supporting metrics. The current structure is too ambiguous.
- 2. Consideration should be given to addressing whether there is a form of long-term incentive that could / should be incorporated for certain levels of management.
- 3. The Committee should more formally review the development plans for key leadership positions.
Chart 10: Markets and Operations Policy Committee Results

Markets and Operations Policy Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate agenda</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorough material</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful information</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate minutes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents diversity</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary expertise/skills</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members prepared</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members committed</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members supportive</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members focused</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient facilitation</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent heard</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of accomplishment</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks input</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and respectful</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps group on task</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures follow-through</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#of responses = 25
This group had a mean rating of less than 4.0. This group rated three things meaningfully low: “effectiveness” (3.2), “timely material” (3.3) in the Meeting Preparation category, and “members prepared” (3.3) in the Membership category. Meaningfully high rated items include: “accurate agenda” (4.4) under Meeting Preparation and “represents diversity” (4.5) under Membership.

The Markets and Operations Policy Committee was most satisfied with Chair attributes (4.30), the only category that averaged more than 4.0 on the scale and least satisfied with Membership attributes (3.84).

This committee’s mean score is 3.93 for 2009, down from 4.05 in 2008. Its “effectiveness” rating for 2009, 3.2, is virtually the same as 2008’s 3.26.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - Getting the agenda with less than a week’s notice is totally unacceptable. It provides no time to confer with others in the organization. Should have at least 2 weeks to prepare for the meeting.
  - Still need to lean on chairs and secretaries to get material turned in on time. Once the basic info is provided on time, need to work on presentations being ready to submit with background material.
  - Meetings may need to be scheduled for a longer time frame as it sometimes seems rushed to stay on schedule, or sometimes staff reports are omitted to keep on schedule. It is not always easy to get up to speed on agenda topics with the short time frame that the materials are supplied.
  - More than once key facts have failed to be memorialized in the initial draft issue of the minutes and had to be added at the MOPC approval.
  - The practice of creating a PDF image of the meeting materials is terribly cumbersome. It takes time, which compresses the time available to working groups to provide the materials.
  - Huge amount of information is given out too LATE to vet through our company. Suggest controversial/major issues be presented/discussed at one MOPC meeting and votes be deferred to a later date to give more time for companies to establish their position on the issue. Suggest voting at the following MOPC meeting or hold a teleconference for follow-up vote after it is discussed at an MOPC meeting. Although each member does have the opportunity to attend the meetings of working groups up to the time that votes take place at MOPC, many
companies such as ours do not have the luxury of enough staff to attend those meetings. Therefore, we end up with information overload at the 11th hour.

- The meeting materials are timelier than they once were, but there are still discussion items, and sometimes action items, where the material isn't provided until it is too late for internal discussion.
- Getting the meeting material a few days earlier would be very helpful.

- **Membership**
  - Most members are not prepared, partly due to the fact that the agenda materials are not provided in a timely fashion. Many are reading it at the meeting for the first time.
  - Too many come with their own agenda and only look at things on how it will affect their company instead of the organization as a whole!
  - Too many times individual members are not up to speed on a specific topic and a significant amount of time is spent on the education element. This is not necessarily a bad thing, since it probably raises the level of understanding of everyone on very complex issues - just makes for a long drawn out process.
  - More time to prepare with the material to be presented would help.

- **Meeting Conduct**
  - Most members are focused on their computers and dissenting voices are not heard.
  - Need to make sure that all major issues in SPP are brought to the MOPC for a vote even if they are not within the MOPC purview. This will reflect the SPP stakeholders' view on the issue.
  - Amidst the complexity of the work at hand - given the magnitude of fundamental changes to the industry (advanced markets, wind integration, equitable cost allocation) the MOPC group works well together. There are a number of broad discussions that require high-level policy discussions and many that require operational or financial impact discussions that while complex and tedious in nature, are nevertheless a much needed part of the decisionmaking.

- **Chair**
  - The chair does a good job keeping on task and on time.
  - The current chair has been productive and focused.
  - John has done an exceptional job of "herding cats" for the past two years!
  - The exiting chair, John Olsen of Westar, has performed an excellent job over the course of the last 3 years. He has kept the group on task, provided needed guidance for meeting conduct, and always maintained a sense of what we are ultimately responsible for to the Board of Directors.

- **General**
  - 1) Agenda and all materials sent out 2 weeks prior to the MOPC meeting.
  - 2) MOPC needs to have more said so on assumptions, how studies are run, and the results reported.
  - 3) More briefings before the MOPC meetings. Day 2 market will need a lot more than 4 hours.
1. Designate a pro and a con for each controversial item to give a presentation during the MOPC. Encourage participants to get their comments to the designee. Too much time is spent on round table discussions where parties keep reiterating their same point.
2. Keep up the pre-MOPC training seminars and try to address the main point of contention during these seminars.
3. Get staff secretaries together on a regular basis so all know what is going on with other groups. We are doing this monthly with all chairs and secretaries, but believe staff should hold these weekly or bi-weekly at the very least.

1. Continue providing focused briefings prior to the general meeting.
2. Set aside significant time to fully discuss the issues related to the Day 2 market design.
3. We need several days of training and discussion in order to understand the market recommendations that will come before the committee for approval.

Meeting materials needs to go out sooner

A) See comments on #3.
B) PowerPoint presentations usually are not in meeting material.
C) Make sure audience knows which material each speaker is addressing, i.e., page number, title, etc.

Place larger, most critical decision items early in the agenda. (Advanced Market, Priority Projects, ITP, SPP facility decisions). Need to make faster decisions on the minor agenda items and not have 20 min. presentations that end up 45 min. for a minor or low impact decisions.
Provide a summary page with the final agenda that contains an executive summary of each action item. (i.e. Priority projects:
1) Vote on whether there will be above or below 10GW wind development;
2) Approve the 3 - 345kV Priority Projects and delay the 345/765kV Priority Projects until January MOPC meeting) etc. Potentially have a regular MOPC participant call prior (1-2) weeks to the MOPC meeting that would pre-prep members for major decisions; possibly simply a briefing from Carl Monroe that indicates the critical issues and focus areas. Even though the material may not be fully-readied at least it would provide a chance for the members to have some prior discussion among the membership in order to streamline those discussions at the actual meeting.

1) Get ALL meeting materials out at least 1 week prior to the meeting.
2) Get a better phone conferencing system.
3) Do better studies.

WebEx for those who chose not to attend in person so that the last minute changes can be seen by all. Do not allow last minute changes unless they have been distributed to those on the phone.

It’s almost too late by the time a issue gets to the MOPC. The assumptions, studies, results are already done. If they are incorrect, it’s back to the drawing board.
o Member-driven is a blessing and a curse. Many members come with one thought/angle and until that point is beat to death or all concede to their viewpoint, at times there is no moving on. Blessing, all have a chance to voice their concern, curse, not everyone willing to make sacrifices to move organization forward.

o This is a great forum for discussion. Each Member feels capable of expressing their opinions.
Chart 11: Market Working Group

Market Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate agenda</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely material</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful information</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate minutes</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represents diversity</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary expertise</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members prepared</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members committed</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members supportive</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members focused</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action recommended</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient facilitation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent heard</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of accomplishment</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks input</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and respectful</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps group on task</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures follow-through</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# of responses = 10
The Market Working Group had two meaningfully high scores, “accurate agenda” under Meeting Preparation (4.5) and “represents diversity” under Membership (4.4). Three items were meaningfully low, “members prepared” under Membership (3.4), “members focused” under Meeting Conduct (3.5) and “effectiveness” (3.2)

This group was most satisfied with attributes in the Chair category (4.20) and least satisfied with items in the Meeting Conduct category (3.84).

The Market Working Group’s mean score of 3.96 is down slightly from the 2008 mean score of 4.11, and its 2009 “effectiveness” rating of 3.2 is virtually the same as the 2008 rating of 3.30.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - The short notice on certain items reflects the dynamic nature of the discussions taking place in the group.
  - The meeting is organized and the chair provides excellent facilitation.
  - I feel that some Staff (and consultants) use their relatively more intimate knowledge of the current/future systems as a leverage during meetings instead of sharing their knowledge prior to meetings

- **Membership**
  - We are dealing with significant issues related to the future success of each Market Participant. I am not sure that upper management of each company is involved in the decision process and briefs/deb Briefs their representative.
  - Members are as committed as they can be given most have other full time responsibilities. Although there are still members that do not really engage in the discussions, they are less and less...
  - MWG members are committed to completing the Future Market Design and agreed to meet semimonthly to complete the design in a timely manner.
  - I consider my fellow members as friends and colleagues, but the skillset necessary to fully understand and design markets is sacrificed by the necessity to maintain diversity of member sectors

- **Meeting Conduct**
  - All MWG members have a chance to voice their opinion on topics before decisions are made.
  - Due to the length of the meetings and frequency there are times when focus can be lost but with the advent of the new market many worthwhile and lengthy discussions are being had and as tedious as those discussions are they are needed.
MWG meetings are the most poorly run meeting. The chair does not manage meetings well, encourages rabbit trails, generally monopolizes meeting discussion, does not discipline others who frequently speak over a speaker, generally favors a few select members. I recommend MWG should employ a formal meeting facilitator.

- **Chair**
  - Richard Ross does an excellent job, even though I do not agree with him all the time.
  - The MWG chair is knowledgeable in all areas of the current market and the future markets design. He creates an environment that encourages members to ask questions.
  - I feel Richard does an excellent job chairing the group. He has a good knowledge of the industry and keeps the group on task even though many times we drift off the issue at hand.
  - MWG meetings are the most poorly run meeting. The chair does not manage meetings well, encourages rabbit trails, generally monopolizes meeting discussion, does not discipline others who frequently speak over a speaker, generally favors a few select members. I recommend MWG should employ a formal meeting facilitator.

- **General**
  - Ensure upper management involvement with decision making.
  - Improve coordination with other working group so that they address review/coordination in a reasonable time frame.
  - 1. Provide more guidance to secretaries on what to include in the minutes.
     2. Ensure the chair and vice-chair understand the rules for conducting meetings.
  - Hire a professional meeting facilitator. Also, I thank AEP for letting us use their conference room, but MWG has outgrown the capacity of that room. Sometimes there are not even enough chairs for all those attending. SPP needs to find a bigger room.
  - MWG’s efforts to prioritize its initiatives should be replicated across the organization. MWG seems to make efforts to be transparent and limit the creation of red tape while other groups at times seem to unintentionally do the opposite.
  - I think this group is under tremendous pressure to get things done and probably is working beyond a sustainable level.
  - Combination of poor leadership and varying degree of member skills make this a very unproductive group.
Chart 12: Model Development Working Group
The Model Development Group had one meaningfully high score, "members supportive" under Membership (4.5), and three meaningfully low scores, “timely material” under Meeting Preparation (3.5), “members prepared” under Membership (3.6) and “effectiveness” (2.8).

This group was most satisfied with Chair attributes (4.20) and least satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes (3.80).

This working group’s mean score for all attributes in 2009 is 3.98, which is down from 2008’s rating of 4.24, and its “effectiveness” rating of 2.8 is down noticeably from the 2008 “effectiveness” rating of 3.50.

This group’s comments on improvements include the following:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - Meeting materials need to be provided well in advance of the meeting. Also, meeting materials should not be changed prior to the meeting. For example, updated draft versions of documents should not be presented at the meeting without sufficient time for the members to review. 10 calendar days should be a minimum.
  - SPP staff seems to delay the start of the webinars every meeting due to technical difficulties that should be solved before the meeting starts. Staff should already set up before the beginning of the meeting and tested all equipment.

- **Membership**
  - As a member of both SPP and MRO there a number of conflicting data needs for both regions that need to be addressed. More clarity is needed for the companies who have generation, load and transmission in Nebraska that are tied to both regions.
  - Some members do not openly participate or come to the meetings with a knowledge of the agenda items.

- **General**
  - Due to my commitments, I am unable to attend many of the meetings. However, the ones that I have attended have included the transmission working group and I think Scott Rainbolt performs outstandingly as the chair of this group. I only have one suggestion and that would be more WebEx options for meetings.
  - It is difficult to deal with the high turn-over rate of SPP employees. A separate department needs to exist for the development and upkeep of accurate planning models.
  - 1. Meeting materials provided well in advance of meeting. 10 calendar days minimum. No exceptions.
    2. Meeting materials cannot be changed in the 10 days prior to meeting.
3. SPP organizational groups need to focus more on the needs of the individual members. Member driven instead of SPP staff driven.
   o New Secretary. Remove non-participatory members
   o Better planning processes within SPP organization are needed not additional process.
   o The SPP MDWG needs to provide more clarity on the data submittal requirements and the rationale for such requirements. For example, the MDWG has repeated stated that short circuit data is required for the annual data submittal effort. Apart from that, there is short circuit task force established that is focused on development of a short circuit model. If the short circuit data is already required for the data submittal, what is the purpose of the task force. There seems to be some conflicting information here that is difficult for the data submitters to understand.
   o As effective as can be while trying to sort through outside agendas/recommendations from staff.
Chart 13: Operating Reliability Working Group
The Operating Reliability Working group had one meaningfully high rating, "members supportive" (4.8) under Membership, and one meaningfully low rating, "effectiveness" (3.6).

This group was most satisfied with Meeting Conduct attributes (4.38) and least satisfied with Chair attributes (4.23).

This working group has a 2009 mean score of 4.29, which is up appreciably from 2008’s mean score of 3.68, and its “effectiveness” rating is also up noticeably to 3.6 in 2009, compared to 3.00 for 2008.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparedness**
  - ORWG is too loose on last-minute supporting materials coming to members for agenda items just prior to the meeting with little time to review prior meeting discussions.
  - Secretary is juggling group facilitation with daily duties and this sometimes leads to short lead times on meeting prep.

- **Membership**
  - The group should try to get more co-ops, munis, generators, and transmission customers as voting members to balance out the overall group membership representation.

- **Meeting Conduct**
  - There are many times where our decision is to ask staff for additional information or a study to help determine what we are questioning.
  - Having a call in option for all meetings including face to face meetings is very helpful to increase participation when travel conflict arises. ORWG does well at this.

- **Chair**
  - Jim is quiet by nature but he is always open to other opinions and he is very good at following through.

- **General**
  - 1. More meetings with MWG for future markets
  - 2. Better process for PRR implementation. Once a PRR is approved by all WG’s it enters a wasteland and no one knows when it will be worked on, implemented, or anything about it unless it is a major (in SPP’s eyes, aka PRR 181). Some PRR’s have been approved for over a year and there is still no indication of when they will be implemented.
  - 3. Process for Protocol revision. I do not know of any formal process to announce Protocol revisions, nor any timeline given as to when they "go live."
The first warning we generally get is a Market Operator saying we are not following the new revision. We need to post them in advance, tell people there is a new revision, and give a date when it will be implemented.

- Continue to focus on review of past action items to ensure resolution and completion.
- More frequent face-to-face meetings
- I feel the ORWG is starting to fall behind in the day-ahead review process, the MWG is meeting six days/month minimum, but I balance this with the fact that everyone has another job they are supposed to be doing at their respective business. I am also concerned that ORWG's need to upgrade the OPS1 program is going to be pushed to the back burner and not done in favor of time allocation to day 2 markets. The ORWG has been asking for improvements/replacement of this program for over 2 years!!! It needs to have something done to fix the deficiencies or it needs to be replaced and it needs to be done in the short term.
Chart 14: Operations Training Working Group Results

Operations Training Working Group

- **Meet No Preparation**
  - Accurate agenda: 5.0
  - Timely material: 4.7
  - Useful information: 4.8
  - Accurate minutes: 5.0

- **Membership**
  - Represents diversity: 4.3
  - Necessary expertise/skills: 4.6
  - Members prepared: 4.5
  - Members committed: 4.9
  - Members supportive: 5.0

- **Meet No Conduct**
  - Members focused: 4.7
  - Action recommended: 4.6
  - Sufficient facilitation: 4.8
  - Dissent heard: 4.7
  - Feeling of accomplishment: 4.9

- **Chair**
  - Seeks input: 4.7
  - Supportive and respectful: 4.7
  - Keeps group on task: 4.6
  - Ensures follow-through: 4.6

- **Effectiveness**: 3.70

# of responses = 9
The Operations Training Working Group had two items with meaningfully low scores, “represents diversity” (4.3) in the Membership category and “effectiveness” (3.7). Meaningfully high scores include three items that scored a perfect 5.0: “accurate agenda” and “accurate minutes” in the Meeting Preparation category and “members supportive” in the Membership category.

The Operations Training Working Group has the highest satisfaction with Meeting Preparation attributes (4.88) and the lowest satisfaction with Chair attributes (4.65).

This group has a mean score of 4.67 for all attributes tested in 2009, which is virtually the same as the 2008 score of 4.58, but its “effectiveness” rating for 2009 is down to 3.7, from the 2008 rating of 4.00.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- Meeting Preparation
  - Mr. Jim Gunnell’s organizational skills in regards to this working group are beyond reproach. Fabulous effort put into the OTWG by Mr. Gunnell. Kudo’s to him. Shannon Bolan - NPPD.

- Membership
  - I would like to have seen more members interested in joining the OTWG from the Western and Southern regions. We just didn’t get a whole lot of interest from these two regions during our last openings within the OTWG. That could have been our problem though, by not getting the word out properly....????
The Oversight Committee had no meaningfully high ratings but did have two meaningfully low ratings: “represents diversity” (3.5) in the Membership category and “effectiveness (3.5).

This committee was most satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes (4.73) and least satisfied with Meeting Conduct attributes (4.42).

This committee’s overall rating for its attributes in 2009 is 4.19, which is the same as the 2008 rating, and its “effectiveness” rating is up slightly to 3.5 in 2009 from 3.33 in 2008.

Following is the response to the prompt for suggestions for improvement (general):

• Now that the Committee has responsibility for internal audit, we need to focus attention on this important area. Also, we need to assure ourselves that Internal Audit has the IT skills to assess this important area. Also, we need to assure ourselves that we are being as helpful as possible to REs on how they can become totally compliant.
Chart 16: Regional Tariff Working Group Results

Regional Tariff Working Group

- accurate agenda: 4.2
- timely material: 3.9
- useful information: 4.3
- accurate minutes: 4.1
- represents diversity: 4.5
- necessary expertise/skills: 4.4
- members prepared: 3.8
- members committed: 4.1
- members supportive: 4.5
- members focused: 4.1
- action recommended: 4.2
- sufficient facilitation: 4.0
- dissent heard: 4.4
- feeling of accomplish...: 4.1
- seeks input: 4.5
- supportive and respectful: 4.4
- keeps group on task: 4.3
- ensures follow-through: 4.4
- effectiveness: 3.5

# of responses = 17
The Regional Tariff Working Group rated two items meaningfully low, “effectiveness” (3.5) and “members prepared” in the Membership category (3.8). Three items were rated 4.5, which for this group was meaningfully high, “represents diversity” and “members supportive” under the Membership category, and “seeks input” under the Chair category.

Regional Tariff Working Group survey participants were most pleased with Chair attributes (4.40) and least satisfied with Meeting Preparation (4.13).

This working group’s mean score for 2009 is 4.19, which is virtually the same as 2008’s rating of 4.12, and its effectiveness rating in 2009, 3.5, is also virtually the same as the 2008 rating of 3.44.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - We do have problems getting information from members and staff in a timely manner in order to distribute to the Working Group in a timely manner. We also continually have problems with both staff and members requesting last minute additions to the agenda and lack of support from senior level staff and Chairs in enforcing the deadlines for providing information and requesting to be on the agenda.
  - The secretary changed halfway through the year.
  - Material distribution is generally good, however occasionally it is late coming. This does make it extremely difficult to properly prepare for the meeting. One week’s posting of the material is sufficient time, but update material the day before is unacceptable. I find it almost impossible to vote on something when the materials arrive the day before the meeting.

- **Membership**
  - The members are very respectful of each other and understanding of the differences in opinions and positions based upon the diversity of the group. Members do not come to the meetings prepared; however, a lot of this is due to last minute additions/changes of materials and last minute additions/changes to the agenda.
  - Members more often keep their own goals in mind instead of the group's goal. Some members are prepared to conduct business at the meeting while others do nothing in advance to prepare.

- **Meeting Conduct**
  - As to the departure question, that varies from one meeting to the next. Most issues take several meetings to resolve, and some meetings "resolve" nothing.
- Sometimes the nitpicking and word-smithing gets in the way of getting things done.
- There are meetings when members are unprepared or have not been engaged (for a multitude of reasons) that causes progress to halt and back up. It is during those times that I feel the group failed to accomplish anything. This does not occur very often and is most likely unavoidable.

- **Chair**
  - Dennis generally does a good job. At times though he wades a little too deep into the discussion and loses his role as moderator or facilitator.
  - The group goes off on rabbit trails and the chair will sometimes follow.

- **General**
  - 1. Continue to have SPP staff as our outside counsel available for meetings - very helpful.
  - 2. Make sure meeting materials and draft tariff language are available well in advance of meetings.
  - 1. We need more support on tariff issues from Wright & Talisman. We spend significant time on issues making assumptions that our views will be accepted by FERC.
  - 2. We need a forum for our lawyers to discuss issues related to the tariff.
  - 3. I am not sure key decision makers of some market participants are aware of the issues until a filing is made at FERC.
  - My recommendation is with respect to RTWG specifically. With the large volume of work to be addressed and the need for members to be prepared when they come to meetings, we need to set deadlines for submission of meeting materials and requests to be on the agenda and enforce those deadlines. I have gotten continual feedback from members that they don't prepare in advance because they know there will always be changes from what they have received and never know what to expect will actually be in materials and on agenda.
  - 1. Keep members focused on the big picture.
  - 2. Keep members on task.
  - 3. Remind members that focus should be on SPP goals in general.
  - 1. Continue working on getting meeting material out on time (Improving!)
  - 2. Better review of the topics by members prior to the meeting.
  - 3. Try not to get hung up on minor issues
  - I believe our working groups are effective, but I believe they would be much more effective if we as staff were more rigorous in setting deadlines for getting on agendas and providing background materials. We can't expect our participants to be prepared for meetings if we don't give them the materials they need to be prepared. This would certainly lead to better, more productive meetings and working group members making more informed and better decisions.
  - I don't know what the difference between "agree" and "strongly agree" is.
  - This group is extremely productive given the work load and quality of work.
Chart 17: Strategic Planning Committee Results
The one item the Strategic Planning Committee rated as meaningfully low was “effectiveness” (3.1) Two items received meaningfully high ratings, the first item, “Necessary expertise/skills” under Membership, was rated 4.6 by the group and the second item, “dissent heard” under Meeting Conduct was rated 4.7 by the group.

The Strategic Planning Committee was most satisfied with Membership attributes (4.38) and least satisfied with Chair attributes (4.15).

This committee’s 2009 mean score is 4.23 for all attributes tested, which is down very slightly from the 2008 rating of 4.31, and its 2009 “effectiveness” rating of 3.1 is also down from the 2008 rating of 3.50.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - These questions place too much emphasis on the process; a committee of this nature needs more brainstorming time.

- **Chair**
  - Richard Spring will be missed, but Rickey Bittle will do a great job.

- **General**
  - The committee has almost stopped functioning...should meet if only to discuss open agenda issues that should be taken up by SPP ....
  - 1. Be involved with the Synergistic Planning Team.
  - 2. Focus on necessary transmission expansion, and getting federal funding for major projects.
  - 3. Focus on wind development and the potential impact this generation will have on our system.
  - The SPC needs to do more long-range strategic planning, rather than focusing on near-term tactics. It is this group that needs to focus on the big picture, i.e., how all of our initiatives fit together.
  - Update the strategic planning process and timeline to coincide with internal budgeting cycle. Include Board and Members Committee in initial brainstorming efforts.
  - Input from the committee members as to agendas etc. is nonexistent.
Chart 18: System Protection and Control Working Group
The System Protection and Control Working Group rated only one item meaningfully low, “effectiveness” (3.6). Participants in the survey rated these items meaningfully high, “accurate agenda” under Meeting Preparation (4.6), “members focused” under Meeting Conduct (4.6) and “supportive and respectful” under Chair (4.6).

The System Protection and Control Working Group is most satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes (4.43) and least satisfied with Chair attributes (4.30).

This working group’s mean score for all attributes tested in 2009 is 3.94, which is down noticeably from 4.49 in 2008, and its “effectiveness” rating of 3.4 in 2009, is also down from 2008’s rating, which was 3.86.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- Meeting Preparation
  - Jason Speer and Mak Nagle are doing an excellent job in the SPCWG
- Membership
  - SPCWG is sometimes asked to provide expertise on system planning/system studies but is made up of relay Engineers rather than planning Engineers.
- General
  - 1. Seek suggestions for improvement/clarification of Criteria.
  - 2. Track recommendations for improvement/clarification of Criteria.
  - 3. Members should prepare for the meeting before the meeting. Come prepared to the meeting.
  - Most of my suggestions apply to myself, personally. I need to be more prepared. I should get prepared. This is best done by spending additional time in becoming prepared.
Chart 19: Transmission Working Group Results

Transmission Working Group

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - Agenda: 4.0
  - Timely material: 2.9
  - Helpful information: 3.9
  - Accurate minutes: 3.8

- **Membership**
  - Represents diversity: 4.4
  - Necessary expertise/skills: 4.4
  - Members prepared: 3.5
  - Members committed: 4.0
  - Members supportive: 4.1

- **Meeting Conduct**
  - Members focused: 3.9
  - Action recommended: 3.9
  - Sufficient facilitation: 3.8
  - Dissent heard: 4.1
  - Reaching or accomplishment: 3.8

- **Chair**
  - Seeks input: 4.3
  - Supportive and respectful: 4.3
  - Keeps group on task: 4.1
  - Ensures follow-through: 4.3

- **Overall Effectiveness**: 3.4

# of responses = 16
The Transmission Working Group rated two items meaningfully high, both in the Membership category, "represents diversity" and "necessary expertise/skills" (both at 4.4). But five items were rated meaningfully low: "timely material" (2.9) in Meeting Preparation attributes; "members prepared" (3.5), "members committed" (4.0), and "members supportive" (4.1) under Membership attributes; and "effectiveness" (3.4).

The Transmission Working Group was most satisfied with Chair attributes (4.25) and least satisfied with Meeting Preparation attributes (3.65).

This group’s mean score on all attributes tested in 2009 is 4.31, which is up from the 2008 overall score of 3.95, but its 2009 "effectiveness" rating of 3.4 is the same as 3.45, the 2008 rating.

Following are the responses to the prompt for suggestions for improvement:

- **Meeting Preparation**
  - Meeting materials are posted prior to the meeting; however, the material is typically posted only a few days prior to the meeting not allowing sufficient time to fully review all of the material. This is likely due to the fact that SPP is trying to complete too many studies at the same time and is putting a lot of stress on members and SPP Engineering staff.
  - Meeting minutes should include an accurate account of all issues discussed even when positions are not agreed with by SPP Staff. Timeliness of receiving meeting materials is essential to preparing for a successful meeting.
  - Meeting minutes that have yet to be approved should be clearly identified as "DRAFT". While the word "draft" is sometimes placed in the file name (which is good), draft meeting minutes are often posted without "DRAFT" being in the minutes document or in the name of the link that appears on the SPP Web site. I would suggest that "DRAFT" be in the name of the link as well as prominently displayed on the first page of the minutes document.
  - Recently Staff made some important decisions regarding compliance analysis that was not fully communicated to the TWG or recorded in the TWG minutes. This involved deciding to not perform analysis on the 10-year model and created a new 6-year model to use for long term TPL compliance analysis.

- **Membership**
  - Members try to be prepared at meetings, however, there are too many studies going on and therefore way too much meeting materials to keep up on all of it.
  - Some people just don’t do their homework before the meeting begins.
  - Staff is not getting information for meeting posted in a timely manner.
• Meeting Conduct  
  o Dissenting opinions are not always acknowledged and these discussions are not completely summarized in the minutes.

• Chair  
  o Enjoy participating in this group and will miss it when I retire.  
  o The chair is very organized, and it is clear he spends time preparing for the meetings. The chair ensures that all meeting attendees are given a chance to be heard and that their opinions are recorded in the meeting minutes.
### Detailed Findings: Overall

This analysis presents average scores for the attribute groups by committee/working group.

#### Chart 20: Average Scores for Meeting Preparation

The Economic Studies Working Group gave the lowest scores for the attributes in this group, rating the category at 3.58. The Operations Training Working Group gave Meeting Preparation the highest average rating of 4.88. Overall, Meeting Preparation was rated 4.18 across the study.
Chart 21: Average Scores for Membership

The lowest average score was given by the Markets and Operations Policy Committee (3.84). The highest scores were given by the Operations Training Working Group (4.66). Overall, participants rated Membership attributes 4.27.
Again, the lowest score was given by the Generation Working Group (3.82), and, again, the highest score by Operating Reliability Working Group and the Operations Training Working Group (4.74). Meeting Conduct was rated 4.21 overall.
Chart 23: Average Scores for Chair

Again, the Generation Working Group gave the lowest score for this attribute (3.78).

The lowest score was given by the Corporate Governance Committee (3.60). The Cost Allocation Group gave its Chair attributes the highest average (4.85). Chair attributes averaged 4.31 overall.
Effectiveness had the lowest scores of all the categories tested, and as this chart indicates, it varied the most among groups. When compared to the averages for the other areas, the average score for effectiveness (3.45) was significantly lower than the highest rated of the other categories, Membership, (4.27).

The Generation Working Group gave the lowest rating for effectiveness (2.8). The Critical Infrastructure Protection Working Group and the Economic Studies Working Group gave the highest ratings for this attribute (4.3).
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Generation Working Group gave the lowest ratings for their experiences with Southwest Power Pool this year. The Operations Training Group gave the highest ratings for the 2009 organizational group survey.

Ariel Strategic Communications recommends that SPP add a battery of questions to help SPP understand how important the items rated are to the participants. For each item, a question could be added, for example, “On a scale of 1 to 5, in which 1 is not important and 5 is very important, how important is the item you just rated in determining this organizational group’s effectiveness at executing its duties?” This would provide SPP with an idea of which items to focus on when responding to the study.

SPP must continue to send meeting materials out as far in advance as possible and to respond to communications from working group and committee members quickly. These seem to be the most important items overall for participants of the study.
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

All rating items are on the following scale, unless otherwise indicated: 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neither agree nor disagree; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree.

Thank you for participating in this survey. From your perspective (as a member, chair or secretary) of the SPP organizational group listed below, please thoughtfully answer all questions.

1. 1. My position on this organizational group is that of a...
   a. Member
   b. Chair
   c. Secretary

2. Please rate MEETING PREPARATION based on the following statements:
   a. The agenda produced reflects the actions to be taken during the meeting.
   b. Meeting material is provided in a timely manner.
   c. The information provided prior to the meeting is utilized during the meeting.
   d. Meeting minutes are an accurate reflection of the meeting.

3. Additional Comment (included on all items):

4. Please rate the organizational group MEMBERSHIP based on the following statements:
   a. The group’s membership represents the diversity of the SPP organization.
   b. The group’s membership has the necessary expertise and/or skills to accomplish its goals.
   c. Organizational group members come prepared to the meetings.
d. Organizational group members are motivated to participate and accomplish the group’s goals.

5. Additional Comment (included on all items):

6. Please rate MEETING CONDUCT based on the following statements:

   a. Members are focused during discussion.
   b. Decisions are identified and action is recommended.
   c. Facilitation is sufficient to guide discussion.
   d. Dissenting voices are heard.
   e. I depart with a feeling that we have accomplished something.

7. Additional Comment (included on all items):

8. Please rate the organizational group CHAIR based on the following statements:

   a. The chair seeks input, and organizational group members are able to influence key decisions and plans.
   b. The chair is supportive and respectful of the individual needs and differences of group members.
   c. The chair keeps the group on task.
   d. The chair ensures follow-through on questions and commitments.

9. Additional Comments (included on all items):

10. Please indicate other organizational groups whose meetings you regularly attend.
    (Choose all that apply.)
11. Please provide three or more recommendations for improvement of this particular group and/or SPP's overall organizational group structure.

12. Compared to other groups in which I participate, this organizational group is...

13. Please share any additional comments about the organizational group's effectiveness:
APPENDIX B: COMMITTEES/WORKING GROUPS

1. Business Practices Working Group
   The Business Practices Working Group (BPWG) is responsible for discussing issues surrounding the development and implementation of SPP’s OATT Business Practices. The BPWG will propose new practices and changes to existing practices that will facilitate effective and efficient administration of the SPP OATT. The BPWG will develop practices that supplement, clarify, and enhance the understanding of OATT provisions and principles without violating those provisions and principles.

2. Change Working Group
   The Change Working Group (CWG) coordinates and schedules any changes to the interfaces between SPP systems, processes, practices and the members/market participants required to implement or enhance needed functions. The CWG will recommend any process improvements or project management to other working groups to facilitate these interfaces.

3. Corporate Governance Committee

4. Cost Allocation Working Group

5. Critical Infrastructure Protection Working Group
   The purpose of the Critical Infrastructure Protection Working Group (CIPWG) is to advance the physical and cyber security of the electricity infrastructure within the SPP region. This group will serve as a forum for discussing security issues, for establishing security policies and procedures for SPP Member-common resources, and will serve as an interface between the NERC CIP Committee and the SPP membership.

6. Economic Studies Working Group
   The Economic Studies Working Group (ESWG) advises and assists SPP staff, various working groups, and task forces in the development and evaluation principles for economic studies. The ESWG will be responsible for ensuring the proper regional data
sets and economic methodology, parameters, and metrics are used in these studies and for ensuring SPP staff annually update stakeholders’ data. The ESWG will also provide technical support for the development and application of economic studies. The ESWG will review the economic planning processes for adherence to sound economic metrics methods used by SPP Staff and MOPC working groups and task forces and will provide recommendations for improvement of the economic evaluations. The ESWG will be responsible for ensuring that SPP and/or third party consultants, contracted by the SPP, utilize the appropriate model and data set to produce consistent results through all economic modeling activities.

7. Finance Committee

8. Generation Working Group
   The Generation Working Group (GWG) maintains, coordinates, and implements Criteria related to generation in Southwest Power Pool (SPP). It is also responsible for ensuring that SPP Criteria are in compliance with NERC Reliability Standards relating to generation for the SPP region.

9. Human Resources Committee

10. Market and Operations Policy Committee

11. Market Working Group
   The Market Working Group (MWG) is responsible for the development and coordination of the changes necessary to support any SPP administered wholesale market(s), including energy, congestion management and market monitoring consistent with direction from the Board of Directors including FERC Order 2000.

12. Model Development Working Group
   The Model Development Working Group is responsible for maintenance of an annual series of transmission planning models (power flow and short circuit models and associated stability database) which represent the current and planned electric net work
of the Southwest Power Pool. It is also responsible for providing NERC with data that supports the models developed by the Multiregional Modeling Working Group (MMWG) and the System Dynamics Database Working (SDDWG).

13. Operating Reliability Working Group
ORWG - formerly known as the Security Working Group (SWG).

14. Operations Training Working Group
The Operations Training Working Group (OTWG) is responsible for identifying and managing training activities for system operators.

15. Oversight Committee (Formerly Compliance Committee)

16. Regional Tariff Working Group
The Regional Tariff Working Group (RTWG) is responsible for development, recommendation, overall implementation and oversight of SPP’s open access regional transmission service tariff. The RTWG will further advise the staff on regulatory or implementation issues not specifically covered by the tariff or issues where there may be conflict or differing interpretations of the tariff.

17. Strategic Planning Committee
In March 2003, the Board of Directors formed the Strategic Planning Task Force (SPTF) to complete a review of the SPP organization considering the current industry environment and make appropriate recommendations to the Board. With the recommendations of the SPTF, the Board reorganized the SPTF into the Strategic Planning Committee effective July 1, 2003.

18. System Protection Working Group
The System Protection and Control Working Group maintains, coordinates, and implements criteria related to system protection and control in Southwest Power Pool. It is also responsible for ensuring compliance with NERC Planning and Operating Standards for the SPP region.
19. Transmission Working Group

The Transmission Working Group (TWG) is responsible for planning criteria to evaluate transmission additions, seasonal ATC calculations, seasonal flowgate ratings, oversight of coordinated planning efforts, and oversight of transmission contingency evaluations. The TWG develops recommendations for the Operations Policy Committee regarding changes to SPP criteria referenced herein and works with individual transmission owners on issues of coordinated planning and NERC and SPP compliance. The TWG coordinates the calculation of the Available Transfer Capability for commerce maintaining regional reliability, while ensuring study procedures and criteria are updated to meet the regional needs of SPP, in cooperation with governing regulatory entities. The TWG is responsible for publication of seasonal and future reliability assessment studies on the transmission system of the SPP region. The TWG was formerly called the Transmission Assessment Working Group.