|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Review of Scope/Procedure | Review of Open Action Items List | SC/WG/TF Meetings |
| ROS | 1. **ROS transitioned to using strategic objectives for 2025, which allow more flexibility and longevity. While ROS can review every year, revisions may not be needed as frequently.**
2. **ROS does not share a similar scope with any of the other subcommittees.**
3. **All of the ROS activities are well reflected in the goals.**
4. **Applicable to ROS working groups.**
 | 1. **ROS reviews its open action items (which includes ongoing issues not included in revision requests) monthly and tries to work towards completion in a timely manner, keeping TAC informed of its progress.**
2. **ROS takes action on around 83 revision requests each year and approves about half (39). The monthly average number of revisions reviewed is 7 and it approves around 3.**
3. N/A.
 | 1. **ROS meets monthly and meeting times range from 3-4 hours.**
2. **Meetings are well attended in person and via Webex by around 150 market participants (members and external participants).**
3. **Stakeholder Services prepares the ROS agenda and has a planning meeting to discuss about two weeks before the meeting.**
4. **On an increasingly frequent basis, ERCOT staff and some stakeholders file presentation materials (for revision requests) the evening before or the day of a meeting. This makes it difficult for subcommittee leadership to review the materials and to try to keep the conversation on a productive track, particularly on time sensitive issues.**
5. **Agendas are always posted seven days in advance of the meeting. With regard to meeting materials, a reminder is sent to working group leadership about posting their reports in advance of the meeting.**
6. **See response to Question 4.**
 |
| BSWG | 1. Yes
2. No
3. No
4. No
 | 1. BSWG is normally well attended and does provide beneficial and constructive feedback to topics discussed during WG meetings.  BSWG typically evaluates Black Start specific revision request, as well as Black Start related initiatives and other required actions such as the review of Black Start Plans and Black Start procured resources.
2. 1-2 Revisions requests per calendar year.
3. The group also reviews Black Start related initiatives, Black Start Resource procurement, ERCOT approved Black Start Plans and event performances.
 | 1. BSWG meets quarterly and the meeting duration varies depending on number topics discussed which can range from an hour to 3 hours. The December meeting, where all TO Black Start Plans are reviewed, is normally the longest meeting of the year which typically lasts 2-3 hours.
2. Yes, attendance does vary depending on discussed topics.  Normally, the most attended closed meeting is the December meeting.  Open meetings can tend to be well attended as the topics may be related to a revision request.
3. Agenda is mainly produced by the chair and the vice-chair, who account for any assignments from ROS or agenda request from group members.
4. BSWG is a primarily closed group that does require an executed NDA.  This can be a barrier for new members who may not be familiar with the process.  In some cases, members are less eager to provide feedback during discussions.
5. 90-95% of the time.
6. N/A
7. Yes
8. Yes
 |
| DWG | 1. Yes
2. No
3. No
4. No, defer to ROS
 | 1. Yes
2. 3-4
3. DWG routinely discusses procedure manual updates, flat-start case building, and event performance.
 | 1. Bimonthly, 3-5 hours duration
2. Yes
3. An email is sent out prior to the meeting to solicit agenda items which are compiled and published a week before the meeting.
4. None
5. 100%
6. No, consider meeting monthly
7. Yes
8. Yes
 |
| IBRWG | 1. Yes IBRWG scope has been reviewed and approved at April ROS meeting <https://www.ercot.com/calendar/04032025-ROS-Meeting-_-Webex>.
2. No
3. No
4. IBRWG scope has just been revised.
 | 1. IBRWG is actively discussing performance of inverter based resources, changing NERC standards landscape related to IBRs and any new performance requirements that ERCOT may see needed as ERCOT system and technology continues evolving.
2. Around 2, primarily NOGRRs, PGRRS
3. Changes to DWG procedure manual related to IBR modeling (jointly with DWG), ERCOT IBR-related events, IBR limitations/issues to perform in accordance with specific ERCOT requirements (with discussions of potential resolution), new IBR technology developments and changes to IBR interconnection requirements/standards in North America (NERC and other ISO areas) and globally, any large IBR related performance events outside of ERCOT.
 | 1. Monthly (only about 1 meeting a year is cancelled due to lack of topics to discuss)
2. Yes, more than 100 attendees at peak at every meeting (IBRWG updates to ROS include peak number of attendees from each respective meeting)
3. IBRWG chair sends out an email to relevant ERCOT team leads and Texas RE asking for agenda items about 3 weeks ahead of the next meeting. Additionally, MPs reach out to the IBRWG chair with proposed agenda items. Sometimes if a specific request is made at the prior IBRWG meeting to hear from a specific stakeholder sector (e.g. OEMs on specific IBR capabilities and/or limitations), the IBRWG chair or vice chair may reach out to specific SMEs and invite them to present. There is a standing item on relevant NERC Updates that Texas RE covers and Other Relevant Industry Updates that IBRWG chair covers (sometimes MPs reach out to the chair with additional items to bring up in these industry updates).
4. N/A
5. 100% we post one week prior but usually not sooner than that
6. Sometimes when certain RRs are discussed, may be sending out an announcement to IBRWG listserv and/or advertising at prior ROS could be helpful to make sure relevant stakeholders are present at those meetings. Sometimes MPs join the discussions late in the process or not at all and this may cause additional delays with RRs as these are going through the stakeholder process.
7. Yes
8. ROS recently updated and approved IBRWG scope and the meetings are well attended, this likely means that the answer is Yes.
 |
| NDSWG | 1. Yes
2. No
3. No
4. No
 | 1. Yes
2. I don’t have an actual number for this. Maybe 8 per year?
3. Change Requests, upgrades, CIM16, MAGE, Handbooks
 | 1. Once per month, 2 hours
2. Yes, usually 30+ folks.
3. ERCOT submits a list of topics to discuss. NDSWG may add additional ones from ROS or from internal discussions.
4. N/A
5. Yes, usually the week before.
6. N/A
7. Yes
8. Yes
 |
| OTWG | 1. For OTWG, the scope of the working group and task force is adequate and valid at the moment. Perhaps more engagement from market participants will help become more effective and supportive to ERCOT.
2. Don’t think there are any other groups that may be doing similar tasks, the only correlation I see is the Black Start Training Task Force that work in conjunction with the Black Start Working Group to plan and coordinate system restoration efforts, practices and training that is of extreme importance.
3. Not aware of any activities that are not reflected in the current scope of the groups.
4. Procedures governing training requirements are up to date and will go through the proper process to be modified or updated if strategic objectives are new, modified or updated.
 | 1. For OTWG, the subcommittees and task forces are actively addressing and proposing solutions for any new or ongoing system condition issues to be brought back to control room personnel’s awareness in the form of training.
2. Revision Requests discussed during the meetings vary depending on which areas are affected by the ongoing Revision Requests. However, from the past year, I think it has been discussed about 2 Revision Requests impacting market participant’s involvement.
3. The most routinely discussed items are related to annual required trainings and additional efforts to bring awareness to market participants into technology trends, event performance analysis and extreme system condition responses used as lessons learned from ERCOT or other Utility industry cases.
 | 1. For OTWG, the meetings are scheduled for at least one hour once every month. The task forces within OTWG members, are meeting at least an hour as an on demand basis, depending of the level of ongoing activity for the task force.
2. Meetings are well attended, having quorum and participation from market participants.
3. The agenda is produced and documented before each scheduled meeting using Microsoft products (Word, Excel, Forms) and shared with the group through email or on the OTWG website.
4. Don’t have specific impediments that currently exist to facilitate an effective and productive meeting. I would say, based on the growth and demand of the ERCOT interconnection, market participants and ERCOT seem to stay ahead in being prepared for the growth and regulatory changes currently facing.
5. The agendas are posted at least 95%+ of the time a week before the scheduled meeting. And meeting minutes are posted or sent, at least, 95% of the time three business days after the completion of the meeting.
6. The inclusion of more market participant best practices to bring awareness during training sessions has helped foster collaboration across the market participants and encouraged cross functional collaboration.
7. For OTWG, to the best of my knowledge, yes the task forces are aligned with the appropriate subcommittee.
8. OTWG is still necessary to disseminate information, best practices and changes impacting the utility industry and ERCOT through training sessions and workshops.
 |
| OWG | 1. Yes
2. No
3. No
4. There could be some minor changes, but nothing that impacts the purpose of the working group.
 | 1. Yes. Currently four revision requests are being discussed at OWG.
2. 8.5 average over the last 2 years
3. OWG routinely reviews and considers revision requests, in addition OWG is involved with HITE List Updates, UFLS Survey, Event Review and Operational Concerns.
 | 1. OWG meets monthly. Meetings are usually 60-90 minutes.
2. Yes. Representatives from various stakeholder groups attend the meetings.
3. The agenda is usually produced by the OWG Chairs based on items referred by ROS, ERCOT, or Stakeholders
4. None
5. ~70%
6. OWG seems to be operating effectively.
7. Yes
8. Yes. The review of revision request referred by ROS to OWG on Operational changes is vital.
 |
| PLWG | 1. In 2025 there has been an increase in PGRR referrals that has made the meeting agenda full. This has resulted in reduced ability to review the NERC Reliability Standards requirements to recommend appropriate RRs as needed.
2. Some overlap with DWG, SPWG, and SSWG but these are limited to specific matters. No, does not make sense to consolidate as there are a large number of revision requests only reviewed at PLWG. We have significant overlap with LLWG. Some discussions, such as PGRR122 – Reliability Performance Criteria for Loss of Load, are held both at PLWG and LLWG. We don’t recommend consolidation at this time, but should have coordination on certain of these RRs.
3. No
4. No. However, we will note that responsibilities include assignments from ROS. Sometimes PLWG receives ad hoc assignments from PRS.
 | 1. Yes, in 2025 we have lengthy meetings with robust discussion on several matters.
2. Between Jan 2024 and May 2025, PLWG has taken up 15 revision requests. We have also reviewed five other miscellaneous matters such as white papers, draft/conceptual RRs, and other ERCOT updates.
3. In 2024 PLWG regularly had on its agenda a NERC standard roundtable to touch on various Standards. However, there has not been time in 2025 due to the influx of RR referrals.
 | 1. PLWG meets monthly and the meeting time ranges from 1-3 hours.
2. Yes, we have averaged 110 Webex attendees since the start of 2025.
3. The chair drafts the agenda and carries over any tabled items, adds referrals, and coordinates with agenda item requests from stakeholders.
4. Sometimes the sponsor of a RR is not available / unresponsive to an emailed request to speak to the item. PLWG is scheduled to follow RPG which makes it challenging to anticipate the start time of the meeting and of various agenda items.
5. Generally yes – about 75% of the time we are posting one week prior.
6. We have discussed confirming in advance availability of speakers as sometimes key people are not available or in attendance (sometimes this is made more challenging due to PLWG following RPG). Also encouraging stakeholders to timely post comments on an issue, because some revision requests are staying at PLWG for several months longer than necessary.
7. Yes
8. Yes
 |
| PDCWG | 1. The PDCWG scope is accurate and current, with no need for revision.
2. See above.
 | 1. I am not aware of any outstanding action items that are assigned to PDCWG.
 | 1. The PDCWG is still meeting regularly on a month basis, except for one month in 2025; meetings typically run for about 2 or 3 hours.
2. Most meetings are now virtual, with an estimate of 20 to 40 attendees.
3. Do publish a monthly agenda
 |
| SPWG | 1. Yes, Scope is still valid and preformed effectively
2. No, working group scope is unique
3. No, scope is comprehensive
4. No, current scope aligns with ROC/TAC Strategic Objectives
 | 1. Yes, the working group continues to discuss and monitor open and emerging issues
2. 1-3 Revision Requests annually
3. Short Circuit Case Builds, protection scheme mis-operation tracking, protection system design, system reliability, NERC and ERCOT Nodal Operating Guide
 | 1. 3 open meetings and 2 closed meetings annually
2. Meetings are well attended, follow up on action items by group members is limited
3. Standing Discussion Items and solicited emerging topics requests
4. Inconsistent working group leadership and lack of active member participation makes timely task completion challenging.
5. 30%
6. Better active participation by members could lead to more effective meetings
7. Yes, working group aligns well with ROS goals
8. Yes, working group is necessary to achieve strategic goals
 |
| SSWG | 1. Yes, the scope of the SSWG is mainly to produce the Steady-State base cases which are still relevant for stakeholders. The SSWG is still effective at completing these functions.
2. The SSWG does not have a similar scope to another Working Group. These are the only models produced in coordination with all TSPs and ERCOT.
3. Not to my knowledge.
4. Not in my opinion.
 | 1. Yes, due to the technical nature of this WG and the evolving challenges on the grid, there is often many ongoing issues to resolve.
2. Typically, I would say anywhere between 4 -5 Revision Requests annually.
3. The large bulk of the agenda usually pertains to cases and procedure manual discussions. Since the manual governs the cases that are produced any proposed technical concerns usually require language revisions.
 | 1. SSWG meets once a month for ~ 3 hours
2. Yes, there is typically representatives from most of the TSPs
3. Either, previous items that are still tabled as well as email requests and agenda solicitation before each meeting.
4. None that I am aware of outside of emerging challenges due to the evolving nature of the grid.
5. Other than one chair in the past 4 years, the agenda is typically distributed on time ~95% of the time.
6. I don’t believe there are specific changes in the case of the SSWG. In my opinion, the current process for selecting a chair involves rotating representation from different companies. There are many benefits to this approach but there can also be many drawbacks. Often, smaller TSPs or very inexperienced members could be placed in a chair position, which can slow meeting effectiveness.
7. Yes, absolutely.
8. Yes, absolutely.
 |
| VPWG | 1. Yes
2. No
3. No
4. No
 | 1. Yes
2. 2 or 3
3. Voltage Profile, Generator Voltage Control Performance, Procedure Manual
 | 1. Quarterly meeting, one hour duration
2. Yes
3. The subcommittee will produce the agenda based on the open action items and the regularly discussed topics. They will confirm with ERCOT subcommittee members and send to the working groups for comment.
4. So far, no specific impediments exist. ERCOT staff is always helpful.
5. Usually a week prior to the meeting.
6. N/A
7. Yes
8. Yes
 |
| MP (Dinesh R) | 1. Yes
2. New to ROS, unsure of the scope of other subcommittees/working groups/task force but surely consider consolidation where necessary.
3. No
4. No
 | 1. Yes.
2. See ROS response above.
3. Outside of NPRR, PGRR, procedure manuals and case studies are discussed.
 | 1. Should consider bi-weekly with shorter duration?
2. Yes
3. Effectively communicated via email
4. None
5. See ROS response above.
6. Non
7. Yes
8. Yes
 |
| MP (Meng) | 1. The current scope remains valid and continues to support ERCOT’s operational and reliability mandates. ROS effectively oversees system reliability protocols, operational procedures, and market rule revisions.
2. While some overlap exists with PRS, WMS, and technical task forces (e.g., IBRs), the scopes are complementary, and collaboration has proven effective. Consolidation is not recommended.
3. Yes. ROS has taken on regular analysis of emergency operations, Ancillary Services redesign, and performance of IBRs, ESRs, and Load Resources—topics not fully reflected in the current scope.
4. Yes. Scope and procedures should updates to explicitly align with:
* Strategic Objective 2 (PUCT reform implementation),
* Strategic Objective 4 (transmission and planning integration), and
* Strategic Objective 5 (analysis of emerging technologies and reliability needs).
 | 1. Yes. ROS maintains a structured review of open action items in every meeting and prioritizes based on urgency, stakeholder impact, and reliability value.
2. Approximately 25–30 Revision Requests are reviewed annually, with an emphasis on reliability rule changes and protocol improvements.
3. Common topics include:
* Emergency operations and event reviews,
* AS methodology and performance,
* Transmission planning endorsements,
* Technology impact analysis (IBRs, ESRs, LRs).
 | 1. ROS meets monthly for approximately 3–6 hours, with additional workshops or joint sessions as needed.
2. Yes. There is consistent and engaged participation from voting members, ERCOT staff, and stakeholders.
3. Agendas are jointly developed by the ROS Chair and Vice Chair, in collaboration with ERCOT and stakeholders.
4. Key challenges include:
* High complexity and volume of issues,
* Occasional delays in posting due to evolving topics,
* Time constraints for stakeholder preparation.
1. All meeting materials are posted on time, with ongoing efforts to improve consistency.
2. Recommendations include:
* Sub-sessions for technical deep-dives,
* Earlier distribution of complex materials,
* Time blocks for recurring issues (e.g., AS, IBRs),
* Pre-meeting stakeholder briefings on major RRs.
1. Yes. As a TAC subcommittee, ROS is directly aligned with TAC’s strategic direction and reporting structure.
2. Absolutely. ROS plays a pivotal role in achieving all five of ERCOT’s 2025 Strategic Objectives—especially Objectives 2, 3, 4, and 5. Its contributions are essential to maintaining system reliability, integrating new technologies, and executing regulatory reforms.
 |