Please fill out the questionnaire below to determine your group’s new category based on the [Technical Committee Categorization Process](https://www.wecc.org/Reliability/Technical%20Committee%20Categorization%20Process.pdf) approved by JGC.

# 1—Group Information

Group Name: **Scenarios Work Group**

Completed by: **Amy Mignella and Rafael Molano (Chair and Vice-Chair)**

What reliability or security topics does this group address?

SWG models WI scenarios according to generation type and profile, and the integration of that resource into the grid. The work has become increasingly complex with the expansion of energy resource variety, distribution and the integration of clean and green energy forms.

How do this group’s efforts directly support WECC’s reliability and security objectives?

SWG modeling generates detailed insights into the WI profile and performance given a set of expected variables, a necessary segment of grid management given rapidly expanding distributed generation and other sector technology diversification. Often, because of this complexity, the interaction of multiple future assumptions and their effect on reliability can only be analyzed with modeling and scenario techniques. Reliability gaps will result from any failure to properly scope scenarios models sufficiently often, and these gaps risk being invisible until an interruption event occurs that reveals them. Scenario analysis also helps determine the impact of events and the probability of a reliability risk.

# 2—Industry Efforts

1. To avoid duplication of efforts and gain efficiency between industry groups, are there any existing groups in the industry external to WECC (e.g.,under NERC or an RC) performing similar or duplicative work?

Yes No *(If none, go to Section 3)*

Scenario analysis is used by the industry to assess risk and transmission network reliability. However, this use is very specific to a given issue and consequently generally employs substantially narrowed modeling assumptions. Scenario analysis is then often not the main objective of such efforts and the results of the work do not yield a broad system profile representing the WECC footprint

If yes, list those groups.

National laboratories, state agencies and industry interests.

Can the reliability issues be addressed by WECC staff and stakeholders participating in that external group instead of having a WECC group?

Yes No, because X

These efforts are either too limited in scope/geography or are inaccessible to the public and stakeholders. In addition, the efforts of other interests are not focused on modeling techniques, except to the extent of achieving a desired, specific objective.

* 1. Can the existing external group(s) appropriately address the reliability issue(s)?

Yes No, because X

They are geographically limited and/or are academic in approach and accordingly fail to most broadly structure the work and provide a result. Their focus is generally not on the scenario techniques, but rather on the other objectives of their analysis.

* 1. Can the existing external group(s) make the most meaningful impact on the reliability issues?

Yes No, because X

They are not public facing or sufficiently broad in their scoping and then would not equal the results of SWG. Also, their charter will often be focused on an alternative objective, not scenario analysis. Scenarios are a means to an end, not the end per se. Collecting data, preparing data, pre or post processing and other techniques may happen in individual groups, but are not consolidated by those external groups.

# 3—Western Interconnection Focus

1. WECC is considering whether some risks currently addressed through WECC committees might be more appropriately addressed under the RCs. The following questions can evaluate this issue.
   1. Is the reliability risk(s) your group is addressing primarily operational in nature?

Yes **No, it is modeling work that incorporates numerous operational and non-operational system considerations**

* 1. Do the RCs have the operational data required to address the reliability risk(s) your group is addressing?

Yes **No, the data from that source would be too limited**

Do the RCs have the operational tools required to address the reliability risk(s) your group is addressing?

Yes **No, the tools result from stakeholder discussion, WECC resources and specific WECC outreach for the modeling purpose.**

* 1. Do the RCs have the appropriate level of expertise required to address the reliability risk(s) your group is addressing?

Yes **No, RC expertise is mostly operational, while SWG requires broader and longer term analysis**

Based on your answers, where (under which organization) do you believe the risk would be more appropriately addressed, and why?

**We cannot think of other organizations to do the SWG work because the objectives of others are sufficiently distinct**

# 4—Group Outputs

1. The groups will be divided into two categories based on output or outcomes of the group. Is the main output of the group a work product(s) or information sharing?

Information Sharing Work Product[[1]](#footnote-2) (*Go to Section 5)*

1. Is the discussion ongoing?

Yes No

*Go to Section 6*

# 5—Work-Producing Groups

1. What work is mainly being created or produced by your group? For the remainder of this section, answer based on your main work product.

**The primary tool is a PCM model (e.g., GridView), but it often requires pre/post-processing data conversions, which are specific to each study purpose. Other work done is the analysis of the results to understand the scenarios’ impacts on reliability.**

1. Is the main work of your group temporary, or is the work recurring/ongoing?

Temporary Recurring or Ongoing  
*Go to Section 5a* *Go to Section 5b*

### 5a—Temporary Work

1. How long have your group been working on the product (if there is a work product being worked on right now)?

1. How much longer until you expect to complete of the work (if there is a work product being worked on right now)?

1. Who is responsible for completing the work?

Collective Group WECC Staff

*Go to Section 6*

### 5b—Recurring Work

1. What is the expected interval for completing the work (i.e. quarterly, annually, as needed)?

**Annually**

1. How long does it typically take to complete the recurring task?

**One year of total work; any reduced time allowance limits the scope of the final result**

1. Permanent groups exist when a work product needs to be created continually or on a recurring basis. Permanent groups should have a strong justification for the ongoing nature of its work. Does the work require a permanent group?

Yes No

1. If yes, please provide a strong justification below for any proposal to form (or keep) a permanent group, rather than a temporary group(s). Why does the work need to be ongoing?

**Scenarios analysis is a key, primary long-term planning approach used across the utility sector. Its use is common in academic, regulatory and technical study approaches as an effective way to understand risk and the impacts of differing system configurations and profiles on transmission/delivery reliability.**

# 6—Committee Relationship

1. Typically, the committee structure will be two layers deep. The JGC, RAC, or RRC may have temporary or permanent groups reporting to them. Permanent work-producing groups in layer two may have a permanent or temporary subgroup in layer three, but a layer three group cannot create a fourth layer. This will enable the JGC, RAC, and RRC to ensure that the work is continually aligned with the overall objective.
   1. Does your work product relate to another WECC group’s product?

Yes No

* 1. What is that relationship?

**SWG depends on input from others like the ADS data set, PCM and others.**

* 1. Is there an opportunity for merging with another WECC group or consolidating efforts? Please describe.

No, what SWG performs in sufficiently unique that a merger would only add challenges to the group’s scope of work and scenarios work will not be meaningful if it is narrowed to any other specific effort.

* 1. Based on your answers, to which WECC group should your group report?

SWG should remain as a report to the Studies Subcommittee.

# 7—Categorization

1. Based on your answers in the previous sections and the committee categorization process workflow, what categorization should your group be?

No group Forum Task Force

Merge with external group Roundtable Advisory Group

Refer to RCs Subcommittee Action Item

Merge with WECC group Work Group

1. Do you have any comments or concerns with the categorization or reporting?

This exercise does not offer sufficient opportunity to describe the role of any group; as such, decisions made from this scope of information will be unreliable. Also, this exercise should only have applied to new group proposals; existing groups with established roles should not be subject to this process.

1. Is there anything else about your group that JGC should know?

**The recent FERC NOPR regarding scenarios work only wholly underscores the criticality of scenarios planning, and does so to a degree that will prioritize the work across the entirety of the North American power system. Like other work performed by WECC, the WECC work will serve to inform the audience across the WI but not replace the work of individual interests for their own purposes or any nation-wide scenarios considerations. The WECC work will remain more than relevant as a single focus in the sector, against which other studies can refer.**

1. Work products are broadly defined as: guidelines, papers, reports, cases, analysis, evaluation, schedules, data requirements, and data requests. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)