**MWG Meeting/WebEx Meeting Summary Notes**

**August 29, 2018 9:30 AM - 11:35 (16:00 scheduled)**



1. Anti-Trust Admonition was reviewed: Darrell S. of CenterPoint
2. Attendance roll-call and introduction: Darrell S.
	* Meeting attendees stated their name and company.
3. Don T. of ERCOT summarized the responses received regarding TDSPs future plans regarding transitioning away from POTS (plain old telephone system) to more supported technologies.
	* Eventual goal will be an NPRR to update 10.12.1(1)(b) to be consistent with newer technologies employed for EPS meter data communications.
	* Several TDSPs commented on their path forwards towards IP communications.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ Clarification of communication methods between ERCOT and TDSPs
			1. ERCOT will reach out to TDSPs to resolve questions on existing responses and non-responses from TDSPs as needed.
			2. Draft language for NPRR targeted for end of 2018 or quarter 1 of 2019.
4. Stacy N. of ERCOT presented an option for read receipt of access notifications.
	* For TDSPs who wish to confirm ERCOT has received access notification forms, they may request a read receipt for the email sent to Mreads@ercot.com which will be provided.
5. Henry P. of ERCOT reviewed procedure for new modeled-generation facilities with cutover dates prior to meter installation due to ERCOT network modeling constraints.
	* ERCOT meter engineering will inform applicable TDSPs when a model-ready date is available based on an approved RARF at multiple events.
		+ When the RARF is approved
		+ When the design proposal is received (if the RARF has already been approved)
		+ When the design proposal is approved (if the RARF has already been approved)
		+ When the cutover date is approaching
	* Harvey S. of CPS inquired as to whom is notified about the cutover date. Henry P. and Donald M. of ERCOT provided that it is to the TDSP supplied contact list in addition to the design proposal approval email.
	* Don T. described the current scenarios which require TDSP participation in the modeling process to meet the dates provided on the RARF.
	* Gabriel G. of AEP commented that the RARF date is impactful to TDSP metering personnel and the parties setting the RARF date could be unaware of their impacts.
	* Debbie G. or Oncor asked if when the RARF is approved if the dates can still be altered. Henry P. confirmed that in some cases yes and some no depending on how close the date is. With ERCOT meter engineering now providing notification when a RARF is approved, it should still be possible to have the date amended with prompt action.
	* Darrell S. asked if the RARF is public information. Don T. answered that the RARF is not public information.
	* Darrell S. commented that enhanced communications between the TDSP and resource owner for impacts regarding RARF dates to metering is needed. Discussions within TDSPs for groups that coordinate with resource owners is needed to explain and emphasize metering impacts.
6. Henry P. presented a path forward to allow for site certification documentation to be returned to TDSPs electronically versus via postal mail.
	* + After discussion of the concept, there was MWG consensus on ERCOT submitting an NPRR with the language presented to the MWG to support this change.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ ERCOT will draft and submit an NPRR, noting Meter Working Group consensus of the concept.
7. Donald M. presented new versions of the Site Certification form and Meter Test Report.
	* Forms were updated to remove signature requirement and language on the form was updated to reflect that submitting versus signing was the binding action.
	* Dan G. of College Station expressed concern that a name can be populated without the recorded EPS meter inspector being aware.
		+ John C. of Austin Energy provided that it is preferable to provide the completed forms in such a way as to prevent alteration.
		+ Donald M. confirmed that the forms could be accepted as either a PDF or password locked Excel form which would therefore prevent altering. Each TDSP will be responsible for ensuring accuracy of names on submitted forms.
	* Dale T. of CenterPoint requested that all TDSPs have time to review the new language within their companies prior to MWG accepting the forms.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ TDSPs will review the new Site Certification Form Ver 4.0 and Meter Test Report Ver 5.0 posted to the MWG meeting page within their respective companies. Next MWG meeting will review the forms before deciding to accept or reject.
8. Darrell S. summarized previous discussion on throw-over VT configurations and the impacts of abnormal conditions such as black start testing and events.
	* Darrell S. presented CenterPoint’s current approach of having primary and backup meters voltages supplied by opposite VTs in the throw over scheme.
		+ CenterPoint has been re-evaluating some locations and for some radial bus connections might update their scheme.
	* Mark R. of LCRA said that they are reviewing their approach and looking at different options.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ ERCOT will have targeted one on one discussions with TDSPs known to be utilizing throw over schemes.
			1. Discussions should help frame thoughts on whether a SMOGRR or design proposal language for clarification and consistency in throw over scheme approaches/uses should be considered by the MWG.
9. Don T. presented a PowerPoint on statistics surrounding EPS metering facility notices, temporary exemptions and document submittals.
	* The analytics provide TDSPs insight into relevant statistics regarding various EPS metering activities.
	* If a TDSP desires to know the key that identifies their company or more detailed information for their company; contact EPSMetering@ercot.com.
10. SCADA telemetry point mapping to EPS meters.
	* Additional source of data estimation for some EPS Meters when weather related events or some unusual circumstance create a need for data estimation. .
11. Darrell S. asked for any new items.
	* None presented
12. Meeting Summary and Closing Remarks: Darrell S.
	* Darrell S. and Don T. summarized the action items to be taken after the meeting.
		+ Action items for are under the last bullets of item 3, 6, 7 and 8 of these notes.
		+ **Action Item from #3:**
			1. ERCOT will reach out to TDSPs to resolve questions on existing responses and non-responses from TDSPs as needed.
			2. Draft language for NPRR targeted for end of 2018 or quarter 1 of 2019.
		+ **Action Item from #6:**
			1. ERCOT will submit an NPRR to support return of site certification documents to the TDSP electronically.
		+ **Action Item from #7:**
			1. TDSPs will review the new Site Certification Form Ver 4.0 and Meter Test Report Ver 5.0 posted to the MWG meeting page within their respective companies. If there are concerns with the language, the TDSP will communicate concerns to Don T. so they can be discussed. Next MWG meeting will review the forms before deciding to accept or reject.
		+ **Action Item from #8:**
			1. ERCOT will have targeted one on one discussions with TDSPs known to be utilizing throw over schemes.
			2. Discussions should help frame thoughts on whether a SMOGRR or design proposal language for clarification and consistency in throw over scheme approaches/uses should be considered by the MWG.
13. End of Meeting (11:35)