**OCWG Issues List (“Parking List”)   
Version 1 / August 14, 2017**

Listed below are topics raised during 2017 OCWG meetings for possible consideration of future HITE Methodology changes.

1. Prospective Construction - How to treat construction planned for Q3/Q4 of a calendar year. Group would like to consider creating a process for the contingent removal of MTE’s with construction planned for 8/1/xx through 12/31/xx that is expected to resolve the associated congestion. MTEs to be removed pending a January confirmation from TSP that the construction was actually completed?
2. Sunset Process – Since each year’s list begins with the previous year’s TAC-approved list, it would be useful to create a sunset process for “older” MTEs. Otherwise, over time the list will become unmanageable.
3. Comment/Review Timelines - Would like to build in some formal language around comment and review timelines for market participant submissions. Addition/removal submittals must be submitted to listserve at least 2 weeks before the working group meeting during which those submissions are intended to be discussed. Market participants must provide notice to OCWG listserve prior to the same working group meeting for additions/removals they would like to discuss or disagree with.
4. Bus Outages – The process today does not distinguish the transmission elements connected to a bus that caused congestion, so all transmission elements underneath the bus get “flagged” as HITEs, creating false positives. TSPs use best practices to schedule bus outages in coordination with generator outage schedules. Including these elements on the MTE list could incent transmission operators to schedule bus outages >90 days in advance which will not necessarily correspond with the relevant generator outage schedules. (Group decided to keep this issue in the repository, but not likely to be addressed in near term)
5. Holidays/Weekends – create provisions for key submittal dates that fall on holidays/weekends, i.e., submittal is due the following business day. (seed list publication, public and private submissions, etc.)
6. Private Submissions - Mechanism to send private submissions to TSPs for review; not all TSPs participate in working group. (if no response, automatically assume the submission is accepted)
7. TSPs performing own studies to suggest MTE removals - Situation has arisen where TSP is unable to replicate overload in its own study and ERCOT does not have bandwidth to validate/analyze TSP’s study.
8. MTEs based on ERCOT Outage Coordination studies – MTEs are included on the seed list based on Outage Coordination Studies that showed congestion, the outage was taken, and no congestion occurred in RT. The Working Group has repeatedly discussed the volume of MTEs captured as a result of this criteria. Suggest reviewing language in criteria (2) of Methodology, page 3. Consider making a distinction between the study-related MTEs that did not cause congestion because the outage did not actually occur vs. those that did not cause congestion when the outage was taken. Consider removing “study” criteria from methodology altogether, given that we now have a robust list based on 2 years’ process + the real time congestion criteria.
9. Suggest reviewing “Timeline/Flowchart” document for any needed updates based on 2017 process
10. Number the pages on the Methodology document.
11. Suggest establishing yearly metrics (# of MTEs on initial seed list, # of market participant submissions, # of MTEs added/removed after Working Group process, # of MTEs sent to WMS/ROS/TAC, etc.)
12. Multiple outages contributing to an MTE overload – with multiple concurrent outages, how do we know which one(s) is/are causing the congestion? How many compounded elements should be captured?
13. Extreme or highly unusual, non-recurring events – tornadoes or Acts of God. Possible criteria to identify in the Methodology as a valid criteria for removal. Might be conditional upon not seeing congestion at other times.