

## 10-26-16 Misoperations Summit Survey Results

### Average Score

Registration process was smooth	3.5
I found the event to be very well organized.	3.6
I thought the event was well worth my time.	3.6
The event kept me engaged.	3.5
The design of the event stimulated thoughtful discussion.	3.6
The discussion was productive, leading to actionable outcomes.	3.3
The length of the breaks was sufficient.	3.3
The time allotted for lunch was appropriate.	3.4
I had the opportunity to build new relationships, and/or foster existing relationships with other stakeholders.	3.5
Overall I found the content valuable.	3.5
I would recommend an event of this sort be offered again.	3.5
The success of this event was aided by the examples/scenarios.	3.5
The success of this event was aided by session activities.	3.4
The success of this event was aided by group discussion.	3.6
The success of this event was aided by questions and answers.	3.4

## If it is decided to hold another event of this sort, what suggestions do you have for the next Misoperations Summit?

The polling and moderator was awesome. Polling shows not every operation is straight forward. Well done. This could be done with other standards

---

Have Jim facilitate again. He did a great job.

---

Deep dive into risks and consequences.

---

From the examples reviewed, it is apparent that there was not consensus. Might be helpful if volunteers send in examples with additional information and be prepared to present the example and answer questions from the group. Possibly spend an hour or so going through 5 to 10 examples and ask the RE compliance personnel to provide input after the group has voted. Ask for volunteers to submit short presentations on success stories where specific actions reduced misoperations with data to prove it. Then pick a couple to be presented at the summit.

---

Have a subject matter expert give definitive rulings on the examples given with his reasons why. Also, the examples should be made sure to provide ample information.

---

Consider using fewer examples/subsequent individual group responses to allow more freedom of discussion. After 2 or 3 examples were analyzed, the majority of the audience seemed to lose interest and were not as engaged. Some of that time could have been used for broader discussion/concerns items. There seemed to be more interaction at the beginning and end of summit.

---

1. As for the voting. I would only have the SMEs vote. I'm in compliance and I really didn't have the expertise to answer the questions. Therefore the numbers were being sewed by those that didn't have the knowledge. 2. The breaks could have been a little longer to allow time for networking. I would suggest this be a day and half event with a socializing event the first evening.

---

---

It might be good to hear NERC or possibly FERC have a discussion of where they see compliance requirements heading related to protection issues. It can be as a panel or just informal discussion. Hand out material or at least make it available before the meeting. I believe you will get better live discussion and less hesitancy in speaking up. Engineer tend to be risk adverse when it comes to speaking up unless they have some time to reflect on it.

---

Make it a 2-day event

---

Nothing comes to mind.

---

More questions ... these examples stimulated very helpful conversations.

---

I would like to have some lessons learned/presentations mingled with the discussion sessions. I think there is an opportunity for some training as well (NERC on the definitions/examples) I understand the value in making the summit a one day event, but there is so much that could be covered regarding misoperations, this could have easily gone a day and a half with the added content I suggested. Some of the sessions seemed rushed so we could cover all the content. Also, if there is a way we could mix the discussion groups up more, it would have been fun to hear others perspectives.

---

I would like to have some lessons learned/presentations mingled with the discussion sessions. I think there is an opportunity for some training as well (NERC on the definitions/examples) I understand the value in making the summit a one day event, but there is so much that could be covered regarding misoperations, this could have easily gone a day and a half with the added content I suggested. Some of the sessions seemed rushed so we could cover all the content. Also, if there is a way we could mix the discussion groups up more, it would have been fun to hear others perspectives.

---

Need to focus on developing a clear definition of what is a misoperation since there was about a 50/50 opinion on what is and is not a misop.

---

Breakdown of metric - is it adequate? Does it need to be different? More clarity around "what is a misoperation" - what was intended to be counted as a misoperation from NERC? Are the Regional Entities looking at misoperations metrics the same and what constitutes a misoperation? There was a lot of disagreement at the Summit. What can we do to align to meet the intent of NERC? Tie misoperations and metric into actual impact to the BES.

## What Other Feedback do you have?

Jim Gunnell did an excellent job of facilitating the discussion in a structured manner that helped me better understand the issue.

This was great. Flowed well, kept the participants engaged, and I learned a great deal. Thank you.

The agenda for the event needs to be available earlier. Also, the agenda should provide more information. The summit was very good, but based on the agenda alone, probably would not have been able to justify attending.

If nothing else, it was well worth the time to have NERC and FERC there to see how much problem with interpretation the standard has and why the misop reporting tool has misleading data. In my opinion, there needs to be a category for those 10% of events that don't fit into any of the categories. This could be "undecided" on whether it is a misop or not. Those events would be highly scrutinized to get credible data.

I believe this event was a good event with a lot of good discussion. However, I believe there was some hand waving going on with the morning session. We read the misoperations standard and had a few people stand up and express their concerns with the standard. The split between determining whether the example events were misoperations was a clear sign that there are too many grey areas. I felt that it was further frustrating that we were given examples, told to discuss between our peers, and given differing opinions on the outcome and there was no clarification as to whether the provided example was a misoperation or not. I was not able to stay until the action items were discussed, so I am not sure if this was addressed at that point, but I felt it necessary to express my concern.

1. Jim did an incredible job of facilitating the summit. This is not an easy task. Great job. Very well done.

---

This workshop will have lasting impact on my relay operations analysis and reporting; I expect I will be more effective in my work.

---

I believe there was such a diverse opinion related to examples presented and if they were a misoperation because there was limited time and because the example kept being displayed and then removed. Next time just leave it on the scheme so it can be read and analyzed more thoroughly. Also, you might want to provide at least some explanation of some of the terms provided in the example but is unique to the company providing the example such as "sectionalizer". This term is too general has different meanings based on the context it is engineered and used and would be better served if a very simple single line or description of it's meaning was provided. For engineers the term "it depends" is used often based on the context of the design. I believe this is why people were hesitate in admitting to the answer in this example.

---

Great job to everyone who coordinated this event. It was well worth my time to attend. Great idea to include FERC, NERC, the regions, and industry in the same meeting. It helped everyone understand each other's position. I thought it drove home the point how complicated is to determine misoperations. I also want to extend a kudos to the gentlemen from NERC (Rich Bauer?). As someone from industry, I was very encouraged by his comments.

---

Overall, great Summit. I feel the content is relevant and important, and it was covered well.

---

Very nice property/building SPP has.

---

Unfortunately, I had to leave a little early, would be interested in hearing what were the "next steps"? Some items are actionable as individual entities. What were action items for NERC and/or the Regional Entities?