**DEV LSE Subtypes**

DEV LSE (which stands for Data Extract Variance Load Serving Entity) issues should be filed when a data discrepancy between a Market Participant’s system and ERCOT system is identified. DEV issues should only be submitted after transactions have been attempted and as a result of comparing data from ERCOT Data Extracts and the Market Participant’s source system. Manual intervention will only occur when all other standard resolution paths have been exhausted.

There are many possible scenarios that may result in differences, or out of sync conditions, between ERCOT data and Market Participant data. Within MarkeTrak, there are six different subtypes that can be filed to resolve these out of sync scenarios. For each subtype, ERCOT performs a series of validations to ensure the change requested in the DEV issue is valid. If the issue passes ERCOT validations, the issue is then transitioned to the Assignee for approval. The Submitting Market Participant and the Assignee on the issue must both agree to the requested change in order for ERCOT to manually update the service history.

There are also timing considerations for completing DEV issues. In this tutorial, we will review the timelines for completing DEV issues, provide an overview of the analysis performed on DEV LSE issue submissions, and demonstrate each of the six DEV LSE workflows.

**DEV LSE Completion Timing:**

DEV LSE issues are allotted a 75 calendar day window for completion. However most are resolved long before the allotted 75 day period. This is to allow for full resolution of the issue prior to the True-up settlement. The following outlines the expected turn-around times for all involved parties on DEV LSE MarkeTrak issues to ensure the 75 calendar day timeline is met:

14 calendar days for initial validation and analysis by ERCOT

21 calendar days for analysis and response by TDSP or Competitive Retailer

40 calendar days for ERCOT & Competitive Retailer to take corrective action

Issues requiring additional analysis or follow-up data from other Market Participants will be updated in MarkeTrak to indicate such a need. Market Participants are required to respond with the necessary information within seven (7) business days.



**DEV LSE Validation(s):**

***-: Happens at the submit transition. Tammy will work with Matt to enter data to force the error and take screen shots. Tammy will add any verbiage for Kim. Force validation +/- 2 day and that other validations can be found via the User’s Guide***

Validations are performed on the Submit transition for most DEV LSE subtypes. These validations apply only to the information provided in the required fields and are performed prior to the completion of the Submit process. The following is one example of a validation performed upon submit. Market Participants should reference the MarkeTrak Users Guide for information on all other validations.

+/- 2 calendar day validation:

For those DEV LSE subtypes where a Start Time and New Start Time and/or a Stop Time and a New Stop Time are required, a validation will be performed to check that the New Start Time and/or New Stop Time is greater than +/- 2 calendar days of the dates entered into the Start and Stop Time fields. Per Market agreement, a +/- 2 calendar day variance is acceptable and any requests to make a date change within this window will result in a failed validation.

For example, a data discrepancy with a Stop Time for a service history row in ERCOT’s system is discovered by Rep 1. The Stop Time in Rep 1’s system is 08/31/2016 and the Stop Time in the data extract from ERCOT is 08/30/2016. Rep 1 attempts to submit issue type ‘LSE Date Change: StopTime’ to change the Stop Date to 08/31/2016. This issue will fail validation on the Submit transition since the Stop Time and New Stop Time are within +/- 2 calendar days of each other. In this situation, Rep 1 should submit a D2D Siebel Chg/Info issue subtype requesting an update to the Stop Time. ERCOT will request a new 867\_03 Final with the corrected date. A DEV LSE issue should not be submitted in this example since the new Stop Time is +/- 2 days of the current Stop Time.



Once the DEV LSE issue has been submitted, ERCOT performs a series of system analysis on the data provided. We’ll review one example of ERCOT’s analysis in this tutorial. Market Participants should review the MarkeTrak Users Guide for more information on all analysis performed by ERCOT.

For our example, Rep 1 submits a DEV LSE issue type ‘LSE Date Change: Start Time’. Rep 1 is requesting to update their service history Start Time from 09/01/2016 to 08/25/2016. The issue is successfully submitted and transitions to ERCOT. ERCOT performs system analysis. One check that is performed is to ensure the requested New Start Time does not precede the ESIID start time in ERCOT’s system. In this example, the requested new Start Time of 08/25/2016 does precede the ESIID start time in ERCOT’s system. The issue fails analysis and the *Analysis Information* field is updated with the following message ‘Rejected as Invalid: Requested New Start Time is before ESIID STARTTIME in ERCOT system’.



Now let’s review the DEV LSE Workflows…

**LSE relationship record present in MP system but not in ERCOT system-Active**

*LSE relationship record present in MP system but not in ERCOT system-Active* is a subtype that should be filed when a Market Participant identifies that an active LSE relationship exists in the Market Participant’s system but not in ERCOT’s system. This issue type can be submitted by a TDSP or a Competitive Retailer and the Competitive Retailer on the issue must be the current rep of record.

Let’s review the process for submitting this subtype. For this example, the current Rep of Record is the Submitting MP.

The Competitive Retailer begins the process by selecting “LSE in MP sys not ERCOT: active” from the submit tree.

The Competitive Retailer enters the Assignee which is the TDSP. ERCOT should not be entered as the Assignee. The Competitive Retailer then enters the remaining required information which includes the following:

* ESI ID
* New STARTTIME – the start time for the active service history row to be added
* STARTTIME – this should also reflect the start time for the active row and should match the date entered in the New STARTTIME field. If the dates in these fields do not match, the Submitter will receive an error message and the submit process will fail.
* ADDTIME – current day
* Comments – comments are not required but it is strongly recommended that pertinent comments are provided.

Click OK to submit. The issue transitions to a state of ‘New’ with ERCOT as the Responsible MP.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to the state of ‘In Progress (ERCOT)’. ERCOT performs the analysis for this subtype. The system validations pass and the issue is transitioned ‘Passed Analysis’ by ERCOT. The issue moves to a state of ‘New (Pending Approval) with the TDSP as the Responsible MP.[show screen shots]

{TDSP VIEW} The TDSP selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to a state of ‘In Progress (Pending Approval)’. For this scenario, the TDSP agrees with the request to add the service history row and selects the ‘Update Approved’ button. The issue then transitions back to ERCOT in a state of ‘New (ERCOT Resolve)’.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to ‘In Progress (ERCOT Resolve)’. With both the Competitive Retailer and the TDSP in agreement with the request to add the service history, the service history row is manually inserted into ERCOT’s system and the issue is transitioned ‘Complete’ by ERCOT. The issue now moves back to the Submitting Competitive Retailer in a state of ‘Pending Complete’. The Submitting Competitive Retailer has the option to select ‘Complete’ to close the issue or the issue will be auto closed in 14 calendar days.

**LSE relationship record present in MP system but not in ERCOT system-De-Engz.**

*LSE relationship record present in MP system but not in ERCOT system-De-Engz* is a subtype that should be filed when a MP identifies that an inactive LSE relationship exists in the Market Participant system but not in the data extract from ERCOT. The Competitive Retailer on the issue should not be the current rep of record for the ESIID.

For each workflow, there are various scenarios that can be demonstrated. For this subtype, we will review a scenario where the system validations fail and ERCOT rejects the issue. For this example, the TDSP is the Submitting MP.

The TDSP begins the process by selecting “LSE in MP sys not ERCOT: de-engz” from the submit tree.

The TDSP enters the Assignee which is the Competitive Retailer. ERCOT should not be entered as the Assignee. The TDSP then enters the remaining required information which includes the following:

* ESI ID
* New STARTTIME – the start time for the inactive service history row to be added.
* STARTTIME – this should also reflect the start time for the inactive row and should match the date entered in the New STARTTIME field. If the dates in these fields do not match, the Submitter will receive an error message and the submit process will fail.
* New STOPTIME – the stop time for the inactive service history row to be added.
* STOPTIME – this should also reflect the stop time for the active row and should match the date entered in the New STOPTIME field. If the dates in these fields do not match, the Submitter will receive an error message and the submit process will fail.
* ADDTIME – current day.
* Comments – comments are not required but it is strongly recommended that pertinent comments are provided.

Click OK to submit. The issue transitions to a state of ‘New’ with ERCOT as the Responsible MP.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to the state of ‘In Progress (ERCOT)’. ERCOT performs the analysis for this subtype. For this scenario, the requested new start time and new stop time for the Competitive Retailer on the issue exists within a compressed period in ERCOT’s system. The issue fails analysis with the reason of “Rejected as Invalid: Requested Date change within compressed period”. The issue transitions to a state of Failed Analysis (PC) with ERCOT as the Responsible MP. When a DEV LSE issue fails analysis, the issue remains with ERCOT for verification. ERCOT reviews the reject reason and verifies the issue failed analysis. ERCOT selects Accept and the issue transitions to Complete (Failed Analysis).

**LSE relationship record present in ERCOT system but not in MP system**

*The DEV issue of LSE relationship record present in ERCOT system but not in MP system*, should be submitted when the ESI ID relationship is in the data extract from ERCOT, but not in the Market Participant’s system. A Competitive Retailer or a TDSP can submit this sub type. For this scenario, we will illustrate the Competitive Retailer as the Submitting MP.

The Competitive Retailer begins the process by selecting “LSE in ERCOT system not MP” from the submit tree.

The Competitive Retailer enters the Assignee which is the TDSP. ERCOT should not be entered as the Assignee. The Competitive Retailer then enters the remaining required information which includes the following:

* ESIID
* STARTTIME – the start time from the data extract.
* STOPTIME – the stop time from the data extract. This is not a required field for this subtype but must be populated if there is a stop time on the extract.
* ADDTIME – from the data extract.
* Comments – comments are not required but it is strongly recommended that pertinent comments are provided.

The issue transitions to a state of ‘New’ with ERCOT as the Responsible MP.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to the state of ‘In Progress (ERCOT)’. ERCOT performs the analysis for this subtype. The system validations pass and the issue is transitioned ‘Passed Analysis’ by ERCOT. The issue moves to a state of ‘New (Pending Approval) with the TDSP as the Responsible MP.

{TDSP VIEW} The TDSP selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to a state of ‘In Progress (Pending Approval)’. For this scenario, the TDSP agrees with the request to remove the service history row and selects the ‘Update Approved’ button. For this subtype, the TDSP is required to populate the first Rep of Record section under TDSP Information to indicate what their systems show for the time period being removed. The TDSP notes the period as de-energized and selects OK. The issue transitions back to ERCOT in the state of ‘New (ERCOT resolve)’.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to ‘In Progress (ERCOT Resolve)’. With both the Competitive Retailer and the TDSP in agreement with the request to remove the service history, the service history row is manually removed. The issue is then transitioned ‘Complete’ by ERCOT and moves back to the Submitting Competitive Retailer in a state of ‘Pending Complete’. The Submitting MP can select ‘Complete’ to close the issue or the issue will auto complete if left untouched for 14 calendar days. It is recommended that the issue be transitioned Complete immediately.

**LSE relationship records present in both systems: Start Date Change**

*LSE relationship records present in both systems: Start Date Change* is a subtype that should be filed when the ESI ID relationship is in the data extract from ERCOT and is in the Market Participants system, but there is an issue with the start time (allowing for +/- 2 calendar days). A Competitive Retailer or a TDSP can submit this sub type.

Let’s review the process for submitting this subtype. For this example, the Submitting MP is the Competitive Retailer.

The Competitive Retailer begins the process by selecting “LSE date change: StartTime” from the submit tree.

The Competitive Retailer enters the Assignee which is the TDSP. ERCOT should not be entered as the Assignee. The Competitive Retailer then enters the remaining required information which includes the following:

* ESI ID
* New STARTTIME – The New STARTTIME must be greater than +/- 2 days from the STARTTIME.
* STARTTIME – The start time from the data extract.
* ADDTIME – from the data extract.
* Comments – comments are not required but it is strongly recommended that pertinent comments are provided.

Click OK to submit. The issue transitions to a state of ‘New’ with ERCOT as the Responsible MP.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to the state of ‘In Progress (ERCOT)’. ERCOT performs the analysis for this subtype. The system validations pass and the issue is transitioned ‘Passed Analysis’ by ERCOT. The issue moves to a state of ‘New (Pending Approval) with the TDSP as the Responsible MP.

{TDSP VIEW} The TDSP selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to a state of ‘In Progress (Pending Approval)’. For this scenario, the TDSP does not agree with the new start time requested by the Competitive Retailer. The TDSP has the option to select ‘No Agreement Reached’ to close the issue or they can suggest an alternate new start time by selecting ‘Modify/Reassign’. In this tutorial, the TDSP selects ‘Modify/Reassign’ where they have the opportunity to enter a different new start time. The TDSP enters the new date, adds relevant comments, and selects OK. The issue then transitions back to the Submitting MP in a state of New (Pending Approval).

{Competitive Retailer VIEW} The Competitive Retailer selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to ‘In Progress (Pending Approval)’. At this point, the Competitive Retailer has the opportunity to review the alternate New STARTTIME entered by the TDSP. If the Competitive Retailer agrees with the revised date, they will select ‘Update Approved’. Other options available to the Competitive Retailer at this point in the workflow are to select ‘Modify/Reassign’ and enter an alternate date for the TDSP to review, or they can select ‘No Agreement Reached’ if they disagree with the revised date and wish to close the issue. For this scenario, the Competitive Retailer agrees with the revised date and selects ‘Update Approved’. The issue transitions to ERCOT in the state of ‘New (ERCOT Resolve)’.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to ‘In Progress (ERCOT Resolve)’. With both the Competitive Retailer and the TDSP in agreement with the request to change the Start Time, the service history row is manually updated in ERCOT’s system. The issue is then transitioned ‘Complete’ by ERCOT and moves back to the Submitting Competitive Retailer in a state of ‘Pending Complete’.

**LSE relationship records present in both systems: Stop Date Change**

*LSE relationship records present in both systems: Stop Date Change* is a subtype that should be filed when the ESI ID relationship is in the data extract from ERCOT and is in the Market Participant’s system, but there is an issue with the stop time (allowing for +/- 2 calendar days). A Competitive Retailer or a TDSP can submit this sub type.

Let’s review the process for submitting a LSE date change: StopTime issue. For this example, the Submitting MP is the TDSP.

The TDSP begins the process by selecting “LSE date change: StopTime” from the submit tree.

The TDSP enters the Assignee which is the Competitive Retailer. ERCOT should not be entered as the Assignee. The TDSP then enters the remaining required information which includes the following:

* ESI ID
* New STOPTIME – The New STOPTTIME must be greater than +/- 2 days from the STOPTIME.
* STOPTIME – The stop time from the data extract.
* STARTTIME – The start time from the data extract.
* ADDTIME – from the data extract.
* Comments – comments are not required but it is strongly recommended that pertinent comments are provided.

Click OK to submit. The issue transitions to a state of ‘New’ with ERCOT as the Responsible MP.

{ERCOT VIEW} ERCOT selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to the state of ‘In Progress (ERCOT)’. ERCOT performs the applicable system analysis for this subtype. The system validations pass and the issue is transitioned ‘Passed Analysis’ by ERCOT. The issue moves to a state of ‘New (Pending Approval) with the Competitive Retailer as the Responsible MP.

{Competitive Retailer VIEW} The Competitive Retailer selects ‘Begin Working’ and the issue transitions to a state of ‘In Progress (Pending Approval)’. For this scenario, the Competitive Retailer does not agree with the new stop time requested by the TDSP. As illustrated earlier in this tutorial, in this situation, the Competitive Retailer has the option to select ‘No Agreement Reached’ to close the issue or they can suggest an alternate new stop time by selecting ‘Modify/Reassign’. For this scenario, the Competitive Retailer selects ‘No Agreement Reached’, enters required comments, and the issue transitions back to the Submitting MP in the state of ‘Unexecutable (PC)’. In this state the Submitter has the option to close the issue by selecting **Accept** or the issue will be auto closed in 14 calendar days.

**LSE relationship records present in both systems: Start and Stop Date** **Change**

*LSE relationship records present in both systems: Start and Stop Date Change* is a subtype that should be filed when the ESI ID relationship is in the data extract from ERCOT and is in the Market Participant’s system, but there is an issue with both the start time and stop time (allowing for +/- 2 calendar days). For this example, the Submitting MP is the Competitive Retailer.

The Competitive Retailer begins the process by selecting “LSE date change: Start and Stop” from the submit tree.

The Competitive Retailer enters the Assignee which is the TDSP. ERCOT should not be entered as the Assignee. The Competitive Retailer then enters the remaining required information which includes the following:

* ESI ID
* New STARTTIME – The New STARTTIME must be greater than +/- 2 days from the STARTTIME.
* STARTTIME – The start time from the data extract.
* New STOPTIME – The New STOPTTIME must be greater than +/- 2 days from the STOPTIME.
* STOPTIME – The stop time from the data extract.
* ADDTIME – from the data extract.
* Comments – comments are not required but it is strongly recommended that pertinent comments are provided.

Click OK to submit. As mentioned earlier in the tutorial, a series of business validations are performed on each subtype on the Submit transition. The business validations for this subtype are as follows:

A check is performed to verify that the New STARTTIME is greater than +/- 2 calendar days from the STARTTIME. If this validation fails, an error message will display and the Submit process will fail.

A check is performed to verify that the New STOPTIME is greater than +/- 2 calendar days from the STOPTIME. If this validation fails, an error message will display and the Submit process will fail.

For this scenario, the New STARTTIME entered is within +/- 2 calendar days of the STARTTIME. An error displays indicating “New StartTime within two day variance of Service Begin Date” and the Submit process fails. The Competitive Retailer can change the value in the New STARTTIME field if the data was entered incorrectly and select OK to continue the submit process or the Competitive Retailer has the option to select Cancel. The Competitive Retailer selects Cancel and the submit action is successfully cancelled.

Notifications to impacted Competitive Retailer’s:

When ERCOT manually corrects service history as requested and approved via a DEV LSE issue, this can impact service history for another Competitive Retailer. For example, Competitive Retailer1 and Competitive Retailer2 have the following service history rows in ERCOT’s registration system:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competitive Retailer** | **Start Time** | **Stop Time** |
| Competitive Retailer 1 | 07/01/2015 | 08/10/2016 |
| Competitive Retailer 2 | 08/11/2016 | 08/31/2016 |
| Competitive Retailer 1 | 09/01/2016 |  |

Competitive Retailer 1 submits a *DEV LSE date change: Stop* MarkeTrak issue requesting a New STOPTIME of 08/02/2016. The TDSP approves the date change and selects Update Approved. The request to change the stop time from 8/10/2016 to 8/2/2016 for Competitive Retailer 1 would result in a de-energized period in ERCOT’s system so the TDSP is required to enter the ROR information for this timeframe on the Update Approved transition. The TDSP notes on the issue that Competitive Retailer 2 is the ROR from 8/3/2016 to 8/31/2016. The issue then transitions to ERCOT to make the date change.

ERCOT changes the service history per the DEV LSE issue:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competitive Retailer** | **Start Time** | **Stop Time** |
| Competitive Retailer 1 | 07/01/2015 | 08/02/2016 |
| Competitive Retailer 2 | 08/03/2016 | 08/31/2016 |
| Competitive Retailer 1 | 09/01/2016 |  |

ERCOT then sends Competitive Retailer 2 an email notifying them of the change to their service history. Here is an example of the notification email:

*A MarkeTrak issue was submitted indicating the following ESIID has an invalid start and/or stop time for the submitting LSE Relationship.  The Affected Competitive Retailer is asked to contact the TDSP if they disagree with the change noted below.  If another change is required the affected Competitive Retailer is asked to file a Data Extract Variance Issue to correct the problem.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ESIID | Competitive Retailer DUNS | Competitive Retailer Name | Old Start Time | Old Stop Time | New Start Time | New Stop Time | Action | MT # |
| 1213132132 | 111111112 | Competitive Retailer2 | 08/11/2016 | 08/31/2016 | 08/03/2016 |  | Start Time Change | |  | | --- | | 186051 | |