**MWG Meeting/WebEx Meeting Summary Notes**

**March 13, 2018 9:30 AM - 12:50 (15:30 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. ERCOT asked for any nominations for MWG Chair or Vice-Chair as none had been received prior to the meeting.
	* Darrell S. of CenterPoint and John C. of Austin Energy had agreed to stay in their respective rolls of Chair and Vice-Chair if no new nominations.
	* No nominations. MWG will present Darrell S. and John C. as for their current roles at WMS for confirmation.
4. Don T. of ERCOT reviewed last year’s MWG discussions regarding POTs to IP transition for EPS meters and presented possible path going forward.
	* Draft language of NPRR was presented with a targeted implantation of 1/1/2022 to facilitate discussion.
		+ The use of the WAN was specified as being between ERCOT and the TDSPs with TDSPs able to implement independent back end solutions on connections to the meters.
		+ Dale T. of CenterPoint recommended adding an option c) allowing for other types of communications as approved by ERCOT or a delay of implementation.
		+ Ray C. of Oncor agreed with the request for additional implementation time and proposed a date of 1/1/2023 to allow for coordination within companies multiple groups.
		+ Matt B. of CPS Energy stated the CPS is in trials currently and 2023 would be a better option
		+ Gabriel G. of AEP agreed with 2023 being a better time frame.
		+ Mark R. of LCRA stated that due to reconstruction of sites 2023 would be a good date.
		+ Ted H. of STEC expressed concern due to some Hydro facilities on the border. Other sites in STEC should be no problem and 2023 should be an acceptable date for all STEC sites.
		+ Eric C. of TNMP agreed that the 2023 should be ok. TNMP is in discussions around this item but cannot offer specifics.
	* Dale T. addressed the language of section b) that the alternate WAN would be for EPS meter only. This language seems to preclude the TDSP for using this infrastructure for other purposes on their side of the connection.
		+ Don T. discussed that the language was based on ERCOT communications group desire to be clear that it would be the same/duplicate connection of the existing WAN for that TSDP, communications across this WAN between ERCOT and the TDSP would only be for EPS Meter communications, and the TDSP would have costs associated to adding new WAN.
	* Gary J. of Garland requested confirmation that EPS meters on current system would be acceptable.
		+ Don T. confirmed that the alternate WAN is only for those that request it and is not required. The current WAN can be utilized for EPS meters.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ Don T. will review language with ERCOT groups for changes. Language will be brought back to next MWG meeting. Will work with CenterPoint to ensure any language change addresses their specific concerns prior to the meeting. Implementation will be planned for 1/1/2023.
5. Henry P. of ERCOT reviewed the changes of NPRR-898 which became effective 1/1/2019. This allows ERCOT to return copies of certification documents electronically without having to utilize postal mail.
	* For TDSPs who wish to receive paper copies as well a request may be made.
	* Don T. specified that those whom wish to get paper copies will be able to, but the electronic document return is what will be considered protocol compliance.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ ERCOT will send an email to each TDSP to allow for reply request of paper copies. TDSP will need to respond to with either acceptance of emails or request for paper copies as well.
6. Donald M. of ERCOT reviewed the changes to the Meter Test Report and Site Certification forms that was presented at the August 2018 MWG meeting.
	* Changes to the form removing the signature field and altering the language to reflect that submission of the document constitutes confirmation of true and accurate data on the form.
	* Those who still wish to sign the forms for personnel assurance may sign anywhere in the comments section of either form.
	* Don T. requested verification that the MWG agrees to accept and implement the new Meter Test Report and Site Certification form. The MWG did so.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ ERCOT will post the new forms on the EPS Metering website and send out an email confirming their posting.
		+ TDSPs may begin utilizing the new forms immediately. For any test or certification dated 1/1/2020 or later, the new forms must be utilized. Prior to that time either form may be used.
			1. If the old forms with the signature field are submitted, a signature must still be applied.
7. Don T. presented draft language altering periodic test requirements for CCVTs and presenting a discussion on removing FOCT language.
	* Draft language as listed under key documents extends the testing periodicity for CCVTs that are tested in the last quarter of the year.
	* Brian C. inquired about conflicts with ANSI 12.1 based on the language of section 10.6.1.2(2)(a).
		+ Don T. clarified that ANSI C12.1 had been revised to remove language specifying magnetic VTs as “stable”. The changes around (2) had been to reflect the updated ANSI language.
	* Antonio A. of WETT asked about the reasoning for 5 year testing requirement.
		+ Don T. described the historical challenges around changes to the 5 year requirement. Specifically that inaccuracies have been found previously and insufficient data has been provided to allow for justification for removal of the requirement.
	* Don T. asked for agreement on the concept of the NPRR for section 10.6.1.2(2) which the MWG provided.
		+ Ray C. recommend a grammatical change to the language of 10.6.1.2(2)(b)(ii). The MWG implemented the change to the draft language and concurred.
	* Don T. opened the discussion for the MWG to consider removing allowances for fiber-optic CTs (FOCTs) from the protocol and SMOG.
		+ Ted H. asked if any FOCTs were still in use for EPS metering. Don T. confirmed that there is none remaining in current use.
		+ Solomon F. of CPS Energy asked if FOCTs have had issues.
			1. Don T. provided that there has been accuracy issues related to the complexity of FOCTs as compared to magnetic CTs that has caused all users to make a decision to remove them from service for EPS purposes.
		+ Brian C. asked if other types of instrument transformers would be allowed as new technologies are developed.
			1. Don T. stated that any new technologies can be considered by the MWG and added as appropriately decided by the market.
		+ Don T. added that changes to the SMOG will also have to be made to remove references to FOCTs.
		+ Abdur R. of Austin Energy inquired about removing 10.6.1.2(3) since changes to testing requirements would necessitate a NPRR making the section redundant.
		+ Debbie G. of Oncor expressed and desire to keep the section to ensure future readers recognized the ability to alter testing schedules when supported.
			1. After a brief discussion it was decided to leave section 10.6.1.2(3) and just remove the FOCT reference.
		+ **Action Item:**
			1. ERCOT will prepare draft NPRR and SMOGRR to alter CCVT testing requirement and remove FOCTs. The draft language will be presented at the next MWG.
8. Don T. presented a PowerPoint with updated 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.
9. Henry P. reviewed the historical discussion regarding throw over VTs and asynchronous conditions during black start testing/events.
	* Previous intention was for ERCOT to coordinate with each TDSP utilizing throw over VTs to review for possible concerns at each installation. The coordination has not yet occurred.
		+ ERCOT will begin the process within the next few weeks to begin discussions.
	* Darrell S. asked if there is anything TDSPs should be doing, or data collection that should be done in advance.
		+ Henry P. answered that there is nothing needed in advance from the TDSP. ERCOT will send a list of sites to each respective TDSP and schedule discussions.
	* Gabriel G. asked if changes will be required at facilities utilizing throw over schemes.
		+ Henry P. replied that no action is being considered at this time, but all action will be dependent on the information gleaned from the research and discussions.
	* Brian C. asked what changes might there be,
		+ Henry P. replied that there is insufficient information to make any statement on what if any changes might be appropriate. Results of the investigation will be discussed through the MWG.
10. Don T. reviewed the slides presented to the Resource Integration Workshop regarding ERCOT model ready dates, RARFs and EPS design proposals
	* ERCOT has worked internally to re-empathize the need for design proposals by the time RARFs are being approved.
	* The possibility of requiring EPS design proposals to be approved prior to a RARF being approved was presented at the RIW.
		+ This discussion is to help ensure the resource owner is communicating with the TDSP meter groups regarding dates and actions impacting EPS metering.
11. Darrell S. asked for any new items
	* Gabriel G. identified on ongoing concern regarding application of line loss compensation in EPS meters.
		+ Is there a value at which compensation becomes non-appreciable?
		+ Henry P. reviewed the language of 10.3.2.2 which states that for meters not at the POI loss compensation must be applied. A change to this section may be considered/recommend.
		+ Brian C. addressed concerns regarding the definition of POI according to Protocol Section 2. Should the POI be the entire substation at the same voltage level?
			1. Don T. provided that historically ERCOT has always take a POI to be a discrete point but understands the vagueness in the protocol definition.
		+ Darrell S. recommended that a modification to the POI definition might be the better solution. Stating the POI could be better defined.
		+ There were conflicting opinions on how to interpret the POI definition and approach the implementations on line loss compensation requirements.
		+ Brian C. recommended research into approaches of other markets and further research.
		+ **Action Item:**
			1. All TDSPs and ERCOT to work within their respective organizations to define POI and how line loss compensation should be applied for various scenarios to be reviewed and discussed at the next MWG meeting.
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 4, 5, 6, 7 and 11 of these notes.
		+ **Action Item from #4:**
			1. Don T. will review language with ERCOT groups for changes. Language will be brought back to next MWG meeting. Will work with CenterPoint to ensure any language change addresses their specific concerns prior to the meeting. Implementation will be planned for 1/1/2023.
		+ **Action Item from #5:**
			1. ERCOT will send an email to each TDSP to allow for reply request of paper copies. TDSP will need to respond to with either acceptance of emails or request for paper copies as well.
		+ **Action Item from #6:**
			1. ERCOT will post the new forms on the EPS Metering website and send out an email confirming their posting.
			2. TDSPs may begin utilizing the new forms immediately. For any test or certification dated 1/1/2020 or later, the new forms must be utilized. Prior to that time either form may be used.
				1. If the old forms with the signature field are submitted, a signature must still be applied.
		+ **Action Item from #7:**
			1. ERCOT will prepare draft NPRR and SMOGRR to alter CCVT testing requirement and remove FOCTs. The draft language will be presented at the next MWG.
		+ **Action Item from # 11:**
			1. All TDSPs and ERCOT to work within their respective organizations to define POI and how line loss compensation should be applied for various scenarios to be reviewed and discussed at the next MWG meeting.
13. End of Meeting (12:50)