

STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIZATION TASK FORCE

January 20, 2016 Meeting Notes

Overall feedback on the Stakeholder Prioritization Process and the execution of the first full cycle has been positive. Stakeholders have commented that they appreciate the process and their input being considered. This meeting of the SPTF was specifically geared toward discussion on areas identified both by staff and stakeholders as possible areas for adjustment/improvement.

Process Review/Feedback

SPTF Feedback

After a review of the Stakeholder Prioritization process and first cycle results and feedback, the following additional items added to discussion list by SPTF meeting attendees:

- o Large number of items in each of the priority groups
- o Strategic plan items rise higher in priority automatically; other items may equally as important to the MPs
- o MOPC process and summary report
- o Include net benefit (if available) in Portfolio Report/Comments Report
- o Ability to attach file(s) to RMS comments form
- o Short duration of comment period

Discussion Items

Prioritizing RRs and Enhancements (Scoring Tool)

Discussion: Staff proposed using severity scale (Critical/High/Medium/Low) instead of the scoring tool for enhancements and RRs to allow consideration for more tactical nature of most RRs/enhancements. Scoring tool would still be used for projects. Severities have documented definitions; essentially a return to the way WGs previously indicated their priority for each approved RR. Severity would replace the priority score and would be used together with complexity and cost estimate to determine priority grouping. Task Force (TF) indicated some concern with using severities, saying that all items (RRs) would be ranked High by the WGs and a way to distinguish between Highs may therefore be needed. Discussion led to agreement for staff to discuss further, to consider how to address this concern.

Prioritization vs. Scheduling – Future Outlook

Discussion: Staff clarified that Stakeholder Prioritization is about prioritization of work, CWG has responsibility for working with SPP on scheduling of work. Known dates are included in the Portfolio Report already. Staff proposed adding future outlook information (by functional area) to the CWG section of spp.org and providing a link to that information from within the Portfolio Report. This proposal would allow future outlook to be maintained in a central location with easy reference for prioritization discussion. TF agreed to this approach.

Subgrouping within Tertiary Priority Group

Discussion: Staff proposed adding subgrouping in the form of A, B, C to items within the Tertiary priority group in order to provide a way for stakeholders to indicate relative priority of items within the group. TF agreed to this approach and requested all items within Tertiary indicate subgrouping.

Further discussion led to agreement to rename the priority groups as follows:

- o In Flight -> Current Release
- o Primary Focus -> Release+1
- o Secondary Focus -> Release+2
- o Tertiary Focus -> Unplanned

The 'Other' grouping will remain unchanged; staff will consider how to provide information re: why an item is classified as Other.

Single View Report

Discussion: Staff requested further information on the objective of a single view and the content of such a view. TF discussion led to agreement to table this idea and potentially consider it as a later adjustment to the process.

Enhancement Aging

Discussion: Staff proposed a process for cancelling an enhancement due to age. Per TF discussion, the following was decided: Enhancements within the Tertiary group that are 24+ months old may be recommended by staff for aging out of the Portfolio. The requesting submitter will be notified re: this recommendation, the Portfolio Report will indicate candidate enhancements, and quarterly meeting will include discussion of candidates. If agreed upon during the quarterly meeting, the enhancement will be moved to the Closed tab in the Portfolio Report.

Withdrawal of Enhancements

Discussion: Staff proposed a process for submitter withdrawal of portfolio items. Per TF discussion, the following was decided: Requested enhancements that have not yet appeared on a Portfolio Report can be withdrawn via RMS request by the submitter. Requested items that have appeared on the Portfolio Report will be listed on a separate (new) tab on the Portfolio Report. Stakeholders may submit comments re: their position on withdrawal of the item. If no objections indicated via comment, the item will be moved to the Closed tab in the Portfolio Report following the quarterly meeting.

Process Cadence

Discussion: Staff requested SPTF observe the quarterly process; after the March quarterly meeting, the TF will discuss the current quarterly cadence and consider whether a more frequent cadence (monthly?) would be of benefit. Staff noted that they are not certain a more frequent cadence can be supported administratively but internal discussion has suggested this may be of benefit overall to prevent potential delay of implementation of enhancements so the TF is asked to observe in preparation for future discussion.

Other SPTF Feedback Items

- Large number of items in each of the priority groups: This item was tabled; TF believed this was addressed by other discussion items.
- Strategic plan items rise higher in priority automatically; other items may be equally as important to the MPs: This item will be addressed by switching away from the Strategic Plan scoring tool for RRs and enhancements.
- MOPC process and summary report: Some members of the TF expressed questions and concern re: the MOPC role in the process and the content of the MOPC summary report. Staff explained the process as follows: MOPC does not approve the Portfolio nor the prioritization of portfolio items but does provide oversight of the process and may act as an escalation point should an MP wish to raise the priority of Portfolio item(s) to their attention. Raising a priority item would be done during the agenda review portion of the MOPC meeting.
Per the MOPC-approved process, a verbal Stakeholder Prioritization update will be provided to the MOPC after the first 2 cycles of the process. Following those first 2 cycles, MOPC may request ongoing verbal updates but the expectation is that the updated Portfolio Report and MOPC Summary Report will be available via the MOPC meeting materials and verbal updates will not continue. The MOPC Summary Report details the changes made to the Portfolio as a result of the quarterly meeting. Some TF members requested additional detail for items that were commented on but unchanged as a result of the quarterly meeting. The quarterly meeting addresses this topic.
- Include net benefit (if available) in Portfolio Report/Comments Report: Staff agreed to include this information, when it is available, on the RR tab.
- Ability to attach file(s) to RMS comments form: Staff will follow-up on this item; attachments should be supported.
- Short duration of comment period: TF agreed to table this item in association with the Process Cadence item above.

Meeting Wrap-Up

Next Steps (Follow-up Items)

- Staff discussion on enhancement and RR priority (severities? Other?); anticipate follow-up discussion with SPTF on this topic.
- Updates to the MOPC Summary Report per discussion
- Handling of "Other" items
- Document how to "read" the Portfolio Report?
- Update overall Stakeholder Prioritization process doc, include information on MOPC process
- Staff work with Market Design on RR tab content; meanwhile RR Master List is available on spp.org.

Action Item Review

No new formal action items were recorded; SPTF Staff Secretary Annette Holbert will follow-up with Chairman Bill Grant re: open action items in Closure Pending status.