

IGG Conference Call Meeting Minutes

Date:	30 th November 2022	Time & Location	3pm - Conference Call
Chair:	Jack O'Dwyer, CRU		
Attendees:	Name	Location	
	Suzanne Hudson, Alice Mooney, Oonagh Delaney, Catherine Keane, Patrick Moran	RMDS	
	Sheena Byrne, Zorah Blok, Sharon Cosgrove	CRU	
	John Bracken, Carl Murphy, Siobhan Melvin, Alan Keegan, Ken Murray, Emer Corcoran, Kevin O'Connor, Donal O'Connor, Catherine Leen, Rachel Hassett, Sinead O'Hagan, Siobhan Gettings, Rebecca Geary, Luke Shinnors, Ciaran McCallion	ESBN	
	Robin McLaughlin, Jason McKnight, Marguerite White	Version 1	
	Keith Plunkett	MRSO	
	Andrew McKinnon	Flogas	
	Julie-Anne Hannon, Ian Mullins, Ger Harnett	BGE	
	Aaron Currie, Mary O'Connor	SSE	
	Donovan Sheridan, Aoife Coppinger	Prepaypower	
	Caoimhe McWeeney, Imelda McCoy	Energia	
	Jessica Gregory, Ceola McGowan	Community Power	
	Desmond McBride, Ann Fitzpatrick	Electric Ireland	
	Canice Kenealy, Peter Brett, Sinead Butler	Ecopower	
Apologies:			
Version Number	1.0		
Status			

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

1 – General

J O’Dwyer requested approval of the previous IGG Minutes of 2nd November 2022. Minutes v1.0 deemed approved.

2. Actions – Previous Conference Call & IGG

S Hudson provided the Action Item Update:

- **1 – Carried forward Actions from the last IGG.**

1147	Supplier Categorisation for new entrants – RMDS to look into the categorisation for new Suppliers entering the Retail Market.		
Update for CC	▪ S Hudson reported that there is no progress on this action at the moment.		
Discussion at CC	▪ Action to remain open.		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: Action Remains Open	Due Date: 11.01.2023

3. Actions – New Conference Call Actions

1 new Action was logged at the Conference Call.

1160	RMDS to provide an update as to when CCR018 (new RM Code 305) and CCR019 (new RM Code 108) will be part of an MMR.		
Discussion at IGG	▪ See Section 5 Retail Market Design for details.		
Forum Logged: CC	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 05.10.2022

4. CRU Update

S Byrne provided the CRU update.

Negative PSO:

S Byrne reported that she is the Market Monitoring Manager in CRU. One of her current workstreams is the administration of the PSO. She gave the following update on the 2022/2023 PSO Levy:

The levy has been set to zero with the intention that Customers will start to see the benefits in Q1/2023. DECC is currently finalising the secondary legislation amendments that are needed to effectively allow the PSO to go negative. It's anticipated that this is going to be finalised in the coming weeks. CRU in conjunction with ESNB and Eirgrid, has been working to finalise the PSO payment timelines to facilitate money flowing from Suppliers to TSO, onto ESNB and effectively onto the retail Suppliers. We made good progress on this and the amendments to the timelines are going to be reflected in the upcoming "Billing & Arrangements Paper" which CRU hopes to publish to coincide with the legislation. However, if legislation is delayed, CRU is going to go ahead and publish the paper anyway in the coming weeks. In addition to that, there will also be an Information Paper provided. This Information Paper is akin to something that Suppliers may have seen around the Emergency €200 Credit. It will include FAQs which may be of use to industry. If Suppliers have any questions or queries, the team can be contacted at PSO@CRU.ie. CRU will be in a position to give more firm details in a couple of weeks once that legislation is finalised. The purpose of this update is a reminder that the PSO Levy is going to be going negative in Q1/2023 and people should be making the necessary arrangements.

I Mullins asked CRU if it could give any guidance on timelines. He read the Information paper that came out on Friday. It just says early Q1/2023. Are we talking about the first half of January or the middle of February? It's just to give Supplier's time to get their processes in a row.

S Byrne replied that the initial aim was for January. As sooner we can start paying these payments back to Customers is key. Unfortunately, until we have the secondary legislation, and that's passed, CRU is hand strung and can't progress it any further. She would say that it would be early as possible in Q1/2023 and people should really be preparing on that basis.

5. Retail Market Design Update

S Hudson gave the Market Design Update.

[IGG Forum Dates for 2023.](#)

S Hudson reported that the IGG Forum dates for 2023 are now available on the RMDS website on the following page:

[Guidance Documents | RMDS \(rmdservice.com\)](#)

[V14.00.00 Assurance Approach](#)

S Hudson asked for approval for the v14.00.00 Assurance Approach. RMDS has appointed Version 1 as the Assurance Body and they are in situ.

Attendees approved the v14.00.00 Assurance Approach.

V14.00.00 Assurance Approach Approved.

[DR/MCR1225 – MCC02 Meter Exchanges](#)

S Hudson reported that there has been some good discussion on DR1225 over the last eight weeks. She has met with CRU to discuss this DR as well. The plan for the DR/MCR today is to take votes, go around the table. Suppliers should state their name and the preference they want, either the original ESNB proposal, or the BGE proposal. CRU is also asking each Supplier if they could provide a short plain

English paragraph on the implications if the other proposal is put forward. Based on the fact that CRU isn't technical, it just wants a very short paragraph to be sent to them via RMDS. If Suppliers can get this into RMDS as quickly as possible, but CRU is willing to give MPs a week to come back on this. MPs don't have to vote, but if they don't, it will be taken that either DR is fine and a "yes" vote will be put to each DR.

Z Blok reported that MPs can approve both proposals, if they wish.

S Hudson asked MPs for their preference.

M O'Connor reported that SSE is happy with what's in the ESNB proposal, but it also happy with the addition that BGE has put forward in order to allow Suppliers to make a sale at first contact. SSE doesn't have any opposition to DR1225. It agrees with the DR but would like the additional piece from BGE added.

P Brett stated that the BGE proposal is the proposal that Ecopower prefers.

I McCoy reported that based on the clarification that CRU has provided on this call, Energia had said that it was happy with the original DR. This was based on Energia's projections on the Customer uptake. However, if the BGE DR was approved by industry, Energia would also be happy enough with that.

J Gregory stated that Community Power supports the BGE approach. If that approach doesn't get approved, the implication is that Community Power will simply sell MCC02 products to MCC02 Customers and won't be selling Smart products to MCC02 Smart Customers at point of sale.

A McKinnon added that Flogas supports the BGE proposal as well. Flogas sees it as a potential barrier to uptake if Customers aren't allowed to avail of Smart Data services at the point of sale.

A Fitzpatrick, reported that, after considered assessment at management level, in terms of looking at it from business and Customer journeys, Smart tariffs, new policy, the intent of the programme and timelines, from Electric Ireland's perspective, it's not looking for any delay here. From the business point of view, there's heavy investment in this programme. To push this out further is not acceptable to Electric Ireland. In Electric Ireland's perspective in terms of the programme, it's whatever the minimum would be, it wants to minimise the timeline as much as possible. She will put this writing in terms of the ask.

J-A Hannan stated that BGE is in favour of the BGE proposal. BGE will send on the plain English paragraph to CRU via RMDS. The BGE proposal is a build on to the ESNB proposal. They're not mutually exclusive. BGE's proposal will also allow Time of Use tariffs to be sold at point of sale and it will ensure a smoother Customer journey versus the original DR. It will still get the meters on the wall on time which is the main objective of ESNB's DR. BGE's proposal is more in line with the requirement to reduce demand because we're going to get more uptake of Time of Use tariffs at point of sale. The two or three months extra is warranted if we're going to get things right for the Customer at the outset, considering this rule change will be place for quite a while.

D Sheridan said that Prepaypower supports the BGE proposal, to be able to offer Time of Use tariffs at the point of sale.

I McCoy stated that she should have also said that when she was putting forward the Energia position, that Energia supports A Fitzpatrick's position, and is keen to keep the Smart Metering Programme on track as best as possible. For business investment and commercial reasons as well, Energia is keen to keep things as close to on track as possible, so is supporting the ESNB proposal.

S Hudson said that MPs don't have to send a note with their preference to CRU via RMDS but if they wish to, she asked that they send it to RMDS as soon as they can.

J Bracken stated that when MPs are being asked for their preference, will CRU have enough information to make a decision?

Z Blok replied that she wants to offer a little bit of clarification on that. For CRU, it would be useful to receive this information, which is a follow up to the preference which Suppliers have already indicated. It's useful to know which proposals MPs have approved. CRU would like to ask those MPs who have just voted that they would only approve either the ESNB one or the BGE one, to send CRU that submission because that's where CRU has to make that determination. If MPs say that a proposal doesn't work for whatever reason, obviously CRU will balance that against the various other factors that are involved in the decision. If MPs say that both proposals are fine, that's grand. For those MPs that are saying, only ESNB or only BGE, please send a paragraph to CRU in plain English because that's important for CRU's records as well as part of the decision making, saying how the other proposal that doesn't have their vote, would impact on their systems. In terms of a timeline for the decision, the sooner the better. We're under a time pressure as part of this. If MPs are able to send this paragraph to CRU today or tomorrow, that would be great. CRU realises that there a lot of other commitments to MP's time. The sooner MPs send that to CRU, the sooner CRU can get back to MPs with a decision.

I McCoy stated that both options are very sensible options. The BGE approach is just an add on to what ESNB has offered. When CRU is making its decision, the decision is all around timelines. Suppliers can choose if they want to offer this add on or not. That's within the Supplier remit to do. The timeline is the big one here, in her opinion.

Z Blok replied that CRU is conscious of the different variables in play here and is aware of the implications of the two proposals. It's a question of getting the different views, putting them next to each other, that's why CRU is asking for this to be in a written submission. CRU is aware of the different factors. She wants to avoid this being a rehashing of this discussion. For those MPs who have indicated that they can only approve one of the two proposals, please sent a written submission to CRU explaining what the implications would be for them, if the other proposal is approved.

G Harnett reported that not wanting to go into the detail of it, but from an BGE perspective, this is all about being able to sell Time of Use tariffs at the point of sale.

J Gregory stated that I McCoy expressed it very well about building on to the ESNB proposal, but if we don't go with the BGE option, Suppliers won't have that option, unless they develop some very complex programme to sell at the point of sale. Secondly, when CRU gets the responses from MPs, what is the proposal? Is CRU going to issue a decision via RMDS or will MPs all have to meet again? How is this going to work practically to be able to move forward?

Z Blok replied that CRU will issue its decision to MPs via RMDS.

J Gregory asked if MPs could get expect that decision by the end of this week, if CRU gets everything it needs.

Z Blok stated that she won't make a firm commitment on the timelines as it will depend on what's submitted. However, the sooner CRU receives the information from MPs, the sooner it will issue a decision. As of us in the room are aware of the tight timeframe, so this is not going to be dragging on for ages. Until CRU receives the information, she's not in a position to say exactly when CRU will issue the decision, but it will be as soon as it can.

J Gregory said, instead of a yes or no in the decision, will CRU give MPs its response in English, like Suppliers are doing, as to its reasons why it opted one way or the other?

Z Blok replied that's a fair point. This is the first time that she's going through this process, so she doesn't know what the normal procedure is in this instance. She assumes that CRU will give a little bit more information than just the decision. She will check out what the normal procedure is.

J Gregory said that it would help to bed in whatever decision there is, to understand CRU's reasoning on one way or the other.

K Murray reported that for the avoidance of doubt, ESBN's preference for the ESBN proposal. More importantly from ESBN's perspective, it's really that a decision is made quickly so that ESBN can get on with the design and build and keep that on track. That's ESBN's request, whatever way it goes, just that it's done quickly.

Z Block replied that's noted.

S Hudson said that ultimately the onus is on everyone to get their short paragraph, non-technical and in plain English, to RMDS as soon as possible. Obviously, DR/MCR1225 is not approved today.

DR/MCR1225 not approved.

DR/MCR1226 – MCC03 Meter Exchanges

S Hudson reported that DR1226 is up for approval as a DR and an MCR.

S Hudson sought approval for the DR/MCR.

M O'Connor said that she thought it was only DR approval and the MCR was only for the technical detail. Is that not the case?

S Hudson replied that ESBN is looking for approval for it as a DR and MCR today.

D O'Connor added that this was ESBN's original proposal. It was done in the past, that if everyone was happy to approve it as a DR and to an approved MCR.

J-A Hannon reported that BGE is happy to approve DR/MCR1226. She wants to clarify that there will be a letter update required for this. Will Suppliers see this in the next Comms & Engagement Working Group meeting in December or January?

K Murray replied definitely not in December. ESBN will certainly kick the process off in January. The idea is that ESBN adds a new letter specifically for this cohort that would go before the standard letter 1 and letter 2, which talk about the exchange process. This will be specific. ESBN will do the first draft and work that up through the Comms & Engagement business that we've discussed before.

A Fitzpatrick stated that Electric Ireland is happy to approve the DR/MCR. Her understanding is that this is the initial phase of it, where the 24 meter will be switched out for MCC01. The Night storage element of that will be part of Phase 3.

Attendees approved DR/MCR1226.

DR/MCR1226 approved.

DR/MCR1227 – 3 Phase Meter MCC01 Exchanges

S Hudson sought approval of DR1227 as an DR and an MCR.

J-A Hannon stated that BGE is happy to approve DR/MCR1227. There's a bit more to understand in terms of the RM code, 305. It's to understand what's been delivered on that by the end of March, but BGE is happy to approve the DR/MCR.

Attendees approved DR/MCR1227.

DR/MCR1227 approved.

CCR018 – New RM Code 305

S Hudson sought approval of CCR018, the new RM code 305.

A Fitzpatrick stated the Electric Ireland is happy to approve CCR018 and CCR019.

J-A Hannon added that BGE is happy to approve CCR018 and CCR019. She requested that for RM Code 305, that Suppliers get more information on what will be delivered with it in March.

I McCoy said that Energia is happy to approve CCR018.

Attendees approved CCR018.

CCR018 approved.

CCR019 – New RM Code 108

S Hudson sought approved of CCR019, new RM code 108.

Attendees approved CCR019.

CCR019 approved.

J Gregory said with regard to these two CCRs, and ESNB doesn't have to give an update on this now, but when will Suppliers be given a view as to when those CCRs will be released in an MMR? Will this be early next year? She assumes it will be well before ESNB starts putting the meters the walls. Can Suppliers know when this will be released into the system.

S Hudson replied that she will get back to J Gregory on this.

A new action was logged Action 1160: **RMDS to provide an update as to when CCR018 (new RM Code 305) and CCR019 (new RM Code 108) will be part of an MMR.**

6. MRSO Update

K Plunkett gave the MRSO Update.

K Plunkett stated that the End of Year document from MRSO for Data Aggregation and Registration will be issued shortly. If MPs have any questions, they can contact MRSO directly.

7. ESB Networks

A Keegan gave the ESNB update.

Test Webservice

A Keegan reported that ESNB expects to have the Test Webservice MCR1210 made available to Suppliers on Monday 5th December 2022. ESNB plans to issue a note via RMDS inviting Suppliers to avail of the Test Webservice.

Hub Relocation

A Keegan reported that a note was sent to all IGG Reps and Hub Relocation Project technical business contacts on 18th November 2022. The note contained all relevant information regarding connectivity checks being performed with MPs, with IPT beginning on 25th November 2022. The note also contained information for the planned cutover dress rehearsal which is scheduled to take place on a single day during the week of 12th to 16th December 2022. For the cutover dress rehearsal, MPs are being asked to provide sufficient access to their IPT EMMA to a member of the Hub Relocation Project Team and to also provide a contact detail to RMDS for a resource who will be providing the access. ESNB asks MPs to refer to the note which issued on 18th November 2022 for any further information. The high-level cutover Approach for the Hub Relocation Project is due to be issued today 30th November 2022 to all MPs via the RMDS Website.

Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme.

A Keegan reported that ESNB wants to remind Suppliers that the window to change Bank accounts for the next scheme Effective Date is from 15th November 2022 to 9th December 2022, in order to not interfere with the funds transfer process. Should any Supplier wish to change their Bank details before the next tranche of funds, ESNB asks those Suppliers to engage with it as soon as possible and before the 9th December 2022. In preparation of the next Effective Date activities, as communicated through RMDS, ESNB has moved the 27th November 2022 snapshot from the SFTS. An MPRN verification list will be uploaded to the SFTS on 6th December 2022 for verification by Suppliers. The list is not to be used to credit Customer accounts. The MPRN verification list will be available for one week until 13th December 2022, at which point it will be taken down. Suppliers are encouraged to download the MPRN verification list and compare it against their own databases. Notifications on the above will issue through RMDS when the MPRN verification list is available. Given the next Effective Date of 20th December 2022, close to the holiday period, ESNB would ask Suppliers to ensure that they have access to the SFTS. Access to SFTS can be arranged through RMDS. ESNB is discussing reporting requirements for over the Christmas period with CRU. ESNB will communicate any amendment to reporting to MPs via RMDS. Suppliers are reminded to ensure that the snapshot list is used as the register of record for the Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme.

Interim Microgeneration

A Keegan reported that at the last IGG on 2nd November 2022, there was some discussion around the Interim Microgeneration Solution and there were some queries that some Suppliers had. At this IGG, ESBN asked Suppliers to submit any queries that they would like addressed regarding interim microgeneration to RMDS by Friday 11th November 2022. ESBN engaged with RMDS shortly thereafter and RMDS informed ESBN that it didn't receive any submissions by CoB on 11th November 2022. Subsequent to that, one Supplier did submit queries to RMDS on Tuesday 15th November 2022. ESBN thanks the Supplier in question for sending in those queries. ESBN also cast the net a bit wider and went out to some of its BAU teams to see what types of queries have been coming in from Suppliers. ESBN wants to replay back now to Suppliers the key themes which have come out of those queries. ESBN will send out a note after this IGG Conference Call which will summarise the key themes and also some of the responses which ESBN provided back to help and aid further understanding with the interim solution.

A Keegan outlined some of the following key themes. He reported that he has broken this down by component. In terms of the Customer notification component, ESBN received a query from a Supplier requesting confirmation that a Customer's NC6 Form had been received by ESBN. ESBN responded to the Supplier in question. ESBN wants to remind Suppliers, that there are various mechanisms available in the retail market at the moment to be able to check and see if an MEC is associated with an MPRN, i.e., Market Message, Extranet, Webservice, Downloadable files. If an MEC is not associated with an MPRN, Suppliers can take it that a valid NC6 form has not yet been processed by ESBN. When ESBN sends out the note on this to MPs, it will list the various BAU contacts for the various teams as ESBN notes that some queries are coming in, not necessarily via the right channel into ESBN. ESBN will underline that and emphasise that a bit more again.

A Keegan added that in terms of the queries that ESBN received via RMDS, most of those pertained to the eligibility criteria, which was introduced by CRU in its decision and then how ESBN gave effect to that in MCR1213. There were some queries about treatment of sites which are not currently eligible for a Smart meter as part of the ESBN led deployment, treatment of sites which are eligible for a Smart meter, which are Non-Technical Non-Participant (NTNP) and also sites which are not currently eligible for a Smart meter through the ESBN led deployment but are NTNP. There were also some queries around treatment of sites with a MEC but who were waiting on a Smart meter. There was a query about how Suppliers can distinguish between sites which have a MEC, and are waiting for a Smart Meter, those that are eligible for a Smart meter and those that aren't eligible. ESBN has provided clarification to that Supplier via RMDS in terms of the queries which it has received. ESBN will emphasise the eligibility criteria which CRU has introduced which gave effect to MCR1213. If a Customer is eligible for a Smart meter as part of the ESBN led deployment, then they will need a Smart meter in order to be paid. That's straight from the CRU decision. If a Customer is eligible for a Smart meter as part of the ESBN led deployment, but is NTNP, they will not be eligible for payment. Currently if a Customer is not eligible for a Smart meter as part of the ESBN led deployment, then ESBN deems these sites by default, regardless of NTNP status. This is clearly set out in the MCR and the Working Practice which was approved and provided to MPs before Go live. ESBN has also provided clarity to that Supplier on the eligible RM codes which are eligible for a Smart meter exchange. ESBN will provide further clarity to all Suppliers on this in the note which it sends out after this IGG Conference Call.

A Keegan stated that in terms of the data collection and data provision component, ESBN received some requests from some Suppliers for a resend of export data. ESBN emphasises to Suppliers, that as part of the interim solution, there's not necessarily a mechanism for ESBN to resend data outside of what's catered for in the design at the moment. It's challenging for ESBN to go in and do this. ESBN has accommodated it in a limited number of instances. ESBN advises Suppliers to access and pull down this data in a timely manner, preferably daily, and in order to mitigate these issues going forward. One Supplier also sent in a query on behalf of a Customer as to why there was a perceived discrepancy between the export reading on the meter and what the Customer was credited back on their bill. ESBN can't speak with a lot of authority on how Suppliers pay their Customers back. There's no mechanism as part of the interim solution, to accept Customer reads. But in this instance, ESBN referred the Supplier onto a 345xml file, which should assist with any queries but there are nuances to it. The Customer could have been exporting before 15th February 2022 which was Day 1. It may not always align. ESBN will make this clear in the note. Also, in terms of data collection and data provision, one Supplier sent queries relating to the issuing of Version 2 Deemed Export files, which happened back in September when it was brought to ESBN's attention about the deemed export calculation. ESBN has provided responses to Suppliers and has

referred them to the many circulars that it provided out to the market at that time in September. ESNB also referred the Supplier onto the market design documentation and Working Practice 0031. To conclude, ESNB will collate all of this and send a note out to Suppliers via RMDS. ESNB hopes that this may aid and give a greater understanding in terms of the interim solution.

M O'Connor reported that this note will make a lot of the people she works with in SSE happy. She looks forward to seeing what ESNB sends on. She requested a session on microgeneration. She reported that MPs did it around Smart and Meter management, specifically around CTF. In SSE's opinion, it was extremely successful. She would like to request a similar session for microgeneration to discuss the data and how data is managed, meter management and processes like that. If we could have a comms session or a TWG. SSE is also happy to have a one-on-one meeting with ESNB, but she would like to request a formal session.

A Keegan replied that ESNB can certainly consider a one-on-one session with SSE. It would be more prudent. In terms of interim microgeneration, ESNB has implemented the solution. It went live on 28th June 2022 which is some time ago now. In advance of that, ESNB had seven or eight working group meetings in total under the IGG when ESNB was developing that initial DR and MCR. ESNB also sent out, starting in March, draft files structure definitions, sample files and updated market design documentation. There was a hypercare period as well for the market which ended at the end of July. ESNB stuck around with its own project until September which coincided with CRU's guidance that payments will be made by the end of August. ESNB can certainly consider a one-on-one session but ESNB's project has wound down and has transitioned to BAU. ESNB's ability to do large round table sessions would be quite limited in terms of time and resources. He doesn't think that interim microgeneration falls under the scope of the TWG either, so ESNB would probably be hamstrung there.

M O'Connor added that she appreciates that but when SSE loaded it into production, that's when the questions started to come. It's the fact that SSE is actually using it now, that's bringing on all these questions. It's not that SSE didn't have technical support before, it's the fact that SSE is loading it in and seeing different Customer accounts and discrepancies. If it's a one-on-one session, SSE will take that.

I McCoy reported that it would be better if we had a round table with other Suppliers. We as an industry are starting to process these payments to Customers and that's when Energia's queries are starting the filter through.

J Gregory stated that she agreed with what I McCoy is saying. It would be useful if there was space to do a session. On the MCC02, the ruling around MCC01 and if you are eligible for a MCC01 meter and you don't have one, you don't get your export. What is the decision going to be made around MCC02 because obviously we need to consider that as well? We're also getting close to early next year when settlement is going to happen for the first time. It would be worth picking up on what M O'Connor and I McCoy has said about a session. For example, Community Power has noticed that if you have a CoS, you're going to get data that you're not necessarily going to be paying Customers for as the losing Supplier. You're not going to be settled for that data. Presumably the data that ESNB is going to send to Semo is not going to be the same data that the Supplier necessarily receives. It may only be for four or five days. It's those sorts of anomalies that are going to come to the fore early next year when you run your first settlement.

C Murphy reported that ESNB can absolutely understand where Suppliers are coming from and that they're only getting up to speed to where things are at now. The market design is quite clear about how the solution was going to work. The questions that ESNB has received, it has answered. The note that ESNB is going to issue today or tomorrow should answer even more questions for Suppliers. If there is going to be a session that's held, the questions should be submitted in advance, and it might give ESNB the opportunity to direct Suppliers back to the areas of the market design that answer those questions in advance of any session.

J Gregory said that she has no problem with that. In terms of the MCC02, when will that be decided, whether the Customers will get data or not?

C Murphy replied that that's already predefined in MCR1213, that if there is a change to the ESNB led deployment, when that is and when that becomes effective, from that point in time the criteria for microgeneration deemed rules will change at that time.

J Gregory said that ESBN will stop sending data for MCC02 sites full stop. Is that the case? If you were getting data up until then and you don't go and get a Smart meter because you're not part of the cohort that's not eligible for one, ESBN is going to stop sending data?

C Murphy replied that the rules are, if you are deemed because you are not eligible for a Smart meter as part of the ESBN led deployment, if that MCC02 becomes effective, if you have previously been given deemed, you will continue to get deemed data, up until such a point in time until you have Smart meter installed.

J Gregory said that that's different to the rules at the moment. At the moment, if you're eligible for a MCC01 meter, and you're part of that cohort, and you haven't got one, you can't get data. That's different.

C Murphy replied that that's the rules that are described in the MCR. If you are getting deemed, you will continue to get deemed. If you have an MEC that is updated, after MCC02 becomes eligible as part of the ESBN led deployment, then that new Customer that has a MEC, that new microgeneration Customer, will not get deemed until they have a Smart meter installed. That's all very clear in the MCR.

J Gregory said that there's different rules for different people. We could get a lot of objections to that.

I McCoy said for NTNPs in relation to MCC02 and beyond, one of the queries that Energia got a response to was, ESBN has advised that regardless of the NTNP status, for MCC02 or above, if the Customer has a MEC recorded against it, an export capability, then it doesn't matter about the NTNP status. Energia will still get the deemed data for it regardless. Is that right?

C Murphy replied that's correct.

A Keegan added that in the way CRU constructed its Decision Paper, it says very clearly that if you're eligible as part of the ESBN led deployment, if you are a NTNP, you're not eligible for payment. What ESBN said in the MCR, and the Working Practice was that if you're not currently eligible for a smart meter then ESBN will deem you by default. If you become eligible for a Smart meter as part of the ESBN led deployment, then payment will come into it. That's clearly stated in the Working Practice as well which was sent out in advance of Go live. In terms of how ESBN gave effect to the eligibility in the MCR, if you even go back to what CRU said in its Consultation Paper, there was a limited time to get the solution in place and it should be as simple as possible. There might be little wrinkles or potholes in it, but this was a hand that we were all dealt to get this in in double quick time. It is very much an interim solution.

I McCoy reported that she gets that it's an interim solution. She doesn't think it makes any difference if it's an ESBN led deployment, for MCC02 meters, or if it's a Customer led deployment, if the Customer says that they are NTNP, that doesn't matter if they are eligible for a Smart meter install or not. That's a Customer saying that they are NTNP and saying that they don't want a Smart meter. Energia's understanding is that if the Customer is saying that they are NTNP for whatever reason, they would not be eligible for any type of deemed export. That's what Energia took away from that Decision Paper.

A Keegan said that that's more of a policy question then.

C Murphy added on the decision whether or not ESBN sends deemed data or whether it installs a Smart meter, the information that ESBN has to make those decisions, are not unique to ESBN. That information that ESBN uses is available equally with MPs. It's not just something that ESBN has. MPs have that information as well.

I McCoy stated that we're not going to get answers today but can take it up again.

J Gregory reported that she's had a look at the MCR, and it talks about existing Customers who are MCC02 who get deemed at the moment, they will continue to get export actual. But any new Customer who has an MCC02, going forward now, once ESBN starts deploying, will not be eligible for export. That's not in the MCR. It's really important that they now become part of this new cohort of Customers because they will not be eligible for any data until they get a Smart meter, even if they put microgeneration on their roof.

C Murphy said exactly. They will be treated very much the same as MCC01s and MCC03s at the moment.

If the Customer has installed microgeneration after the fact, where a Customer who already has Microgeneration, you could preclude them.

J Gregory said that you may get a backlash against this. If there are neighbours and both are MCC02, and one happened to get microgeneration before and now you can't get microgeneration because you're waiting for ESBN to put a Smart meter in.

C Murphy said that this is very much a policy decision. There was a lot of debate about that.

J Gregory said that this is new because these Customers weren't previously able to get it. This is very specific to the MCC02 inclusion now into the cohort which is part of the ESBN deployment. The policy was for MCC01 and now we're increasing the deployment. It didn't specify that those who were new to it couldn't get it. Whereas those that had microgeneration before were fine. We could get kick back on this.

C Murphy stated that he doesn't disagree with J Gregory. There probably will be kick back but these discussions were had that's what the decision was and that's what the approved design is.

M O'Connor said that this conversation has been great. This is what Suppliers are talking about. It's an opportunity now that Suppliers are using it, to have this kind of conversation. When will ESBN decide if we can have this conversation? SSE's analytics and BAU support team would love the opportunity to engage in this very conversation that we are having right now. That's why SSE is looking for.

C Murphy replied that he's not saying no, but the market design is really well detailed and is quite good. The solution is live since 28th June 2022 so Suppliers can actually see what data they are getting. Suppliers can actually play that back against the market design and rationalise what the market design is doing. The note that ESBN will issue should clarify even more the recent questions that it has received as part of BAU and the questions that ESBN received from a Supplier on 15th November 2022. Suppliers should have a look at this as well. If Suppliers still have questions, submit them into ESBN. ESBN will come back with good, rounded answers and hopefully be able to point to the areas of the market design which answer those questions. If Suppliers still need to have a session, ESBN can look at that at that point. If the questions are quite detailed, they will require a detailed nuanced answer. ESBN requires that detail to be able to revert back to the Supplier.

I McCoy suggested to M O'Connor that Suppliers set up a session themselves. She will talk offline with M O'Connor about this.

M O'Connor said yes, Suppliers could meet and then bring ESBN in.

J Gregory asked if Suppliers should ask RMDS to help with this as well.

I McCoy said this would be good, to just make sure that Suppliers are all on the same path. It will help Suppliers that are just starting to process their payments to understand the lay of the land.

M O'Connor stated that the CoS and the additional data is one thing that is stumping SSE as well. It's stumping in terms of how the Customer is going to see this because once they leave a Supplier, they leave them.

C Murphy said that ultimately, if you are the registered Supplier, you will get the data for the time that you are the registered Supplier. In the same in the existing market design, if data is sent to a Supplier while the Supplier is the registered Supplier, ESBN will send that data to the registered Supplier. If subsequently there is a retrospective CoS, ESBN will send the data to the new Supplier. When ESBN is providing data to SEMO for settlement, ESBN will only count the data to the Supplier for the days that they are registered to those MPRNs on the day that ESBN is doing the process. ESBN runs the settlement infrequently for a period in the past to avoid all CoS cancellations. All of that detail is in the MCR.

I Mullins asked with regard to this Supplier session if we're looking for support for it here or is it the case that we'll that this away because it's definitely of interest to BGE. He wants to know the next steps and actions.

C McWeeney replied that Energia will take it away and reach out to Suppliers after the meeting.

DUoS Security Cover

A Keegan reported that following on from a DUoS Security Cover review that was undertaken by ESBN, it identified an opportunity to amend the rating requirements relating to letters of credit and security cover. ESBN has engaged and has approval from CRU to lower the credit rating requirements for entities who provide DUoS security to Suppliers. These new arrangements will allow a column rating to be applied across the appropriate security cover options. In the coming weeks, ESBN will write to each MP and will provide a DUoS agreement variation note outlining the lower rating requirements. ESBN hopes that this reduction in DUoS cover requirements will be of benefit to all Suppliers at this time.

Negative PSO

A Keegan thanked S Byrne for the CRU update on the negative PSO update in the meeting. ESBN will shortly engage with Suppliers' TUoS billing points of contact to obtain Supplier Bank Account details, into which ESBN will be transferring funds associated with the negative PSO. Similar to the Government Credit Scheme, ESBN will need to verify the Bank Account details. However, if Suppliers are using the same Bank account details for receiving the PSO, as using for the Government Emergency Credit Scheme, then those details don't need to be verified. ESBN just needs that confirmation from Suppliers. ESBN will issue a communication to Suppliers via RMDS once the process begins.

I Mullins said that CRU is looking at the dates for the legislation and they are limited on the timings. We're coming to Christmas and telling us all of this on 22nd December 2022 is really not going to help, for a January rollout. He asks all the bodies involved be cognisant of the holiday timelines and telling Suppliers before Christmas doesn't mean that Suppliers are going to have things done for January.

At the end of ESBN's update, J Bracken thanked A Keegan for looking after ESBN's updates over the last while as he is moving onto a new project this may be A Keegan's last IGG.

8. Version 1 Update

Robin McLaughlin introduced himself on the call. He is leading the Assurance side for Version 1. Version 1 is hoping to reach out and say hello to everybody in the coming weeks. He wants to say hello and put a face to the name. He is looking forward to working with MPs as well. Jason McKnight and Marguerite White are also part of the team.

MPs welcomed Version 1 to the IGG.

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

S Hudson provided the outage update.

Outages

- There are no outages for December as of yet.
- Full outage details are available, as usual, on the [RMDS Website](#).

10. AOB

Two items were raised in AOB.

Registration of site with Microgeneration Installed

A Keegan reported that ESNB wants to let Suppliers know about some work that is ongoing at the moment on the registration of sites with Microgeneration installed which never informed ESNB. These are sites which may have installed microgeneration but never sent in their NC6 form. There is a bit of work going on at the moment to enable customers to retrospectively register Microgeneration installations. There will be a new part of the ESNB Website which will contain information for Customers about how to go about doing this, and the types of forms and standards that they have to meet. ESNB will send some information on this and will circulate it around to aid with any queries. It's ongoing and is due to go live in early December.

Christmas Working Hours

C McWeeney asked about Christmas Working Hours for ESNB around disconnections. She presumes the ESNB freeze date is in action now but when will they be recommencing? Suppliers received a calendar from GNI a while back. Is ESNB going to issue something similar?

S Hudson replied that the Christmas Working Arrangements Document is imminent and will be circulated shortly.

C McWeeney asked about the disconnections.

A Keegan replied that he will check this out and revert to C McWeeney.

Next Meeting:

- IGG 11th January 2023 at 10:30 – this meeting will be a Conference Call on MS Teams. Details will issue in due course.

Retail Market Design Service

39, Merrion Square East, Dublin D02 NP96. T +353-1-669 2410; info@rmdservice.com; www.rmdservice.com