

Minutes

MRSP Performance Monitoring Task Team

Thursday, May 3, 2001
G.C.S.E.C.A.

Topic	Lead	Anticipated Outcome	Att.
1 Welcome	John Wallace	<p>John Wallace opened the meeting. No introductions necessary. Brief review of agenda items.</p> <p>*ACTION- Kathryn Hathaway not present- report moved to next session on MRSP Performance in California.</p>	
2 Review of Performance Monitoring Document Draft	All	<p>Discussion of new items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions section- add section to define terms used in document. (under Purpose section) Once we have solid definitions, they will be added. At this point, they still need refinement and dependent upon method used for error counting. • Event changed to exception to remain consistent with standard billing terminology. • File replaced with 867 transaction set. • ACC Continuing Certification section- this section was added after the last meeting of the task team to incorporate ACC rules into document. (no edit yet) • Note- tracking by service point instead of meter as there could be unmetered service points, or multiple meters tied to one service point as with a totalized account. 	
3 Discussion	All	<p>Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GMT Waiver – issue came up regarding GMT waiver when we were discussing timestamps on files and performance issues. <p>*ACTION- Tony Gillooly from T.E.P. will research and bring copy of waiver.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Error tracking- issue came up regarding tracking of errors that are not at the service point level. These are errors such as EDI file errors that occur before the file gets “through the door”. Will these be tracked? How? What criteria will apply? <p>*ACTION- Group will discuss at next meeting to determine what position is. Need to decide if these will be pursued or ignored.</p>	

4	Review of Performance Monitoring Report	Aycock	<p>Discussed examples A and B presented for tracking system, as well as report format. Overview:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method A- Tracking based solely on service point- MRSP may make 1 or 20 errors in the same billing cycle for a service point and will count as one violation. <p>PRO- same criteria apply for all three areas of tracking and scale does not change.</p> <p>CON- If mass errors are producing, MRSP is not being held accountable for each error.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method B- Data remittance, estimated data are by service point. Errors are by error count. <p>PRO- held accountable for every error.</p> <p>CON- can be out-of-compliance with as few as one service point problem. Scale not the same for all criteria.</p> <p>Vote taken on which method should be used amongst members. TEP only dissenting opinion.</p> <p>*ACTION- TEP will discuss whether they can agree to this or propose other scale ideas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format- discussed and alternatives were presented. Group drafted new report format. <p>*ACTION- Kimarie Aycock will present new format at next meeting.</p>
5	Review Drafts of Letters to MRSP and Director of Utilities	All	<p>Letters reviewed and edited. Draft samples of new letters.</p> <p>*ACTION- Kimarie Aycock will draft new sample letters.</p>
6	Discussion of monitoring by territory or ESP-MRSP Relationship	All	<p>Discussion as to whether you monitor by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESP-MRSP service points within UDC territory. There would be one report for each MRSP/ESP relationship. • MRSP service points within full UDC territory (not tied to ESP) <p>*ACTION- Group will discuss at next meeting.</p>
7	Review of action items and agenda for next meeting	John	<p>Went over agenda and date for next meeting. Set for May 17.</p>
8	Adjournment	John	

