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

**Bucket 1: Items we can address immediately via Methodology changes**

**Bucket 2: Items that need to be kept on the Parking List/WG needs to discuss more**

**Bucket 3: Items that have already been resolved**

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? Bucket 2. Because we coordinate outages for elements to be effective March 1 >90 days, we need to know >90 days whether it’s on the list or off. 12/31/xx does not allow for this. Would likely need to be November-ish? Not sure if pursuing this provision is worth it.
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. Bucket 2. Not enough history yet to know how long the sunset process should be.
3. Comment/Review Timelines - Would like to build in some formal language around comment and review timelines for market participant submissions. Addition/removal submittals should 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 Bucket 1 (with some tweaks)
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. Bucket 2. Megan Sauter to draft language for the group to consider at a future meeting.
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.) Bucket 1
6. Private Submissions - Mechanism to send private submissions to TSPs for review; not all TSPs participate in working group. Bucket 3. If TSP does not respond, 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. Bucket 3. (This is just a general observation)
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. Bucket 2
9. Suggest reviewing “Timeline/Flowchart” document for any needed updates based on 2017 process. If anyone noticed any changes that need to be made, send them to the Chair to circulate a redlined version in January.
10. Number the pages on the Methodology document. Bucket 1
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. Consider developing language in the Methodology to allow ERCOT to make non-substantive changes to the HITE list, e.g., changing station names or other nomenclature changes. Need to define what changes are non-substantive; David Ricketts to work with other stakeholders on this. If market participant requests a more significant change, e.g., cutting in a new station, it is to be communicated to ERCOT and vetted to the WG Chair for consideration of scheduling an off-cycle OCWG meeting to discuss. Market participants would like ERCOT to provide notice of minor changes. For next Seed List, the most current HITE list will be used. Bucket 2 until we have more info.
13. ERCOT will add a 3rd possible entry to the “source” column to the MTE list to flag items that were added to the list via private submittal. ERCOT will add an additional column to indicate the year in which the private submittal occurred. In the future, a TSP may request a previously-added private submission be removed. Bucket 1; no Methodology change needed.
14. Previously-approved private submission removal requests should happen during public submission process. Following such a request, TSPs, ERCOT and other MPs may discuss offline. Need to build a deadline into the Flowchart for private submissions to be proposed for removal so there is another WG meeting afterwards for final discussion. Need to decide how to treat this removal if the generator does not agree with the removal. Bucket 2.