

IGG Conference Call Meeting Minutes

Date:	28 th September 2022	Time & Location	3pm - Conference Call
Chair:	Jack Walsh, CRU		
Attendees:	Name	Location	
	Alice Mooney, Oonagh Delaney, Catherine Keane, Patrick Moran, Tracy Caffrey	RMDS	
	Sarah McCauley, Zorah Blok, Robert O'Rourke	CRU	
	Siobhan Melvin, Alan Keegan, Ken Murray, Emer Corcoran, Donal O'Connor, Catherine Leen, Rachel Hassett, Sinead O'Hagan, David Deally	ESBN	
	Simon Fox-Mella, Sarah Fuller	Gemserv	
	Jim Long	MRSO	
	Andrew McKinnon	Flogas	
	Julie-Anne Hannon, Ian Mullins, Ger Harnett	BGE	
	Aaron Currie, Mary O'Connor	SSE	
	Donovan Sheridan	Prepaypower	
	Caoimhe McWeeney, Imelda McCoy	Energia	
	Jessica Gregory, Ceola McGowan	Community Power	
	Desmond McBride	Electric Ireland	
Canice Kenealy, Peter Brett	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.	Gemserv Update
9.	Notice Board Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG, etc.
10.	AOB

1 – General
J Walsh requested approval of the previous IGG Minutes of 24 th August 2022. Minutes v1.0 deemed approved.

2. Actions – Previous Conference Call & IGG
O Delaney provided the Action Item Update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 – 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O Delaney reported that there is no progress on this action at the moment. 		
Discussion at CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: Action Remains Open	Due Date: 02.11.2022

1156	Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme – CRU to look at the possibility of a lessons learnt session.		
Update for CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ O Delaney reported that an Extraordinary IGG took place on 15th September 2022 which looked at the lessons learnt from the Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme. 		
Discussion at CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action deemed closed. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CRU	Status: Action deemed Closed	Due Date: 28.09.2022

1157	TUoS Tariff – CRU to provide an update on the changes to the TUoS structure in the Network Tariff Consultation.		
Update for CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CRU provided an update on TUoS in the Network Tariff Consultation, see Section 5 Retail Market Design for details . 		
Discussion at CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CRU	Status: Action deemed Closed	Due Date: 02.11.2022

3. Actions – New Conference Call Actions
2 new Actions were logged at the Conference Call.

1158	Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme – Suppliers to revert to ESBN via RMDS as to whether they intend or not to use the same Bank Account details going forward.		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 4 CRU Update for details. 		
Forum Logged: CC	Assigned to: Suppliers	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 05.10.2022

1159	Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme – Suppliers to revert to ESBN via RMDS if they want a MPRN list of DG1 and DG2s.		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 4 CRU Update for details. 		
Forum Logged: CC	Assigned to: Suppliers	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 05.10.2022

4. CRU Update

S McCauley provided the CRU update.

Electricity Credit Benefit Scheme - Update provided post IGG on 29th September 2022:

RMDS issued the following note to MPs on behalf of CRU: *“Further to IGG discussion yesterday following verbal advice from the Dept, the CRU has now received written advice stating that the payment of €600 for the upcoming Government Electricity Credit scheme is inclusive of VAT, not exclusive of VAT. The three payments advised by the Dept will be €183.49 each excluding VAT”.*

S McCauley said that MPs have probably heard the announcement in the Budget yesterday, that the Government has decided to provide three payments of €200 excluding VAT to domestic electricity Customers. The legislation is to include three payment periods. The first credit is to be provided in the November/December billing cycle. The second is to be provided in the January/February billing cycle and the third payment is to be provided in the March/April billing cycle. CRU would like to get confirmation today from MPs if they have any issues with the payment periods or if they can provide these payments in those timeframes. CRU would like Suppliers to let them know this as soon as possible. There will be one overarching scheme with three separate payments and the same principles as the previous scheme will be applied. The legislation on this is forthcoming. The specific dates as per the last time will be set out in the regulations. The regulations will include the relevant date and the effective date, which we refer to as the snapshot date. CRU will develop an updated Guidance document and updated FAQs. CRU will schedule an Extraordinary IGG once it has more information on this. Hopefully CRU will get more information and will be able to schedule the Extraordinary IGG for next week.

S Melvin asked if the €200 is exclusive of VAT.

S McCauley replied yes, it is exclusive of VAT. This might make it slightly cleaner this time around to explain to Customers.

J Gregory asked when Suppliers have to get back to CRU on whether they are okay with the timeframes and the commitment on that. Do Suppliers have to get back to CRU as soon as possible?

S McCauley replied that she appreciates that this is very short notice, but those three payments periods are to be set out in the legislation. The idea is that it would be on back-to-back bills. She asked that Suppliers get back to CRU on this as soon as possible.

J Gregory added that this is effectively bi-monthly billing, with a bill every month with that credit applied for the next three bills. There is a bit of work that needs to go into this, and this is the first time that Suppliers have actually heard about the schedule that needs to be applied. She won't be able to get back to CRU on this today but will try to get back as soon as possible. Can CRU confirm that the €200 is below the line?

S McCauley replied yes. Hopefully this will make it a bit easier to explain to Customers.

M O'Connor asked if it's three €200 payments, a total of €600?

S McCauley replied yes.

A McKinnon said as S McCauley has said that there is one scheme, will there be one snapshot date?

S McCauley replied that it's one overarching scheme, but there will be separate payments. There will be one relevant date, one snapshot in terms of the funding. The relevant date relates to the date that the funds are transferred to ESN. But there will be three effective dates, three separate snapshots for Suppliers.

S Melvin stated that in advance of the Extraordinary IGG, and given the tight timelines, ESN is going to be using the same bank account as it did previously. She asked Suppliers to confirm via RMDS if they will be using the same bank account details or not, by next Wednesday 5th October 2022. If Suppliers are going to change their Bank Account details, ESN will have to verify them again with a penny test.

A new action was logged,

Action 1158: Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme – Suppliers to revert to ESN via RMDS as to whether they intend or not to use the same Bank Account details going forward.

S Melvin added that in the previous scheme, ESN made two lists of MPRNs available. If any Supplier wants a MPRN list of DG1 and DG2, ESN can make those lists available. Suppliers are asked to come back on these to ESN via RMDS by Wednesday 5th October 2022.

A new action was logged,

Action 1159: Electricity Costs Benefit Scheme – Suppliers to revert to ESN via RMDS if they want a MPRN list of DG1 and DG2s.

S Melvin asked that Suppliers, in the meantime, continue to de-register any eligible sites, particularly those sites where unallocated credit was returned. If any of those MPRNs are eligible for de-registration, Suppliers should get them de-registered so that they don't go out in the next snapshots.

5. Retail Market Design Update

O Delaney gave the Market Design Update.

MMR v13.4.

O Delaney reported that a note issued to MPs yesterday about an MMR which covers the updated CTF Briefing document which will go live on 25th October 2022.

V14.00.00 Assurance Approach

O Delaney asked for approval for the v14.00.00 Assurance Approach document. RMDS hasn't received any recent feedback.

Attendees agreed to approve the Assurance Approach.

J-A Hannon reported that BGE submitted comments to RMDS on this yesterday. These comments were on pages 42 and 43. There were two deletions. One was with respect to the TWG being the place where MPs can discuss changes. BGE requests that this is put back in as the TWG is the place where MPs would discuss changes to MCRs. There is a footnote at the end of page 43 about the IPT workbooks and when they will be delivered to MPs, but this was deleted which was implying that MPs wouldn't be getting them, but she assumes that MPs will. BGE is asking for these deletions to be re-instated as the rationale isn't clear as to why they wouldn't be included.

O Delaney replied that the first one is probably okay but the fact that the date of the IPT workbooks being issued was removed is because we're a good distance out from actually issuing the IPT workbooks. The date shouldn't change but may change.

J-A Hannon requested that it's even put in that MPs will get IPT workbooks.

O Delaney replied yes, this will be put in.

MCR1213 – Interim Retail Microgen Solution

O Delaney sought approval for the Re-versioned MCR which includes the updated formula.

Attendees agreed to approve MCR1213.

MCR1213 approved.

MCR1219 – SPAYG System Process changes

O Delaney sought approval for the re-versioned MCR.

J-A Hannon reported that there are quite a few questions which are outstanding in this MCR. The TWG has an issue on the Q&A log. There are questions on there that ESNB answers various questions to MPs. BGE submitted a number of questions last week in line with the deadlines required for the MCR. BGE got some answers back with there are one or two which BGE is unclear on the answers and one that hasn't yet been answered. There are still some questions outstanding at the TWG level to trash through to make sure that we're all on the same page. On that basis, it's unclear what exactly BGE would be approving if it were to go ahead without having the understanding.

O Delaney replied that the questions are mainly clarifications, and they will probably get answered in the next while.

J-A Hannon said that there are clarifications but there is a query for example around change of supplier journeys which would be pretty critical in terms of making sure that Customers get the experience that they need, a good experience. BGE has put down a couple of suggestions around what the right Customer journeys are and is BGE correct in its interpretation of them? Depending on the answer to that from ESNB, which BGE doesn't have yet, that in itself requires further assessment internally in terms of systems and processes. BGE wants to ensure that it has this bottomed out before the suggestions in MCRs go ahead because they may need some tweaks and we don't want to waste time in re-versioning and going back again etc.

R Hassett stated that there is one query outstanding on the log. There are a number of scenarios that

BGE has sent into ESNB to validate. ESNB should have this back to BGE very quickly and there is nothing incorrect in terms of interpretation, but ESNB is including some additional options, for example where BGE suggested that D would be the only possible date, but also there would be D+1 and D+2. In the main, ESNB hasn't seen anything that would contradict anything in the MCR as it is set out.

J-A Hannon replied that she's not on the Smart Team herself, but when BGE got the replies this morning, one of BGE's team had to go through it quite quickly to see it. BGE needs more time to fully validate it but from their initial assessment, there are further queries that they have. In relation to some of the answers that BGE got, there was the premise that there might be a bit of misunderstanding of terms of what exactly BGE was asking to get clarity on. There is a bit more to thrash out before BGE can be comfortable about how it all works.

R Hassett said that there was quite a volume of queries that came through and ESNB has done its best to give BGE answers as quickly as possible but there isn't y anything in terms of materiality that would be a change to the MCR. There's a lot of clarifications in terms of the type and variations in the scenarios that ESNB set out in the MCR. In terms of the very detailed matrix, ESNB is working through that and will come back on it as soon as it can. ESNB sent a note out around MCR1216 and there has been some additional feedback based on miscommunication on timings. For MCR1219, ESNB has gone through a lot of work to bring the MCR from where it was when it first proposed to try to deliver a solution that will meet enough of the initial request as possible. From ESNB's perspective, it wants to give everyone a level of clarity in terms of what the solution is going to be and to be able to give that certainty that this is the baseline version of this MCR. Then people can go ahead with their design and development of that. She appreciates that there a lot of questions that have come in from BGE, but ESNB has received very little questions from other Suppliers. She wonders if there is the same level of uncertainty from other Suppliers about this particular MCR.

J-A Hannon stated that it would be good to hear from other Suppliers. BGE fully understands the changes and understands the role of the TWG to thrash through them to understand that it understands the changes before trying to vote through any of those changes.

J Gregory stated that not everyone is necessarily at the same level of detail of design. It's just to be aware about re-versioning in the future as Suppliers get to that point. On some of the queries that have been raised, they are not about contesting the design. They're about understanding the intention behind the design, particularly about the new required date and the processing date. What's not clear from a lot of the detail, is exactly how the different rules actually work between business as usual and the new way forward with required dates and business as usual dates, especially when you're backdating processing. Suppliers are not sure if legacy works in the same way. Is it Smart only that ESNB is backdating or is it doing real time processing? ESNB has spent a lot of time putting summaries together, but she feels that there's a need for another TWG to really flesh out those scenarios before approving.

R Hassett replied that it would be good to get how much outstanding feedback there is. The first time that ESNB presented these scenarios was quite a number of weeks ago, with the intention of giving everyone as much detail as possible. She takes the point about people working through design but the aim here is to give everyone a stable platform in which to build their high-level detailed design build. The longer we put that off, the more it is subject to people not being able to progress.

J Gregory said that she absolutely gets that, but her concern is that the door shuts when Suppliers approve this and the TWG stops, and Supplier's engagement stops. She knows that ESNB is saying that it won't, but Suppliers really need to be clear that before anything is signed off, that they are comfortable with everything that is being put forward for design. There are a number of areas that although they are alluded to, that are still not clear. Suppliers need to make sure what's there before going into approval again of an already baselined MCR.

D O'Connor reported that fundamentally what MCR1219 is saying that ESBN is going to complete the CoS quicker. That's the premise. Suppliers submitted that MCR to begin with. ESBN has taken this on board, and he has seen a lot of the feedback and has contributed to a lot of the responses. He's yet to see anything that says we should to change something in terms of how we progress or what's been proposed. All of it seems to be based on understanding how we work, and the CoS process is kind of complex at the moment anyway. It seems that a lot of the existing business rules have been rehashed in terms of how it works. ESBN has given the instances where it has made the CoS complete quicker. Are there any reasons why we shouldn't have the CoS completing quicker? That's the first obvious one.

J Gregory said that Suppliers need to understand the scenarios where the CoS is going to complete quicker. It's not about the CoS completing quicker. At the moment, ESBN is talking about the required date. We're talking about when you process that. It's the time period between the required date and the processing of it taking place. There seems to be now a host of new rules about D+1, D+2, D+3 and D+4. We've had pre set rules, where you could request Day and you get it applied approximately five days later. All of that has now changed. She's not saying that Suppliers are objecting to it, but we need to be very clear as to all of the different ramifications of all the different scenarios. We had one or two scenarios previously to now more of a thirty-scenario mark based on the new rules. We need to build that because Suppliers are going to have to deal with that with consumers coming on board. It's just about clarity and not wanting to rush through this to a point that Suppliers agree something that they haven't yet fully understood.

D O'Connor stated that the required date rules are all staying the same. What's really happening is how quickly ESBN can send out the messages. For example, if you've a required date that is five days in the future, that will be the same exactly as it is today. If you have a required date that is for example tomorrow, and if there's a CoLE associated with that, that will be sent out quicker. It's what business rules you apply once you start getting the messages. Is this the bit that's going to cause Suppliers difficulty?

J Gregory replied that it's about understanding all of the different ramifications. Suppliers have given ESBN a lot of detail. She understands that ESBN has got back with detail this morning. Suppliers need to go through it once ESBN has gone through the scenarios. We may need another TWG, or another IGG at some point. It's not fair to expect sign off on something before Suppliers have actually really looked at the detail and the responses that have come back. Perhaps to have an open conversation at a TWG to make sure that everyone is on board. That's all Suppliers are asking for.

R Hassett stated that ESBN has given that opportunity at TWGs. TWGs will continue to be held throughout the entire phase as long as they are needed. The purpose of the TWG is to provide a forum for any questions. ESBN has not made any changes to the required date logic.

J Gregory said that the last TWG when MPs discussed this in detail, Suppliers got ninety-two slides about the changes that have being applied and how it was added to the design. All that happened was that ESBN walked through those slides. Suppliers then went away and started looking at the design and if they have the capacity to do so, Suppliers then came back to ESBN with questions which needed further feedback. MPs are not actually in the position on engaging on it and having bi-lateral conversations or group conversations about the design which is how it happened in phase 1. All Suppliers asking for is rather than rushing to the point of closing this down, is to make sure that Suppliers understand the design.

M O'Connor said that she doesn't disagree with that. Her comment is around change control. Her concern is that we have TWGs that come up which are initiated by ESBN and RMDS, they are not initiated by Suppliers. If Suppliers need something that needs to be looked at or questioned, do Suppliers have the right to request a TWG to look at this?

R Hassett replied absolutely. If a TWG is requested outside of occasions, for MCR1219 specifically, ESBN has driven that. The original MCR was approved on the basis of D+5 requests for PAYG customers but no changes to validations or processing times. ESBN has proposed what it considers would hopefully achieve the D and D+1 processing in a lot of circumstances outside of the existing rules for debt flagging. ESBN has always said to send in any queries or feedback. ESBN hasn't been asked to hold another TWG but it's something that it could have accommodated if it been asked.

G Harnett said that he wants to pick up on M O'Connor's point because it was covered at the ILG. K Murray took an action to circulate the change control process because what we're dealing with here is a baseline plan with a series of approved MCRs. We've already approved a version of this MCR. Suppliers asked what the change control process was, and K Murray said that he would circulate the change control process for phase 1. That hasn't happened yet. What change control process are we applying to ESBN's new proposals here?

O Delaney replied that from a RMDS perspective, it's the standard retail market change control process which is published on the RMDS website which hasn't been changed.

G Harnett added that MPs discussed that at the ILG as well. There's one line that says that for an MCR, an MP can put forward changes and it will be dealt with in the context of a re-versioned MCR. It seems to be an endless loop so anyone can put forward more changes and they will just go into a re-versioned MCR that will come up at the IGG for approval, and that's it. The discussion at the ILG was that we need a little bit more solidity than that and there's where K Murray offered to circulate the change control process from Phase 1.

K Murray stated that was the case and it will also be done. He said that he also made clear at the ILG that the RMDS process is governed by RMDS. RMDS has its own change control process which is different from that of the Smart Programme.

G Harnett said that he understands that. If ESBN Smart was to circulate the change process from Phase 1, we could then have the two of them on the table. MPs could then maybe ask RMDS whether it would be possible to take some of those features on board to stop what is an endless loop of potential change where nobody has any certainty.

R Hassett stated that during the design, that's what ESBN is trying to avoid. That's why ESBN proposed the changes it did to MCR1219. From her perspective, she hasn't heard any objection to those changes. ESBN proposed the changes that would allow the D+1 processing where the existing market rules allow. ESBN wants to get to a point where it can baseline MCR1219, and then people will have certainty on that.

G Harnett added that we have already baselined this

R Hassett replied that MCR1219 was approved at a very high level of information because of the fact that there were numerous options proposed in the original MCR. The agreement was to go with D+5 but with the understanding that this would be worked through, and further detail brought.

G Harnett said that when you baseline it's meant to bring certainty to all of us and MPs did that in good faith. It's the case now that Suppliers are trying to understand the changes that ESBN put across in what was a ninety-two-page presentation at one TWG. BGE has asked some questions subsequent to that presentation within the deadlines. ESBN has clarified the latest batch dispatch of clarifications at 09:15 this morning to BGE so it needs a little bit of time to consider those to understand what it is being asked to build.

R Hassett reported that MCR1219 was brought to two TWGs, first of all on a high-level basis of what

ESBN was proposing and then ESBN brought the detailed market changes. This has been socialised for quite a while.

G Harnett added that in the context of the ninety-two pages, in a meeting which lasts an hour and a half, is pretty much fast reading. The vast scale of change being proposed over those ninety-two pages in an hour and a half is certainly deserving a little bit of time to tease out ramifications here because it's quite serious. All BGE is trying to do is get its head around the sheer volume of the change that ESBN has proposed after baselining the v14.00.00 plan. He doesn't think this is unreasonable. It's a fair ask.

M O'Connor said that on change control, it was her assumption that we were going to use the Phase 1 change control process that Suppliers spent a lot of time putting together because it was more specific to the Smart programme, and it had that bit more agility. If that's not the case, she would like to understand that. Are we using the change control process from Phase 1 or are we using the RMDS one, because they are two different processes?

K Murray replied that he will circulate the Phase 1 process straight after this meeting. What the document actually says is that there are two processes. It's very clear that the NSMP process does not interfere with RMDS' current role and current governance arrangements, so they stand. RMDS is responsible for the design and for managing changes to the design. The NSMP is really all about ensuring that the overall programme is co-ordinated and aligned. The NSMP doesn't get involved at ILG level with the detail of market changes. That's all managed through RMDS' governance arrangements.

M O'Connor replied that her only problem with that, is that the whole purpose of it was that if Suppliers did go and take the ESBN baseline and at whatever point it was signed off. If Suppliers were working on it and found technical issues, they needed to find a quick way to address that across the industry. The Smart change control was meant to address technical issues.

K Murray replied that MPs might want to take a look at what was agreed and written down. It took quite a lot of effort. It's always been clear for the governance of the NSMP, that it doesn't seek to replace or interfere or duplicate the work of RMDS and the other governance forums.

M O'Connor added that it was to include agility and a quicker ability for MPs to make technical changes if they came up. The relevance of this is we're looking at signing off an MCR at the end of September, soon to be October. We're going into design and Suppliers finalising contracts with vendors. If something comes up that needs to be changed, that was meant to be the purpose of Smart change control.

K Murray said that we have to recognise that that's possible. In any programme, something that wasn't foreseen can arise and this would have to be addressed and impact assessed across all MPs. That stands. That's absolutely what the whole thing is trying to cover. ESBN Smart were intending to bring both MCR1216 and MCR1219 here to get them approved so that everyone would then have a firm basis on which to proceed. BGE is saying that it still has outstanding queries that they want to work through on MCR1219. There was some confusion on MCR1216 over dates so that is going to go around another TWG. The intention is to reach a baseline as soon as possible. That's what ESBN has been aiming for.

M O'Connor said that she doesn't disagree with that. If we're all in some kind of a position that we are still assessing signoff, how much can we actually go back and say that we know it's signed off but we're having these problems and recognise this after further assessment. The point of the change process was to address technical issues that came about as MPs did reviews.

J-A Hannon stated that K Murray has nailed it on the head here in terms of the TWG and the impact assessing. The point here is that we haven't completed the impact assessment from BGE's perspective. For MCR1219 there are still some answers that BGE has still to get from ESBN and work through them. A

TWG can be held along with the scheduled TWGs. Maybe the way forward would be to have one or two more TWGs on MCR1219 and close out those additional issues, it could be at the TWG which is going to be held for MCR1216.

R Hassett said that it would be interesting to hear from other Suppliers, because ESBN doesn't have any queries outstanding for other Suppliers.

I McCoy stated that from Energia's perspective, it needs a bit more time. It's like what other Suppliers have said. There's a lot happening across the wider marketplace and not only the Smart world. From Energia's perspective, it's the same resources and same bodies that it is using. There's a lot coming in from all areas, and Energia hasn't had time to fully complete its impact assessments. It has a high-level understanding of the changes, but it just needs a little bit more time to go through them. Energia is just trying to get its priorities in line to make sure that it is delivering to all the other expectations and deliverables that are landing its way. Energia hopes to complete its impact assessment pretty soon.

J Gregory added that what's often been asked for in these large-scale programmes, is to have a discreet design phase so that people can plan it in, and they know when design is going to be happening, when the plans are for signing it off. It allows companies to plan better for this type of activity rather than it just being an organic continual process that it has been for the last eighteen months. Perhaps as a lessons learnt here, we can look at this for Phase 3. For whoever is running the project, to actually have a discreet design phase.

R Hassett said that she fully takes the point that we all need to be in agreement as to what point we're going to baseline.

J Gregory said absolutely. Looking back at how any normal project would work, you would have a design phase that people would work to. They would have the resources in place for doing that. As I McCoy has said, everyone is stretched because of the crisis, it's just been endless for the last eighteen months. We really do need proper management of the NSMP Phase 2 to help such an enormous audience to deliver it.

MCR1219 was not approved.

DR/MCR1223 – Peak ToU for DG7 to DG9.

O Delaney reported that RMDS is fast tracking the approval for DR/MCR1223 today as the Consultation Paper was published at 14:00 today. RMDS sent an email about this DR/MCR after that.

S Melvin added that DR1223 was issued to MPs in August. There has been no change to the DR. RMDS circulated the sample files to MPs yesterday. There was no change to those files which were set out in the DR. Based on the CRU decision today, ESBN is supporting the approval of the DR/MCR as the target date is coming into effect on 1st October 2022.

A Currie reported that SSE is cognisant that the decision has only been out there for an hour and a half. Other resources are being used on other similar projects, so SSE doesn't really feel that there is adequate time to really impact assess this DR/MCR as it would like, given the other industry work which is ongoing. On that basis, SSE is not really comfortable approving this DR/MCR at this point in time.

S Melvin replied that she takes the point. It's unfortunate that the CRU decision was only published at 14:00 but the CRU decision is that the tariff changes will come into effect on 1st October 2022. ESBN will be complying with that CRU decision and will make the necessary changes that the tariffs to take effect

from 1st October 2022.

J-A Hannon said she echoes what A Currie has said about the timelines. BGE assessed this DR when it came out in August and is certainly not in a position to implement this for 1st October 2022. Perhaps CRU would be able to address it, would CRU consider giving Suppliers a week or so to assess this and come back and if possible, put it in for 1st November 2022?

R O'Rourke reported that the Commission's decision is for the tariffs to apply from 1st October 2022. He appreciates that this is not ideal. Ideally CRU would have issued this decision a few weeks ago.

J Gregory said that she still has to go through the paper in detail, but around the TUoS charging, which was an action on CRU previously, what is the view on that, just for as a summary for this meeting? Is there going to be TUoS charged at this stage, or has this been pushed out now?

R O'Rourke replied that the new terms that will apply to the XLUs, that's not going to be implemented at this time. The focus is really on demand response and the Beat the Peak Programme. CRU has also asked Eirgrid to provide more information around forecasting, blow in periods, but the TUoS tariffs will not be going ahead.

J Gregory said that includes the three-phase capacity for the TUoS, there was going to be Day/Night/Peak for that across the board, that's not happening, is that the case?

R O'Rourke replied that it's not across the board, but it is applying to DGST.

O Delaney asked for fast track approval for DR1223 and MCR1223 as this is due for implementation for 1st October 2022.

Attendees agreed to approve DR/MCR1223.

DR/MCR1223 approved.

MCR1189 – Additional CoLE in the 017MM

O Delaney sought approval for the Re-versioned MCR.

Attendees agreed to approve MCR1189.

MCR1189 approved.

6. MRSO Update

J Long gave the MRSO update.

Microgeneration

J Long reported the hypercare period for Microgeneration finished last week which means that any queries relating to the interim microgeneration scheme will now default back to the business, which is MRSO. MRSO will issue a note later via RMDS giving the details of MRSO's generic email address where any further queries can be sent to in relation to the Microgeneration scheme. *(RMDS subsequently issued a note on this matter to MPs on behalf of MRSO).*

Smart Data Services

J Long reported that on the Smart Data Services the following figures are up to date as of 29th September 2022:

- The figure to date for MCC12 which is the 24-Hour Meter is **92,000**.
- The figure to date for MCC16 which is the Day/Night Meter is **14,561**.

J Long added RMDS will issue a note with these figures via RMDS following this meeting. *(RMDS subsequently issued these figures to MPs on behalf of MRSO following the meeting.*

SoLR Event

J Long reported that there is an SoLR event due to happen on Friday 31st September 2022. MRSO is being inundated at the moment with queries from a lot of Suppliers in relation to a lot of different questions and queries. MRSO is working through them and is getting a very quick turnaround on them. If Suppliers have queries relating to that switching process, they should continue to send them into MRSO. MRSO will deal with each of those individually to get responses out as quickly as possible.

7. ESB Networks

A Keegan gave the ESNB update.

A Keegan firstly reported that he will be representing ESNB RMS at IGG Meetings now going forward. He acknowledged and thanked S Melvin for all of the work which she has done as the RMDS IGG Rep for the last while.

Hub Relocation

A Keegan reported that a note to all the IGG Reps was issued on 7th September 2022, i.e., the Project Team issued the updated Technical Communication document to all technical and business reps. ESNB asks that Suppliers are cognisant of all changes that are outlined in that version. The communication via RMDS contained all the necessary details of these document updates, updates related to the IP addresses used for the new ROI IPT and production hubs. With regard to Test EMMAs, ESNB requests that MPs complete their required action as outlined in market plan, with all the necessary details provided in the Technical Communication document. This request requires MPs to have the necessary firewall rules in the place for their Test EMMA only. The window for this action is to be completed is from 12th September 2022 to 10th October 2022. ESNB asked Suppliers to inform it via RMDS when this action has been completed.

CRU Customer Protection Measures.

A Keegan gave an update in relation to CRU's Customer protection measures and some of the actions contained in the decision. In terms of Action 3, which relates to the financial hardship meter Customers and that they would be placed on the most economic tariff. If Suppliers need new tariffs to meet this requirement, ESNB is keen that Suppliers engage with ESNB via the existing channels.

In relation to Action 7 and the moratorium on domestic disconnections, the final date for submission for market messages is 23rd November 2022.

For Action 10, the moratorium on vulnerable Customer disconnections, it will be implemented from 1st October 2022 to 31st March 2023.

On Action 11, Emergency Credit, ESNB will be increasing the emergency credit for the financial hardship Customers. ESNB is cognisant that there may be instances where Customers will be putting in a lot of codes if there are any tariffs increases going on, some Suppliers may have that. It's important that there are supports and communications available for Customers to assist with that on the Supplier end. For lifestyle prepayment, ESNB is assuming that Suppliers will have the necessary communications in place to advise Customers of that as well.

S Melvin added that when the emergency credit is made effective on PAYG systems, the next time the Customer vends, they will get a code for their normal vend/top up. They will get a code for the emergency credit to make that effective on their PAYG meter. Also, for any Suppliers that are changing tariffs around the same time on 1st October 2022, then the Customer will also get a code for the Supplier tariff. Customers may be facing putting in maybe a sixty-to-eighty-digit code. This is where ESNB has concerns that if the Customer doesn't put them in in the correct sequence or they make a mistake, that Suppliers have support there for Customers. Suppliers could maybe make it clear on the vend receipt, maybe put a message saying that it's important to put the codes in the correct sequence. Also, to communicate the increase in the Day Emergency credit to Customers to make them aware that it's moving from €10 to €20.

8. Gemserv Update

S Fox-Mella reported that there was no Gemserv update.

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

O Delaney provided the outage update.

Outages

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

10. AOB

No Items were raised in AOB.

Next Meetings:

- IGG 2nd November 2022 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