

# **IGG Conference Call Meeting Minutes**

<b>Date:</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> September 2024	<b>Time &amp; Location</b>	3pm - Conference Call
<b>Chair:</b>	Jack Walsh, CRU		
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	
	Suzanne Hudson, Sean McKeivitt, Catherine Keane, Tracy Caffrey, Rebecca Duggan, John O'Reilly, Gary McNerney.	RMDS	
	Anna Rourke, Jack Walsh.	CRU	
	Siobhan Melvin, Damien Power, Ken Tobin, Rachel Hassett, Carl Murphy, Paul Harrington, Catherine Leen, Kevin O'Connor.	ESBN	
	Robin McLoughlin, Jason McKnight.	Version 1	
	James Long.	MRSO	
	Peter Brett, Sinead Butler.	EcoPower	
	Judit Gal.	Orstead	
	Ian Mullins.	BGE	
	Caoimhe McWeeney, Lyle Scott, Lisa Williamson, Imelda McCoy.	Energia	
	Tallis Dixon.	Bord Na Mona	
	Aine Ni Cheara, Declan Hanna.	SSE	
	Desmond McBride.	Electric Ireland	
	Jack McCarthy.	Flogas	
	Antoin O'Lachtnain, Jennifer Condron.	Pinergy	
	Deirdre Lynn-King, Gerard Taylor.	Arden Energy	
Gregg Allen, Ceola McGowan.	Community Power		
Peter Breen.	Go Power		
<b>Apologies:</b>			
<b>Version Number</b>	1.0		
<b>Status</b>			

Agenda:	
1.	General
2.	Approval of previous IGG Minutes
3.	IGG Actions
4.	CRU Update
5.	Version 1 Update
6.	Retail Market Design Update
7.	MRSO Update
8.	ESBN Update
9.	Notice Board Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG, etc.
10.	AOB

1.General
J Walsh requested approval of the previous IGG Minutes of 28 <sup>th</sup> August 2024.  Minutes v1.0 deemed approved.

1170	Timeline and Programme for delivery of MCR1208.		
<b>Discussion at IGG</b>	An update will be provided on this action once prerequisites for delivery of MCR1208 have been updated.		
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> ESBN	<b>Status:</b> Open	<b>Due Date:</b> TBD

2. Actions – Previous IGG
S Hudson provided the Action Item Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 – Carried forward Action from the last IGG.</li> </ul>

3. Actions – New Conference Call Actions
No new actions were recorded at the conference call.

#### 4. CRU Update

A Rourke provided the CRU update.

##### Government Electricity Credit

Final date for customers to escalate complaints in relation to Government Electricity Credits is on the 30<sup>th</sup> September.

#### 5. Version 1 Update

J McKnight gave the Version 1 update.

##### IPT Evidence Review

Good progress so far and many thanks to all participants. Some follow up actions ongoing.

##### Cybersecurity Assessment

Due date of October 4<sup>th</sup> 2024 and any queries should be submitted to RMDS.

##### New Entrants

Some activity in this space however all in the early stages of the process.

#### 6. Retail Market Design Update

S Hudson gave the RMDS Update.

##### MCR 1232

Approval was given by Market Participants.

##### MCR1233

Approval was given by Market Participants.

##### CCR0021 New RM Code

Approval was given by Market Participants.

##### Working Practice Document Review

A review has taken place on all Working Practice documents on the RMDS Website, in doing so a number of WP's have been identified as being inactive and require an end date as they are no longer relevant. This list will be circulated for information purposes. The documents will remain on the website but will have an end date added to indicate the document is no longer relevant.

I Mullins enquired if any action was required of the IGG in relation to these documents and S Hudson confirmed there was no action needed.

##### IPT

All tests have completed on schedule and remaining tasks consist of uploading evidence from a Market Participant perspective.

##### New Entrant and Market Participant Assurance Strategy

Responses to feedback are being reviewed and will be issued to MP's in the coming week. CRU have been made aware of this feedback.

*J Walsh states that CRU supports the scorecard as an initiative and it will be a positive development for customers, will enhance the customer experience and will progress having a more customer centred approach and CRU support the scorecard coming into effect as soon as it can be developed.*

A O'Lachtnain stated as asked previously if the Balance Scorecard was a regulatory action as the assurance body is to be market facing and not customer facing, as such there should be a consultation process.

S Hudson advised the documents have been out for a period of three months now and feedback has been received.

A O'Lachtnain states that this has now become a regulatory action and has changed the assurance process by way of now including customer protection measures within Market assurance.

S Hudson advises the scorecard is multi-faceted and will benefit customer, market and supplier.

R McLaughlin states measures in the Balance Scorecard are the same as requirements for New Entrants and highlights that while it will enhance customer experience that is not the only function.

A O'Lachtnain refers back to the initial query on why the relationship between DSO and Supplier now will include the Assurance Body. Is there an issue with this or how will that be protected moving forward?

R McLaughlin does not see how the MRA is related. It is also stated that suppliers grow and systems will change, the Balance Scorecard will be beneficial here to identify any issues.

A O'Lachtnain states that he does not see the benefit and asks if it is still urgent?

R McLaughlin states that the Strategy is urgent and the Balance Scorecard is contained within it.

A O'Lachtnain has concerns that decisions are being made without adding to the quality of service, all major incidents that have happened previously would not be covered within the Balance Scorecard. Confidentiality issue is also raised again.

S Hudson advises that any information taken on by the assurance body is covered within the confidentiality clause in the contract held by RMDS with Version1.

A O'Lachtnain does not see how this relates to the confidentiality agreement already held within the MRA. It is asked again if production information has been shared already?

S Hudson advises it has not.

A O'Lachtnain asks again when the answer to the confidentiality question will be provided?

S Hudson asks if any other suppliers hold the same views on the Scorecard as A O'Lachtnain (on behalf of Waterpower)?

A O'Lachtnain advises Pinergy are also in support.

C McGowan states Community Power are also in agreement.

S Hudson raises that the Strategy has been overlooked in most feedback raised and requests that Market Participants review same if they have not already.

A O'Lachtnain advises that feedback has been provided (on behalf of Pinergy) and re-iterates that a formal consultation process should take place. A question is also raised on who has ownership of the assurance process.

S Hudson advises that the assurance process is in place for the Market.

A O'Lachtnain states that there is confusion now as the assurance body is acting on behalf of CRU not the Market and RMDS is not the assurance body nor does it oversee the assurance work either and asks why

RMDS branding is on the Strategy document?

S Hudson advises it has been created this way if the instance should arise that the assurance body changes as the contract goes out to tender, the strategy will remain the same.

C Murphy states that the assurance strategy is agnostic to the assurance body, the assurance strategy is the Retail Market assurance strategy that is approved by CRU and it is not necessary for any assurance body who would come into the market to provide a new strategy. If they wanted to suggest changes they would have the ability but they should not have to develop an entire strategy upon commencement.

A O'Lachtnain states the process for reviewing the assurance set out for v14.00 was complex after the new assurance body came in as it is their assurance strategy and not the market assurance strategy, what is being proposed now is a change that was not consulted upon.

C Murphy advises that the assurance strategy is written in a way that it is brought to the IGG for discussion and is approved by CRU.

A O'Lachtnain advises that the change in letterhead from Gemserv, to Version1 and then to RMDS signifies that RMDS are the owner of the Market Assurance Strategy which is different to what has been done previously.

C Murphy states that it was always the intention to have RMDS branding on the Assurance Strategy so that in the event of a new assurance body being brought on that it would not be necessary to update the strategy.

A O'Lachtnain states that if this is the case that should have been consulted on.

C Murphy asks where it is stated that the assurance body owns the assurance strategy?

A O'Lachtnain advises it is inferred based on the relationship between CRU and the assurance body.

C Murphy advises that while the assurance body can change the assurance process the assurance strategy needs to be brought to IGG and approved by CRU. The RMDS branding being on the strategy is so that no change is required should a new assurance body be appointed.

A O'Lachtnain states that if a new assurance body were to be appointed it would be their prerogative to change the assurance strategy. Feedback is also not considered consultation as the market were provided with a completed document.

C Murphy advises all Market Participants are expected to provide opinions on the assurance strategy that may be for the improvement of same but ultimately it is the decision of CRU to say how the strategy works. There is a limit to how much Market Participants can or should influence the assurance strategy as MP's are the ones being assured.

A O'Lachtnain states that MP's have previously never been consulted but have been asked to provide feedback.

C Murphy when an assurance approach is developed for a release it is brought to IGG and feedback is requested. This process is similar.

A O'Lachtnain does not believe this strategy deals with the high risk issues within the market. Governance is weak within the IGG.

S Melvin states that there has been no change in the way IGG operates over the last number of years, the term consultation may not be used but by asking for feedback it is the responsibility of each MP to review the documents and provide feedback should they see fit.

A O'Lachtnain states that with the addition of the TWG certain items have been moved across to that forum. Is there a Retail Market development plan yet?

C Murphy advises it is being developed at the moment internally and will be circulated in due course.

G Allen states the Community Power agree with A O'Lachtnain Change for the better is supported but there has been no consultation process, What is the need to introduce the Balance Scorecard, what are the benefits for suppliers and market and as a small supplier what is the material benefit relative to the cost of implementing same. Introducing this will mean costs for suppliers which can be accepted but will require a consultation process.

## 7. MRSO Update

J Long gave the MRSO update.

### Small Scale Generators

Marked increase in application forms received for Small Scale Generators from Retail Suppliers.

### Upload of Site Specific DLAF

Currently working through them, will complete in coming days and will be published on RMDS Website.

## 8. ESB Networks

K Tobin gave the ESNB update.

### Webservice Annual Secret Keys Update:

- Market Participants are advised that ESB Networks has recently shared their annual secret keys for the Production Webservice. These Secret Keys were to have been updated by 24th Sept.
- This is a periodical task and market participants are asked to apply the new secret keys as soon as possible to avoid any impact to the production webservice. .i.e.: connectivity issue
- ESB Networks would also like to advise that a similar secrets key will issue in November for the Test Webservice.
- ESB Networks will remind Market Participants at the October IGG

### TIBCO EMMA Upgrades

- Upgrades will be required to be made in Q1/Q2, 2025.
- ESB Networks will provide Market Participants with further detail for these upgrades in the coming Weeks

### Update on MCC12 Non-Zero Estimates during Power Outage Scenarios

- ESB Networks is continuing to explore a more efficient way of updating this Non-Zero estimate data and providing the data to suppliers more regularly.
- There will be further updates provided at the IGG meetings.

### New CCR to bring in new 19 RM Codes

- 19 New RM Codes are required as part of recent meter tender will be brought to the next IGG in October 23rd

D McBride requests that the API Secret Keys are issued with a longer lead time to execution.

C McWeeney asks for an update on root cause analysis of the delay in MCC12 data.

C Murphy advises that it has been resolved and a note issued at the time. It is still being reviewed at the moment with a possible preventative fix from the vendor. An update will be provided at the next IGG if that is successful.

**9. Notice Board: Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG etc.**

--

**10. AOB**

**Next Meeting:**

- IGG 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2024 at 10.30am. Meeting details will be shared in due course.



**Retail Market Design Service**

**56 Mount Street Upper, Dublin 2, D02 P406**

**Email: [rmds@esb.ie](mailto:rmds@esb.ie) | Web: [www.rmdservice.com](http://www.rmdservice.com)**