|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TDTMS Issue Tracking Request Form** | |
| **TDTMS Issue Tracking Number:** | **(TDTMS Use)** |
| **Issue Status:** | **(TDTMS Use)** |
| **Last Modification Date:** | (TDTMS Use) |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ISSUE SUBMITTER SECTION: | | |
| **Submitter Name:** | **Submitting Company Name:** | **Date of Submission:** |
| **Sheri Wiegand** | **TXU Energy** | **05/10/2016** |
| **Submitter’s E-Mail Address:** | **Phone Number:** | **Affected Business Process:** |
| sheri.wiegand@txu.com | **972-979-5225** | **AMS LSE – Dispute MarkeTrak Subtype** |
| **Issue Statement:** *(Short description of issue)* | | |
| Today, when a CR finds the sum of the LSE interval data does not match the consumption of an 867, it has been discussed/presented (yet not documented in the MarkeTrak User’s Guide) to utilize the *Other* MarkeTrak subtype for issue resolution. Findings from earlier discussions reveal CRs are currently using the *AMS LSE –Dispute* subtype for resolution of the discrepancy. With the proliferation of AMS metering and our increased learnings on AMS data, the *AMS LSE Dispute* subtype seems to be the logical choice for this more common issue as opposed to the “catch all” *Other* subtype. TXUE proposes to add language to the MT User’s Guide clarifying the subtype to be used for this common issue. | | |
| **Operational/System Impact:** *(What is the issue doing to your system and/or operations)* | | |
| Operationally, the proposed language change in the MarkeTrak User’s Guide will not require any systemic revisions and may continue to operate as it does today. The required field entry for the UIDAMSINTERVALs from the AMS Supplemental Extract file in the START Time and STOP Time fields may simply be submitted as the beginning and end times of the service period being disputed. | | |
| **Market Impact:** *(What is the issue doing to others)* | | |
| The proposal provides clarity and consistency for the MarkeTrak subtype to be utilized when the situation of the sum of the LSE interval data does not match the 867 consumption data. Today, market participants are primarily utilizing the *AMS LSE – Dispute* subtype for issue resolution. The User’s Guide currently states this subtype is to be used when a CR is disputing “a specific one day interval” and a “new issue must be created for each additional day”. The User’s Guide is lacking on what subtype to submit for this 867/LSE dispute situation. Last year, over 3200 *AMS LSE Dispute* MTs were submitted and ~1400 *Other* MTs. | | |
| **Desired Outcome:** *(What do you expect to change)* | | |
| Requesting revision of the MarkeTrak User’s Guide language to align with the current use of the *AMS LSE – Dispute* MarkeTrak Subtype and define the situation as an example of when to utilize the subtype. | | |
| **Once Completed:** | | |
| **Please submit this completed form via e-mail to current TDTMS Leadership** | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TDTMS DISCUSSION SECTION: (TDTMS Use)** | | | | |
| **Date of TDTMS Discussion:** | **Change Request Created (Y/N):** | | **Change or Revision Request Tracking Number:** | |
|  |  | |  | |
| **Discussion/Revision History:** | | **Referred to TDTMS Subteam (Y/N):** | |  |
|  | | | | |
| Recommended Resolution: | | | | |
|  | | | | |