



## **PGRR 109: ERCOT Responses to TAEBA's Comment**

Sun Wook Kang  
Dynamic Studies, ERCOT

PLWG Meeting  
October 18, 2023

# PGRR109: ERCOT Response to TAEBA's Comments

- ❑ ERCOT appreciates the comments from Texas Advanced Energy Business Alliance (TAEBA)
- ❑ ERCOT has the following responses to TAEBA's suggestions based on the reasons outlined in the [ERCOT comments](#) posted on Oct 10

# Summary of ERCOT Responses

## ❑ Regarding TAEBA's Suggestion: Reduce ERCOT's Response Time to 5 Business Days

ERCOT Response:

- ERCOT needs the 10 Business Day timeframe for thorough review
- ERCOT Staff needs sufficient time as we may need to review models in more details, additional communications and/or discussions internally and/or externally

## ❑ Regarding TAEBA's Feedback: Unclear Triggers for 20 Business Day Extension

ERCOT Response:

- The extension acts as a buffer period
- Unusual situations (e.g., high volume of review requests or urgent tasks) may arise

## Summary of ERCOT Responses (continued)

### ❑ Regarding TAEBA's Concern: Defining IBR Changes Needing Dynamic Model Updates

ERCOT Response:

- ERCOT does not have discretion and is not in the position to make the determinations
- ERCOT recommends IBR owners to closely work with OEMs as they have comprehensive insight of the equipment and complex dynamic models

### ❑ Regarding TAEBA's suggestion: Reduce TSP Dynamic Stability Study Timeline to 30 Days

ERCOT Response:

- The 30-day timeline was discussed, and the DWG TSPs reached an agreement on the 90 days since TSPs often manage various workloads and study requests

## Next Steps

- ❑ Based on the reasons mentioned, ERCOT encourages stakeholders to recommend approval of PGRR109 in its original form as submitted by ERCOT
  
- ❑ Next Steps and Timelines
  - ROS in November
  - TAC in December
  - Board of Directors in December

# Questions?



Sun Wook Kang, [Sunwook.Kang@ercot.com](mailto:Sunwook.Kang@ercot.com)