**PWG Meeting Notes** – January 28th, 2025

Via WebEx 9:30 AM

Attendees:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Richard Beasley - CNP  | Cindy Juarez - AEP | Jesse Macias - AEP |  Bill Snyder - AEP |
| Sam Cannon – ERCOT | Amar Khalifeh - ERCOT | Sam Morris - ERCOT |  Jordan Troublefield - ERCOT |
| Jason Cox | James Langdon - Vistra | Sam Pak - Oncor |  Sheri Wiegand - Vistra |
| Angela Ghormley - Calpine | Emilio Legorreta - Bravos | Steve Pliler - Vistra |   |
| Monica Jones - CNP | Eric Lotter – Grid Monitor | Kathy Scott - CNP |   |

* **Admonition**
	+ Sam Pak advised the attendees of the Antitrust Admonition**.**
* **Introductions, Agenda Review**
	+ Sam confirmed the meeting participants and reviewed the agenda.
* **Meeting notes for January 13**
	+ Sam reviewed the notes from the January 13th meeting. The meeting notes were approved with no revision.
* **Update BUSIDRRQ & BUSLRG Profile Market Counts**
	+ Sam said there was little movement among the profile counts. He reminded of TNMP’s plans for conversion work in Q1/Q2 2025.



* **Annual Validation Process Outstanding Issues:**
	+ Exclusion of De-energized/Inactive/Retired ESIIDs – Amar Khalifeh confirmed AV exclusion. Kathy Scott asked if ESIIDs de-energized between 12/31/24 and 2/28/25 would be included. Amar said those ESIs would be excluded.
	+ Exclusion of BUSNODEM, BUSIDRRQ, BUSLRG, BUSOGFLT, NMLIGHT, and NMFLT load profiles – Amar confirmed AV exclusion.
	+ Exclusion of no usage months – Amar confirmed ESIIDs with no usage months for the period of evaluation would be excluded from AV processing.
	+ Confirmation of Maxed Meter Demand Factor – Amar said the queries for business and residential are separate thus the max meter demand is calculated from calendar months and may not necessarily align with the demand values on customer’s invoices.

Bill Snyder inquired if PV profiles will be excluded, which Amar confirmed including WD and DG profiles as well. Thus, if a RESHI is noted as PV, it will not be evaluated for HI or LO and will likely fall into the defaulted “base” profile.

Amar said some ESIIDS will be subject to lags and gaps, but this AV run should be better than the previous. Sheri Wiegand commented that the late February exclusion of the “bad” status ESIs will improve the AV data.

* **2025 Annual Validation Kickoff Preparation**
	+ Sam observed ERCOT is addressing the questions raised in the previous meeting. Sam asked the TDSPs if there was agreement for a late February AV kickoff. Kathy and Jesse Macias agreed for CenterPoint and AEP, respectively. Bill inquired what type of MarkeTrak would be used by ERCOT. Amar said the MarkeTrak type will be confirmed by email before the MarkeTraks are sent.
* **Future Annual Validation Process Enhancements**
	+ Sam suggested a whiteboard session at ERCOT to clarify future AV enhancements. Cindy Juarez and Sheri voiced agreement. Sam opened the forum to session suggestions.
	+ Sheri mentioned expanding the three-year lookback to five years. Kathy and Sheri discussed the longer lookback would include more data although more anomalies are included in an expanded lookback. Amar said a larger sample produces better results and a new set of load profiles should be considered.
	+ Sam said the topics of Load Profile shape adjustments and future AV process improvements could be kept separate for discussion purposes.
	+ Sheri mentioned previous discussion to review the residential load shapes. Amar displayed usage shapes for RESLOWR, RESHIWR, RESLOPV, and RESHIPV. The shapes for RESLOWR and RESHIWR showed consistency while the RESLOPV and RESHIPV were less focused.
	+ Sam said the dive needed to extrapolate meaningful data from the RESLOPV and RESHIPV shapes reinforces the need for a February whiteboard session. Sam inquired if ERCOT has the bandwidth to perform certain sensitivities, such as the number of data points in a three-year lookback versus a five-year lookback. He added PWG did not want to overburden ERCOT. Amar said the lookback toggle involves a code change, and the AV process could be run on both the new and old methods to observe model impact.
	+ Kathy said a revamping of the AV process is needed rather than tweaking, considering the effort needed and the three-year AV cycle. Sam agreed with the need and said revamping is down the road. Amar concurred and observed there are competing ERCOT priorities. Kathy said there should be a larger resource commitment from ERCOT to avoid the treadmill of doing things the same way. Sam said Kathy’s points are valid and ERCOT resources will be needed to continue moving forward.
* **2025 Goals and 2024 Accomplishments**
	+ Sam reviewed the slide listing PWG’s 2024 Accomplishments and 2025 Goals. No revisions were made.

**2024 PWG Accomplishments:**

* Recommended suspension of 2024 Annual Validation processing
* Worked with ERCOT Forecasting Team to compare the beginning of AV against the current AV/Load Profile landscape
* Assessing and evaluating existing process of Profile Decision Tree methodology for BUS & RES profiles and as it relates to Annual Validation (on going)
* Reviewed draft LPGRR on conversion of Excel to Word format: LPG Appendix D, Profile Decision Tree
* Memorialized and posted Purpose and Needs for Load Profiles and Annual Validation to PWG main page (to be reviewed annually)

**2025 PWG Goals:**

* Explore enhancements to future AV processing requirements
* Engage in market efforts related to load profiles
* Support and update continuing efforts for IDR/AMS transition plans
* Review enhancements to Load Profiling Guide where applicable
* **Other Business**
	+ Sam observed the recent PWG focus on AV delayed PWG review of the newly converted Word version of the Decision Tree. He said the impending AV changes would impact the Decision Tree. Sam suggested waiting to gauge those impacts before reviewing the new Decision Tree. Jordan advised there was not pressing urgency to complete the review. Jesse agreed work should not be duplicated. Sam said the Decision Tree review would be paused to evaluate the AV changes.

**Future Meeting Dates –** 2/13/25 at 9:30 am. The meeting is in-person with WebEx coverage.

* **The meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.**