September Meeting

Tuesday, September 21, 2021

* Review of minutes from July 21, 2021 PGDTF meeting
  + No comments.
* NDSWG meeting update
  + We met with NDSWG to discuss the current SCR associated with GMD
  + Concerns and questions were raised about:
    - What exactly is GMD and GIC studies
    - Why we are doing these studies in the first place
    - Existing power flows being affected
    - NOMCRs being held up due to validation issues of new data
    - Where will they be obtaining the data to submit and with what frequency
    - How will this affect current workload
  + All these doubts and concerns were discussed and addressed during the presentation. However, there are still several doubts about how to address this. The working group will be on the lookout for the SCR and will want to provide comments.
* SCR presentation - Larisa Loyferman
  + Trying to find/propose the best way to submit and maintain the GIC Data
  + The data submission is for 69kV all through 345 kV levels (GIC model should duplicate approved ERCOTs SSWG base case model for specific year)
  + This SCR is a first step to start conversation between ERCOT and Siemens to find the best solution for maintaining the GIC data by including it into MOD
  + We need to understand that we are building into the existing model with data that has already been developed and validated (at least the data that exists today)
  + TSPs need to remain aware of the data that is required to be able to more easily obtain the data required when the facilities are being built and/or ordered from the manufacturers
  + We need to ask Siemens for the best way to add the GIC data to MOD
  + Having a good reliable model is key to be able to trust the results
  + Josh (AEP) - At what point during a project would the GIC data becomes reliable enough to be included in the models? This is key, since we might not have the correct data to submit until right before or in some cases after the facilities are online
    - Larisa (CNP) - This SCR is looking for the best possible way for maintaining the existing system GIC data and the GIC data for the proposed future projects by including these capability in MOD.
  + Josh (AEP) - NOMCRs should be limited to existing facilities. NOMCRs 1 year out should not be required, since the GIC data for those facilities would not be accurate.
    - Leslie (ERCOT) - We do have data gathered from the previous assessments that can serve to give support to TSPs on handling the submissions to NMMS. We are still working on how this process will work out. Integrating the data into NMMS would be beneficial to facilitate the next vulnerability assessment.
  + Larisa (CNP) - the initial effort to gather the GIC data and create the GIC models for the GMD Vulnerability assessment was burdensome, having the data included in NMMS would significantly facilitate the next data gathering and model building efforts. The process to update the originally build GIC models was built on top of the data from the first build and took less than a few months. Having the ability to update the GIC modeling data consistently would help in maintaining the GIC models with verified data to begin the next assessment. Would really encourage everyone to look at the GIC data requirements and understand what is being submitted and realize that finding this within your companies should not be that hard.
  + Chu - What is the next step for the SCR?
  + Phil Bracy (ERCOT) - once submitted we will process it and it would go to the next PRS meeting, but it needs to be submitted 14 days prior to the meeting to be eligible for consideration. The deadline would be the 09/29 to be considered in the October PRS meeting. From when the SCR is received ERCOT has 5 days to process it and have it published by 09/29.
  + Chu - the SCR will be sent out to the group for final comments. We would like to submit it by the end of the month.
  + Larisa - We should not rush the comments from the TSPs, if we can't submit it to be considered in October, we can wait for the November PRS meeting.
* Steady state voltage performance criteria
  + ERCOT recommends using same steady state voltage criteria used in other planning studies for the GMDVA studies
  + We plan to bring this to October RPG meeting and to TAC for approval
  + Larisa - The results that you shared previously; did it change with the finalized version of the report? So, what criteria was used in the final report?
  + ERCOT - yes, the existing criteria was used

**Rollcall September 21th, 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendee** | **Company** | **Attendee** | **Company** |
| Chu Liang | WETT | Jorge Canamar | Sharyland |
| Matthew Tavor | ERCOT | Walter Reid | APA |
| Ping Yan | ERCOT | Eric Meier | ERCOT |
| Phung Nguyen | ERCOT | Leslie Williams | ERCOT |
| Phil Bracy | ERCOT | Jun Li | CenterPoint |
| Samuel Whistler | CenterPoint | Jianhui Zhang | AEN |
| Juan Santos | GPL/TMPA | Joshua Wicher | AEP |
| Omer Siddiqui | CPS | Larisa Loyferman | CenterPoint |
| Sirius A. | ONCOR | Omar Urquidez | BMCD |
| Doug Evans | STEC | Dylan StJohn |  |
| Farhad Nikouei | ERCOT | Chenyan Guo | Lone Star |