



STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIZATION SURVEY REPORT

Published on June 26, 2017

CONTENTS

Executive Summary..... 1
 Staff Response 2
Survey Responses..... 2
 The Stakeholder Prioritization Process 3
 The SPP Portfolio Report..... 5
 Prioritization Process Submissions 6
 Stakeholder Prioritization Process Meeting Frequency..... 8
 Value of the Stakeholder Prioritization Process 9
 Comments..... 12

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SPP launched the Stakeholder Prioritization Process Survey on May 22, 2017, distributing 2,874 survey invitations to the registrants of six exploders: the Market, Regional Tariff, Change, Operating Reliability, Business Practices and Credit Practices Working Groups. 136 individuals responded to the survey invitation.

Eighty-one respondents indicated they were familiar with the Stakeholder Prioritization process, and 44 of them indicated they have participated in at least one quarterly cycle of the process. Of those that were familiar with the process:

- Eighty-two percent indicated they felt they “have a better understanding of SPP’s inventory of work” as a result of the Stakeholder Prioritization process.
- Sixty-five percent agreed that “stakeholders have appropriate input to the prioritization process at SPP”. (Seven percent disagreed, and 27 percent gave a neutral response.)
- Sixty-one percent said it “has met its stated objective of increased stakeholder input into the prioritization process for enhancements, RRs and projects”. (16 percent disagreed with this statement, and 25 percent gave a neutral response.)
- Seventy-two percent said it “has met its stated objective of increased transparency into the prioritization process for enhancements, RRs and projects”. (Seven percent disagreed with this statement, and 21 percent gave a neutral response.)

Fifty-two respondents indicated they were familiar with the SPP Portfolio Report, and of the 48 who rated the report, 38 (or 79 percent) indicated it “is helpful and easy to navigate”. Seven respondents disagreed with this statement, and 3 gave a neutral response.

Fifteen respondents indicated they have submitted comments for the Stakeholder Prioritization quarterly process, of which nine (or 70 percent) agreed “the comment period provides enough time to review the report and provide comments”. Three respondents disagreed with this statement, and one gave a neutral response.

Eighteen respondents indicated that have submitted an enhancement request for an SPP system, of which thirteen (or 72 percent) agreed “the status of the enhancement [they] submitted was easy to locate in the SPP Portfolio Report”. Two respondents disagreed with this statement, and three gave a neutral response.

Fifty-nine respondents agreed that SPP should convene the Stakeholder Prioritization quarterly meeting when comments and questions have been addressed to the satisfaction of the commenter. Seventy-nine respondents agreed that the Stakeholder Process should continue on a quarterly basis.

STAFF RESPONSE

Respondents were asked to provide comments regarding the Stakeholder Prioritization process, and based on their responses SPP staff commits to:

1. Provide a more detailed description of each enhancement within the SPP Portfolio Report
2. Provide more education about the Stakeholder Prioritization process.
3. Administer the Stakeholder Prioritization Process Survey on an annual basis to continue to gauge the process’s effectiveness and stakeholder engagement in the process.

SURVEY RESPONSES

Following is a detailed report of all responses to the Stakeholder Prioritization Survey.

Question 1

Please indicate the working group(s) in which you are an active participant (check all that apply).

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Marketing Working Group	43
Regional Tariff Working Group	16
Change Working Group	31
Operating Reliability Working Group	23
Business Practices Working Group	12
Credit Practices Working Group	11

THE STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

Question 2

Are you familiar with the Stakeholder Prioritization process?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Yes	81
No	55

Question 3

In how many quarterly cycles of the Stakeholder Prioritization process have you participated?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
0	20
1	8
2	15
3	6
4+	15

Question 4

**Please indicated the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:
*Quarterly meeting materials provide all the information needed for discussions about prioritization impacting stakeholders.***

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
(5) Strongly Agree	6
(4) Agree	36
(3) I don't know	58
(2) Disagree	7
(1) Strongly Disagree	1

Average Score: 3.36

THE SPP PORTFOLIO REPORT

Question 5

Are you familiar with the SPP Portfolio Report?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Yes	52
No	60

Question 6

Please indicated the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: *The report is helpful and easy to navigate.*

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
(5) Strongly Agree	3
(4) Agree	35
(3) I don't know	3
(2) Disagree	7
(1) Strongly Disagree	0

Average Score: 3.71

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS SUBMISSIONS

Question 7

Have you submitted comments for the Stakeholder Prioritization quarterly process?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Yes	15
No	94

Question 8

Please indicated the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: *The comment period provides enough time to review the report and provide comments.*

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
(5) Strongly Agree	1
(4) Agree	8
(3) I don't know	1
(2) Disagree	3
(1) Strongly Disagree	0

Average Score: 3.54

Question 9

Have you submitted an enhancement request for an SPP system?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Yes	18
No	86

Question 10

Please indicated the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: *The status of the enhancement you submitted was easy to locate in the SPP Portfolio Report.*

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
(5) Strongly Agree	2
(4) Agree	11
(3) I don't know	3
(2) Disagree	1
(1) Strongly Disagree	1

Average Score: 3.67

STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIZATION PROCESS MEETING FREQUENCY

Question 11

Should SPP convene the Stakeholder Prioritization quarterly meeting when the comments and questions have been addressed to the satisfaction of the commenter?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Yes	59
No	28

Question 12

Should the Stakeholder Prioritization process continue on a quarterly basis?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Yes	79
No	12

Question 13

What frequency cadence would you recommend?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Monthly	1
Semiannually	4
Annually	2

VALUE OF THE STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

Question 14

If you have participated in the Stakeholder Prioritization process or reviewed the report, do you feel you have a better understanding of SPP’s inventory of work?

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
Yes	37
No	19

Question 15

Please list the titles and/or functions of your company’s representative(s) who typically review the reports and/or attend the Stakeholder Prioritization meeting. For example: CWG rep, MWG rep, IT rep, etc.

- MWG Rep, MOPC Ret
- I don't know. I assume MWG rep, but I don't see these reports regularly, nor am I aware of the Stakeholder Prioritization meeting.
- CWG Rep MWG Rep TWG Rep IT staff Transmission planning staff
- CWG Rep
- CWG Rep, MWG Rep
- EMT rep
- John Fulton Carrie Dixon
- Regulatory rep
- MWG rep, MOPC rep, ORWG rep
- Brent Wilcox - Manager of Settlements Catie Dial - Lead Settlement Analyst
- CWG rep and MWG rep
- EVP, Directors MWG ORWG
- CWG rep
- CWG rep, MWG rep
- regulatory analyst
- MWG Rep SAWG Rep ESWG rep CWG rep
- MWG rep - John Varnell
- MWG rep CWG rep
- MOPC rep
- MWG rep, RTWG rep
- Carrie Dixon - MWG and CWG rep
- MWG rep, CWG rep, MOPC rep, RARTF rep, TWG rep

- MWG rep, OTWG rep
- CWG Rep MWG Rep
- CWG rep, MWG rep
- CWG and MWG Reps
- CWG, IT

Question 16

**Please indicated the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:
*With this process, stakeholders have appropriate input to the prioritization process at SPP.***

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
(5) Strongly Agree	2
(4) Agree	31
(3) I don't know	28
(2) Disagree	2
(1) Strongly Disagree	4

Average Score: 3.37

Question 17

Please indicated the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:
Overall, the Stakeholder Prioritization process has met its stated objective of increased stakeholder input into the prioritization process for enhancements, RRs and projects.

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
(5) Strongly Agree	2
(4) Agree	29
(3) I don't know	26
(2) Disagree	6
(1) Strongly Disagree	3

Average Score: 3.32

Question 18

Please indicated the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement:
Overall, the Stakeholder Prioritization process has met its stated objective of increased transparency into the prioritization process for enhancements, RRs and projects.

RESPONSE	RESPONSE TOTAL
(5) Strongly Agree	3
(4) Agree	32
(3) I don't know	25
(2) Disagree	5
(1) Strongly Disagree	3

Average Score: 3.40

COMMENTS

Question 19

Please provide any other comments regarding the Stakeholder Prioritization process.

- Since I am not aware of the report or the meetings, I do not believe the process increases stakeholder input, transparency or provides appropriate input into the process.
- the call I think is important even if comments have been resolved so that other can hear the resolution to the comment/question/challenge.
- The process was designed to fail. SPP staff did not want to give up their control over projects being done. Also if a working group put a High med. or low on anything the staff can enter numbers in the weighting to stop or change how the MP's want it done. If the process would have not been done the way that is you would be asking these questions to be used to kill it. You need to be asking question like; should there be sylows for RR's? Should a number ranking be to set priority (like ERCOT)? does the high, med. and low give enough wait to tell SPP when to put the change into a system. And yes I was involved in the setting this up but Staff had bill grants ear and nothing I brought up got past the process of calling this a stakeholders process or stakeholder DRIVEN process. I have answers to all of the questions I asked above but SPP staff stopped all of them from being done in the TF by saying that is not in the scope of this TF.
- It would be helpful to provide a description of each enhancement. As is, it's hard for me to know if I agree or disagree with priority just based on the very brief description or name that is listed in the report. I also don't have a good understanding of the level of work for each enhancement.
- The comments I have heard is this process is now ran by SPP staff and the materials and processes are set by staff and very little stakeholder input is considered. Unless there is a substantial change in approach, this group is wasting their time.
- Even though there is stakeholder input into prioritization some projects appear to be moved in priority based on items outside the process
- It would be good to coordinate the quarterly meeting with another stakeholder meeting, like MWG. I would like to attend the quarterly call, but my schedule doesn't seem to align very well with the quarterly meetings. I would also like to see if the quarterly meetings could be scheduled such that the SUG could meet and have time to provide input by the deadline.
- It would be nice to have more detail included in the description of the enhancement requests. Often there are only one or two sentences that describe the request. More information would help those who did not the submitter understand the changes that are being requested better.
- Stakeholder prioritizations summary reports should be reviewed as part of each Working Groups Monthly meeting agendas.
- We strongly support the transparency projects as well as our ability to influence project prioritization.