

PLWG Meeting February 29, 2012

Initiator	<u>Agenda Item No. 7.b</u>	Action required from PLWG
<p>SPWG</p> <p><u>Reference posted documents:</u></p> <p>1) N/A</p>	<p><u>Concern:</u></p> <p>Presently there is no formal mechanism among the ERCOT Short Circuit, Dynamics, and Steady State Working Groups to “trigger” changes made in each case that would need to be similarly addressed in the other cases. For example, if SSWG makes a significant change to the power flow case after it has been completed, SPWG may not be notified to see if a similar change is needed in the short circuit case.</p>	<p>Determine if stated concern is a PLWG issue</p> <p>If yes, review alternatives proposed by SPWG.</p> <p>Make recommendation</p> <p>Determine if there is a need to revise existing Planning Guides.</p>
Comments:		
<p>1. SPWG (Koellner)</p>	<p><u>Alternatives:</u></p> <p>In order to address this deficiency, here are a few options to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Do nothing. Use TPIT and quarterly TPIT updates as a way to trigger case updates. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pros: no additional effort required, each WG member can consult TPIT as they see fit. 2. Cons: may not cover every situation/scenario, does not involve any discussion of changes. 2) Have each TSP handle model changes/updates/errors/corrections internally. A TSP’s SPWG rep should be talking to their SSWG and DWG reps to discover these situations and “cross-trigger” internally. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pros: matches the responsibility to fix a problem with the most motivation to correct a given problem, no additional WG effort required. 2. Cons: Discovery of case updates/corrections/errors may not be communicated outside that TSP (which may or may not matter). 3) As “major case updates” are discovered in one WG, send a courtesy notification the other WG chairs (or a designee). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pros: keeps it informal, low overhead, loosely accomplishes goal of inter-WG discussion. 2. Cons: not mandated, who defines what a “major case update” is? 4) Formalize a “Modeling Coordinator” position within each WG. Set up a quarterly conference call (maybe on same schedule as TPIT?) to discover case updates/corrections. Define “major case updates”. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pros: best addresses the original concern. 2. Cons: most costly in terms of effort and WG time/involvement and we may find in most cases the WGs don’t really care about or benefit from other WG’s updates or corrections. 5) Establish a repository somewhere on the ERCOT web site to post case updates that could have cross-WG impact. The repository would be available to all WG members to consult as necessary. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pros: keeps it informal, little additional WG time/impact, can be done in conjunction with alternative 4 above. 	

	2. Cons: not as proactive of a solution, requires some setup on ERCOT's web site, still need to define what constitutes a major case update.
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	