**MWG WebEx Meeting Summary Notes**

**May 8, 2018 9:00 AM - 10:18 AM (11:00 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. ERCOT reviewed the revision description, business case and language of the potential NPRR for section 10.12.1 impacting communication pathway requirements.
	* Draft as reviewed is listed under key documents for the meeting.
	* Request for any objections was made; there were no objections.
	* Darrell S. confirmed that the MWG was in consensus for ERCOT to move forward with working to submit the NPRR.
4. Don T. ERCOT reviewed the revision description, business case and language of the potential NPRR for section 10.6.1.2 changing CCVT testing requirements and removing FOCTs as allowed instrument transformers.
	* Draft as reviewed is listed under key documents for the meeting.
	* Request for any objections was made; there were no objections.
	* Darrell S. confirmed that the MWG was in consensus for ERCOT to move forward with working to submit the NPRR.
5. Don T. ERCOT reviewed the revision description, business case and language of the potential SMOGRR for section 7 removing FOCTs as allowed instrument transformers.
	* Draft as reviewed is listed under key documents for the meeting.
	* Request for any objections was made; there were no objections.
	* Darrell S. confirmed that the MWG was in consensus for ERCOT to move forward with working to submit the NPRR.
6. Donald M. of ERCOT added comments that the removal of FOCTs will necessitate an update to the site audit checklist, removing questions related to FOCTs.
	* ERCOT will also be updating the numbering scheme of the site audit checklist into a sectional format (i.e. 1.1, 2.3 etc). This will allow for questions to be added and deleted going forward without requiring renumbering of the whole sheet.
	* ERCOT will publish a version of the sheet containing the current numbers and future numbering scheme on the same sheet to allow TDSPs to transition to the new numbers.
	* After a grace period, the site audit checklist on the ERCOT website will be updated to only have the new numbering scheme.
7. Darrell S. reviewed the action from last MWG regarding the discussion on POI and line loss compensation and opened the meeting to input.
	* Don T. presented the zonal versus nodal protocol definition for POI. Several scenarios were also presented with questions on how to determine the POI under the current definition.
		+ ERCOT has had internal discussions regarding the POI definition and it is likely that ERCOT will be submitting a NPRR to update the POI definition.
	* Brian C. of CenterPoint commented that line loss compensation is part of the holistic discussion as related to POI.
		+ Don T. replied that until the POI is clearly understood, determining loss compensation is very difficult.
	* Brian C. presented from the Handbook of Electrical Metering chapter 16 regarding the impact of loss compensation. There are times the loss value is small and therefore will not have a significant impact on the energy registration.
		+ Don T. commented that while ERCOT is having internal discussions on the POI definition, loss compensation will still need to be addressed.
		+ TDSPs should provide their thoughts regarding concepts when loss compensation will be required.
		+ Brian C. asked if the POI NPRR would come back through the MWG and the timeline. Don T. answered that it is likely the NPRR would not come through the MWG; though that is to be determined.
		+ Harvey S. of CPS added that an addition to the POI definition could be added specific to metering.
	* Gabriel G. of AEP added that an option for determining loss compensation that does not require calculations during the design proposal would be preferred.
		+ There was general agreement that an approach using a distance only approach would be preferable for real world work.
		+ Don T. replied that ERCOT is open to different solutions but currently has one they are willing to stand behind. Other options can be considered if presented.
	* **Action Item:**
		+ TDSPs to formulate a technical approach to when loss compensation is needed to help frame protocol language.
8. Darrell S. asked for any new items
	* + There were none presented
9. Meeting Summary and Closing Remarks: Darrell S.
	* Darrell S. summarized the meeting and the one action from item #7.
		+ **Action Item from #7:**
			1. TDSPs to formulate a technical approach to when loss compensation is needed to help frame protocol language.
10. End of Meeting (10:18)