**MDWG WebEx Meeting**

|  |
| --- |
| **May 31, 2016 09:30 AM - 12:00 PM** |
| [**WebEx Conference**](https://ercot.webex.com/ercot)  Teleconference: 877-668-4493  Meeting number: 625 829 301  Meeting password: Mdwg |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | Antitrust Admonition |
| 2. | Introduction  Amy Lofton (ERCOT)  Aubrey Hale (ERCOT)  Carolyn Reed (Centerpoint)  Daniel Spence (DME)  Dave Pagliai (ERCOT)  Heather Boisseau (LCRA)  Jack Brown (Garland)  Jane Cates (ERCOT)  Jayasree Kannala (Centerpoint)  Jim Lee (AEP)  David Kee (CPS)  Kristin Abbott (?)  Lindsay Butterfield (ERCOT)  Michelle Trenary (TPS)  Mike Juricek (Oncor)  Monsherra Odanga (Oncor)  Sam Pak (Oncor)  Shuye Teng (Austin Energy)  Tracy Richter (ERCOT)  Troy Anderson (ERCOT)  Cory Phillips (ERCOT)  Kaci Jacobs (TXUE) Brian Brandaw (ERCOT)  Sherry Looney (Luminant)  Taylor Woodruff (Oncor)  Jennifer Bevill (CES) |
| 3. | Previous Meeting Minutes – Available on the website |
| 4. | NOGRR084  Daily Grid Operations Report and has been in process for a number of years.  Update from Aubrey.  Updated list of topics that Jamie provided. He’s a little behind and there’s talk that 98% of it has been done but is going to be business planning in less than 2 months.  Julie asked for a date for business planning.  What’s the next step after business planning?  AH: All projects go through business planning, Executive review, IA, rough budget.  Julie: When is the language coming back to market for OWG and MDWG for approval?  Lindsay: It would have to be referred to OWG.  Julie: MDWG’s concern is that we have a lot of folks interested in the language. When can they see it.?  LB: When it’s posted. It would have to be the SMEs drive that. MDWG have had a lot of input. In the past, we’ve had a lot of back and forth and this has vanished.  Julie: Who do they need to talk to?  AH: Chad  LB: Getting a little pushback from presenting the draft language. Julie doesn’t want to misrepresent the group’s desires.  Mike Juricek says they very much need to see the language and if we wait till the formal process, it requires us to go through the formal comment process.  Also another question was when we started the NOGRR was the way to do it, but now what is the best process?  It was NOGRR because of Operations.  Is there a better mechanism today for getting a report created.  LB: why do we want NOGRR 084.  Julie: we already did the language and data elements called out and because it came back as a big dollar amount, a lot of the data elements are not quite as useful as originally thought and there are other data elements that would be more useful. We’re not amending an operating guide, but amending a report.  Troy A.: It would seem a NOGR would be needed to modify what is in the greybox, then it might be a NOGRR partnered with an SCR.  MJ: 2012 requirement that it had to be in protocol or OG to create the Daily Grid Operations report – what do we still need?  Julie: MDWG concerned that it might not move forward.  MDWG would like to see the language and asked Aubrey to reach out to Chad Thompson and see what concerns they have for sharing the language.  AH: Got pushback last week from Chad but AH will reach back out to Julie after talking again with Chad.  Julie: Also looking for guidance about mechanism, a NOGR or NPRR.  Carolyn would like to get updates on ERCOT for this change. See some improvement by next month. AH: Language is ready but will go through internal business review.  MJ: Originated from MISUG. |
| 5. | Reports to be Automated  Tracy: ERCOT met with the business groups and it was determined that none of these can be automated. No further investigation to automate them.  Julie asked why.  Tracy: Not feasible and/or data already being provided.  What about CEER 2 or 3? AH will follow up with these  Troy Anderson: Some of the elements will be deployed with NOGRR025, some are available with NDCRC and a few are just too complicated. |
| 6. | Load Forecast Distribution Factors Report  Waiting for Board approval. |
| 7. | CRR Balancing Account Extract User Guide  No feedback received. Agreed with the changes. Tracy will get it posted. |
| 8. | Market Data Transparency SLA Update (Dave Pagliai.)  Will sit another two months for COPS July meeting. Dave is looking for approval. Changed Appendix B.  Questions, comments or concerned.  Carolyn (Centerpoint) does this have to be approved? Are you going by the old SLA until the new one is approved.  DP: Yes, just restricted to talk about organization sync to COPS market guide.  AH: has the COPS Mkt Guide been approved? Yes 041 and 042 were approved at TAC, so implemented tomorrow. |
| 9. | Windows 10 and ERCOT DC downloading  Brian: The ideas that the guys are working on a modification, scope of the change isn’t that big; functionally more comprehensive.  Propose the scope of the change to be gone over in the next meeting. |
| 10. | Missed Postings List Review  We have a summary of the missed postings and Tracy explained.  Heather: Are these all the reports that would be tracked?  This is just the Hourly, 15-Minute and 5-minute reports. They would like a more comprehensive list – like all from EMIL.  HB: Are there other groups that are monitoring?  AH: Will take that as an action item to provide what we monitor and Julie would like to know if there is a list that includes at least all that the market notices provide. |
| 11. | EWS Modification  Brian presented the Report Notification scope recap. Scope is to create a new notification infrastructure. Notify when reports are available but don’t use the existing notification system. Most reliable way is by using web sockets.  An SKI and API is another piece of the infrastructure that is easier.  Implement a notification when a DOC ID is published. Notification will include some basic metadata as well as the URL to retrieve the report. Market Participants won’t have to do much modification to their systems.  New infrastructure would support OPT-IN by DUNS. Market Participants can choose which reports they want. Functionality would be available on MIS through an Admin page for USAs.  Include Delivery confirmation and Logging.  Carolyn: To get this through business planning and an IA, then what? How will it be processed via the stakeholder.  Brian and Kaci decided in the last MDWG meeting for making it an item in MDWG and then it goes to a voting body but he’s not sure what the process is.  AH: Who is sponsoring?  Michelle: This should be an SCR and to be presented to other subcommittees, COP and TAC.  Brian agreed.  Carolyn agrees. So will ERCOT sponsor?  BB: Internally people have said it should be market sponsored.  (Phone) Could MDWG sponsor this change?  Julie believes it could. Will need to be presented to other subcommittees.  Comments: this is great, but don’t change anything existing.  Julie, Brian we’ve maintained all along that what is in place will remain in place. It could be stood up with old functionality; this is an incremental change, not wholesale notification changes.  Julie says they could sponsor if Brian will provide the meat of the presentation (and Aubrey).  Julie will get with Brian to plan out a schedule for presenting to other groups.  Daniel Spence (DME) when are you going to start getting some details on implementation?  Brian: We wouldn’t be able to get too far down that road until a project is kicked off. We can talk about concepts but actual design can’t begin until project is in planning. |
| 12. | Change Management and Communication –  Aubrey: The issue was raised at MDWG and a workshop was held last Friday. Bill Magness has directed Cheryl Mele to develop an ERCOT data strategy to get a broad picture and they’ve sent the workshop notes to the Leadership group. Last week, AH they pulled together release management, project management, and market rules, to see what could be done to help.  AH: Document the problem statements on paper and bring those back to MDWG. Would like smaller group of folks to run drafts by. There are some things for ERCOT that will be more problematic, Is this true of all reports?  Julie: a report change often necessitates a change on the market’s end and a) only getting a 30-day notice is not enough time to get changes scoped out, budgeted, and implemented and b) we don’t have sample data. Updated XSDs would help. The wind report was an example of an internal change that left the market wondering why. It’s a big deal to change table structure. So, the more advanced notice and input we have into changes coming, the more we can be prepared to implement the changes.  Sample data, vs. data definition and sometimes things just show up.  Daniel: Not typically a data set included.  Heather: We would like to just monitor.  AH: We have MOTE but not everything is there. No reporting infrastructure.  Brian asked to be involved. |
| 13. | Upcoming Changes by ERCOT   * What’s in R4 – August   Tracy – MIS changes: One RFC to move links around on the Grid Forecast page.   * + Null vs. Zero (Tracy: scheduled for R4) * What’s in R5 – October – Tracy: No MIS changes for R5 * What’s in R6 – December |
| 14. | Other Items – Anything to be considered under Other Items?  NO |
| 15. | Adjourn |

Next Meeting June 28, 2016 WEBEX ONLY (last Tuesday of the month)