**MWG Meeting Summary Notes**

**January 14, 2016 09:30 AM - 12:00 PM** ERCOT Taylor, TCC1 Rooms 252/253   
800 Airport Drive Taylor, TX 76574
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1. Anti-Trust Admonition was read : D. Sumbera
   * The Anti-Trust Admonition was read by D. Sumbera
2. Attendance roll-call and introduction: D. Sumbera
   * Meeting attendees mentioned their name and company
3. Nominated and selected MWG Chairperson and Vice–Chairperson: D. Tucker
   * D. Tucker asked for Nominations to which there were no new nominees. Consensus was reached to select Darrell Sumbera as Chairman and Harvey Scheffler as Vice-Chairman of MWG for 2016, subject to WMS confirmation.
4. Discussed proposed NPRR/RMGRR with the concept of "*Allow AMS Data Submittal for TDSP-Read Non-Modeled Generators"*. : D. Tucker

The MWG discussed the draft NPRR and RMGRR and was generally supportive of the concept and language.

1. Reviewed proposed SMOGRR language change in section 1.3.7 (e) regarding Parallel CTs: H. Perez
   * The MWG discussed the recommended language options and had consensus on the proposed language provided by Centerpoint. ERCOT will initiate an internal review process for submittal of a SMOGRR with this language for further market consideration and review.

If the market approves subsequent SMOG language, the parallel-CT burden calculation spreadsheet from the 1/29/14 MWG meeting will be posted on ERCOT’s EPS Meter Webpage.

1. Reviewed proposed SMOGRR language change in section 1.4.7 regarding Loss of Potential: H. Perez
   * The MWG discussed the proposed language change for SMOG section 1.4.7 and had general consensus of the voltage threshold range and the time range for recording of the event, though some further discussion is needed on this topic.
     1. Do all EPS meter brands support the recommended loss of potential threshold programming and event notification?
     2. While the language offers each TDSP flexibility in the threshold range and “outage duration” in regards to recording the loss of potential event, should a standard be set for each meter in regards to how the event is recorded and reported?
   * Action Items:
     1. ERCOT to send an e-mail to the TDSP EPS Metering contacts to solicit feedback on EPS meter compatibility with the recommended change.
     2. ERCOT to send another survey asking the TDSP to participate in a follow-up discussion on this topic.
   * Upon completion of the action items and if no further questions arise, a SMOGGR will be drafted using the proposed language or language modified based on discussions and feedback.
     1. It was noted that the implementation date for any change in regards to this discussion would need to allow the TDSPs time to reprogram meters during the annual meter test process. Implementation would be delayed for 1 year after market approval of any submitted SMOGRR approval to allow the TDSPs time to re-program the EPS meters.
   * CPS raised a question on the feasibility for some type of automatic event reporting from the outage scheduler to the MDAS group whenever generators go offline for scheduled outages. The described concept would be based on TDSP mapping of breakers to EPS meters. ERCOT agreed to discuss this concept with CPS and report back to the MWG for further group discussions on this topic.
2. TDSP’s submission of nameplate photos of newly-installed instrument transformers (CTs & VTs) as part of Site Certification Documents: H. Perez
   * The MWG discussed the recommended language change for SMOG section 3.2.3 (i) adding the requirement for the TDSPs to send clear photos of the nameplates of CTs/VTs as part of the site certification documentation. It was clarified that the electronic photos of the nameplates would only be required for new sites or existing sites where the instrument transformers are being replaced.
   * There are opportunities to take photos of the CTs/VTs while these are not yet installed so it was emphasized that ERCOT is not requesting TDSPs to take photos of energized equipment.
   * MWG reached a consensus on the proposed language change for further market consideration and review.
   * ERCOT will initiate an internal review process for submittal of a SMOGRR with this language for further market consideration and review.
3. EPS Meters via IP-based Communications: P. Vinton
   * P. Vinton made a presentation regarding the existing IP-based communications setup and discussed the benefits. He also discussed a possible way of IP-based communications setup with the TDSP using a third party vendor.
   * If TDSPs want more detailed information on IP metering, they can send a request to mreads@ercot.com.
4. New or other business items: D. Sumbera
   * There was a question from Centerpoint to the other TDSPs if anyone had done any research regarding an alternative to the 5-year CCVT re-certification testing.
   * Oncor mentioned that they had looked into the issue but found that it was more economical to relocate the CCVTs to other Non-EPS metering uses and just install new CCVTs.
   * CPS concurred with Oncor and mentioned they were transitioning to wire-wound voltage transformers.
   * No other topics were brought up for discussion.
5. Meeting Summary and Closing Remarks: D. Sumbera
   * D. Sumbera asked the attendees for any other comments or suggestions. There were none so he thanked everyone for their time and closed the meeting.
6. End of Meeting