**MWG Meeting/WebEx Summary Notes**

**Aug 21, 2018 9:30 AM - 11:33 AM (12:15 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. Darrell S. opened the floor to comments from the previous MWG action item concerning Point of Interconnection
	* Don T. of ERCOT explained that ERCOT has been working internally on reviewing possible changes to the POI definition and a probable NPRR.
	* Brian C. of CenterPoint provided that CenterPoint’s position is that the definition is clear in that the substation at the same voltage level is considered the POI.
	* Don T. restated ERCOT’s position that for metering, the POI has been historically considered as the point in ownership change between entities. The ERCOT NPRR will reflect ERCOT’s position.
	* Brain C. asked why the current language could not be applied pending resolution.
	* Don T. replied that there are multiple situations, as presented at the last MWG Meeting, that the current definition of POI as literally interpreted, does not allow for a POI to be determined. ERCOT’s position is to continue to utilize the point in ownership change between entities as the POI for metering.
	* It was asked if there will be any impacts or connection to NPRR 945
		+ Don T. replied that the definition of POI is integral to understanding NPRR 945 implementation.
4. Darrell S. reviewed the action item regarding loss compensation and opened the floor to input
	* Brian C. provided that after CenterPoint’s technical review, their position was that with a meter accuracy of 0.1%, losses below that should be ignored.
	* Don T. clarified that until protocols are changed ERCOT does not have the latitude to disregard the loss compensation requirement. The previous proposal ERCOT offered at the 3/13/19 MWG; represented one possible path forward to address the concern raised by multiple TDSPs in regards to line-loss compensation of small distances between the POI and EPS Meter placement.
	* Ray C. of Oncor found the language acceptable but would like to see a higher percentage threshold.
	* Brian C. stated that meters cannot rationalize current below 0.1% therefore distances of up to 1 mile could possibly be ignored.
	* CPS proposed an update to the percentage in the ERCOT language to 0.05%.
	* Donald M. of ERCOT introduced the issue that changing language to ignore loss compensation below a decided value may result in existing meters being required to remove loss compensation. Any Protocol change will need to consider this concept.
	* Henry P. reviewed the concepts that there is a difference between accuracy and losses. ANSI Standards, Protocols and SMOG define minimum accuracy requirements for different devices.
	* Antonio A. of WETT agreed with Henry statement and expounded on the difference between losses and accuracy.
	* Don T. offered that it seems the MWG has consensus that there can be an amount of line loss that may be small enough to be considered negligible, though at this time the MWG does not have consensus on what that value might be.
	* **Action Items:**
		+ ERCOT will send out a survey to all TDSP’s soliciting a proposed value for the threshold on what can be considered negligible losses.
		+ TDSP will respond with a proposed value and technical justification of their value for review at the next MWG.
5. Don T. reviewed the 400 yard rule and ERCOT’s application and measurement methodology.
	* Harvey S. of CPS asked if the measurement was from furthers load point to furthest generation point.
	* Don T. replied that it is from furthest interconnection points regardless of type.
	* Brain C. asked if there was a known reason that 400 yards was selected as the threshold.
	* Don T. replied that it was selected during market open rule formulation to recognize the configuration of existing facilities.
6. Henry P. reviewed possible changes to the SMOG regarding instrument transformer nameplate requirements
	* SMOG 3.2.3(i) was reviewed with a possible change to allow for a PE letter when instrument transformers are located inside an apparatus and photos were not obtained during the construction process.
	* SMOG 7.5.2 was reviewed as an updated to refer directly to IEEE C57.13 rather than a list unique to ERCOT for nameplate information requirements.
	* SMOG 7.5.6 was reviewed with an addition on methodology for when no statement regarding PCB content on oil filled transformers is present.
	* There was agreement with the language as presented.
7. Donald M. presented changes to the site audit checklist
	* Checklist has been reorganized to group items more logically and a new numbering scheme created.
	* The new checklist with both old numbers and new numbers will be posted to the ERCOT website following the MWG Meeting.
	* Beginning 1/1/2020 a checklist with only the new number scheme will be available and will be in use.
		+ 3 questions referencing FOCT requirements will most likely be deleted by 1/1/2020 dependent on board approval of NPRR 948.
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. Darrell S. asked for any new items
	* + Doug B. of BEC inquired about the use of IRIG versus MV-90 synchronization.
		+ Tony D. of ERCOT confirmed that current protocols present an issue to IRIG use since it would supersede MV-90’s ability to set the meter time. The meter time could be set by MV-90 but then would reset to IRIG time if there is any difference.
		+ Stacy N. of ERCOT also provided that issues have occurred previously when IRIG has been attempted during daylight savings time switches.
		+ Don T. provided that changes are possible if supported by an implementation that does not introduce errors or issues in regards to EPS Metering processes. Introducing this concept may require Protocol and/or SMOG changes.
		+ **Action Item:**
			1. BEC and ERCOT will work to test possible issues with IRIG during the upcoming DST transition.
10. Meeting Summary and Closing Remarks: Darrell S.
	* Darrell S. summarized the meeting and the one action from item #7.
		+ **Action Item from #4:**
			1. ERCOT will send out a survey to all TDSP’s soliciting a proposed value for the threshold on what can be considered negligible losses.
			2. TDSP will respond with a proposed value and technical justification of their value for review at the next MWG.
		+ **Action Item from #9:**
			1. BEC and ERCOT will work to test possible issues with IRIG during the upcoming DST transition.
11. End of Meeting (11:33)