

IGG Conference Call Meeting Minutes

Date:	17 th July 2024	Time & Location	3pm - Conference Call
Chair:	Jack O'Dwyer, CRU		
Attendees:	Name	Location	
	Suzanne Hudson, Sean McKeivitt, Catherine Keane, Tracy Caffrey, Rebecca Duggan, John O'Reilly, Gary McInerney	RMDS	
	Jack O'Dwyer, Anna Rourke, Jack Walsh	CRU	
	Siobhan Melvin, Damien Power, Emer Corcoran, Keith Fitzpatrick, Rachel Hassett	ESBN	
	Robin McLoughlin, Jason McKnight	Version 1	
	James Long	MRSO	
	Peter Brett	EcoPower	
	Judit Gal	Orstead	
	Ian Mullins	BGE	
	Anca Stanciu, Caoimhe McWeeney, Kyle Waddoups, Lyle Scott, Lisa Williamson	Energia	
	Tallis Dixon, Ceola Mcgowan	Bord Na Mona	
	Aoife Coppinger, Mark O'Sullivan	Prepay Power	
	Aine Ni Cheara	SSE	
	Desmond McBride, Ken Tobin, Amanda Griffin	Electric Ireland	
	Kim Scullion	Erova Energy	
	Andrew McKinnon, Jack McCarthy	Flogas	
	Antoin O'Lachtnain, Jennifer Condron	Pinergy	
	Deirdre Lynn-King, Gerard Taylor	Arden Energy	
	Gregg Allen, Jessica Gregory, Sian Boyle	Community Power	
	Emma Mullan	Go Power	
	Lucy Cayley	Statcraft	
Apologies:			
Version Number	1.0		
Status			

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 O'Dwyer requested approval of the previous IGG Minutes of 5 th June 2024. Minutes v1.0 deemed approved.

1170	Timeline and Programme for delivery of MCR1208.		
Discussion at IGG	An update will be provided on this action once prerequisites for delivery of MCR1208 have been updated.		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: ESBN	Status: Open	Due Date: 17.07.2024

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

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

4. CRU Update

J O'Dwyer provided the CRU update.

Additional Customer Protection Measures

Final responses were received on July 3rd 2024 from suppliers and many thanks to all for their feedback. Issues raised by suppliers and their responses have been considered for any changes to the measures for this coming winter.

The Retail Team currently has a decision paper drafted and are awaiting approval from the commission to publish the paper.

Government Electricity Credit

Weekly reporting from suppliers has ceased as of the 28th of June 2024 and the window for any customers who did not receive a credit to make a complaint to their supplier has also closed as of the end of June. Suppliers will retain the unallocated credits until December 11th in the case where a complaint has been escalated to the CRU Customer Care Team and credit awarded as a result of that complaint.

There will be a final report due on the 13th December 2024, suppliers will be reminded of this closer to the date.

A Coppinger asked for clarity on the customer protection measures and how they compare to the measures that were in place last year.

J Walsh advised that they would be very similar with some measures being scaled back this year and that no new measures have been introduced.

I Mullins asked for a timescale on when the marked would have visibility on the decision paper?

J O'Dwyer and J Walsh confirmed the aim was for August, hopefully early August but possibly late August.

I Mullins also asked if later this year would see Scheme 4 introduced in relation to the Government Credits?

J Walsh advised this is not yet known and would likely be decided in the Governments Budget 2025 in October.

5. Version 1 Update

J McKnight gave the Version 1 update.

J McKnight thanked Market Participants who facilitated the formal assessments and advised they have all been completed and outcome reports issued to the CRU. At this point it is recommended to progress to the IPT phase. There are a few residual actions to follow up on but no material issues that would prevent IPT going ahead as planned.

J McKnight stated Version 1 have been collaborating with RMDS on the IPT Test Scenarios and assisting with the scope of the workbook which should be going out soon. RMDS will update further.

Supplier Assurance activities currently include four Material Change applications and several Market Entry applications in the early planning stages also.

6. Retail Market Design Update

S Hudson gave the RMDS Update.

Re-Versioning of MCR 1216

S Hudson informed Market Participants that approval is being sought for the Re-Versioning of MCR 1216 on this call. Please see slides for further detail on re-versioning.

Approval was given by Market Participants.

Re-Versioning of MCR 1189

S Hudson informed Market Participants that approval is being sought for the Re-Versioning of MCR 1189 on this call. Please see slides for further detail on re-versioning.

Approval was given by Market Participants.

New Entrant and Market Participant Strategy

S Hudson advised that RMDS circulated the New Entrant and Market Participant Strategy document along with the Guideline Document for the Balance Scorecard. This document forms the second part of the overall Assurance Approach that will be utilised by Version1 going forward and is being raised today for discussion.

On the 27th September 2023 the Market Assurance Strategy was raised at IGG and Approved and over the last few months RMDS and Version1 have been working on the next part of the strategy which is The New Entrant and Market Participant Strategy. What is coming in here is continual assessment, which is forming a new part of the strategy.

Any questions on the documents circulated are encouraged and to assist understanding of the documents from a high level Version1 have put together some slides on the documents which will allow this topic to be raised again at the August in person IGG.

R McLoughlin presented the slides.
Please refer to slides for further information.

A Coppinger asked for more information on when a supplier would need to be re-certified?

R McLoughlin advised that the re-certification process would be triggered when the supplier had triggered a re-certification or has made notification that a material change has been undertaken and re-certification is required in a particular area.

A Coppinger asked if a low score on the Balance Scorecard would trigger a re-certification.

R McLoughlin advised that it would not and any outcome from a low score is outlined in the Guidance Document.

A Coppinger asked why these documents did not go out for consultation?

R McLoughlin advises that the assurance approach in place was written by a different assurance body and there was a need for Version1 to update and refresh.

S Hudson advised that this needed to be updated due to the presence of a new assurance body and in addition to this the strategy documents should be owned by the market and not one individual assurance body and as such the new documents have been created as RMDS branded documents and will stay in place regardless of any change of Market Assurance provider.

The new documents also improve the assurance provided to the market and improve the market with the inclusion of the continual assessment piece. Suppliers will not be required to take any action in relation to the Balance Scorecard as the process will be an automated and will be built by ESBN and issued to suppliers on a six-monthly basis to give a visual on performance versus the market average.

As there is no major change to the assurance being provided it was not sent out for consultation and CRU have reviewed and are happy with the Balance Scorecard and Continuous Assessment piece.

A Coppinger asks when a response from suppliers is needed on these documents?

S Hudson advises that at present it is planned to be brought to the in person IGG in August which will be held in CRU offices. It is requested that Market Participants read the documents before this time so that further discussion can be had in August.

A Coppinger asked for confirmation that there would be no cost for the Balance Scorecard Dashboard for suppliers and asked who the cost would fall to?

R McLoughlin advised that the cost would fall under RMDS and ESNB and there would be no requirement for suppliers to make any changes to their own systems to facilitate this report.

A O'Lachtnain Thanked R McLoughlin for the presentation and for providing further information and asked if the changes are being characterised as incremental changes in terms of text?

R McLoughlin advised that there has been a comparison between the old document and the new document and there is no major differences, there were some omissions of techniques that are currently used e.g. formal assessment so these items have been added that were previously not included. In terms of new techniques that have been included the Continuous Assessment and New Entrant process would be the main focus.

A O'Lachtnain stated that traditionally in the industry when there are incremental changes made a tracked changes version of the document is available for review by Market Participants. In the original document there are some complex tables which have been changed e.g., defining material changes, and without the tracked change version it is difficult to see what exactly has been changed.

A O'Lachtnain highlighted that to look for Market Participants to review these documents at this time of year for some suppliers, particularly small and medium size suppliers, is a big ask and would place constraints on resources already under pressure.

R McLoughlin advised that it is not seen as a material difference and in the material change form itself the process for a material change is defined.

A O'Lachtnain advises that to read and compare both documents to determine the new definition of a material change would be a big undertaking.

R McLoughlin advises that there is no change to the definition of a material change and that this has been made clear.

A O'Lachtnain states that this is a new document and although it is advised that it is not materially different there are differences in chapter headings etc. and suppliers will need time to review this, large suppliers will have additional resources for this task that smaller suppliers will not. Additionally, is the strategy now an RMDS strategy as opposed to an Assurance Body strategy?

S Hudson advises that it is the market strategy and is owned by the market and the aim is to ensure that regardless of a change in assurance body in the future the strategy will remain in place.

A O'Lachtnain states that the assurance body Version1 have been charged by CRU, with carrying out the assurance for the market, not RMDS or any other department.

S Hudson confirms that this is correct.

A O'Lachtnain states that it seems like a change that the strategy is now being put forward by RMDS where in the past it would have been the assurance body, and this appears as though it is a material change. In terms of the Balance Score Card, there are associated benefits for suppliers but is there a wider benefit for the Market and is their evidence of this benefit? Additionally, the rejections metric seems like a weak metric at this time as opposed to completions. An example is then provided of a supplier who has not received a

response to an 016 Market Message in 4 months, and measuring rejections is a blunt way of measuring excellence or quality and is only a measure on suppliers.

R McLoughlin advises he does not agree that the metrics only reflect on suppliers, and it drives efficiency by putting focus on submitting messages correctly the first time around and highlights if all suppliers are having the same issue with a Market Message, it can drive change in that area. Evidence can be seen of the effectiveness of the Balance Scorecard in NI in line with the market changes implemented in that space because of the metrics.

A O'Lachtnain asks if this should lie with MRSO to make improvements in this space as that is what is outlined in the contract, and this appears as though the arrangements are being changed regarding the contract with ESB Networks to deliver the messages in accordance with the format and now CRU has intervening and assuming responsibility for that too. The benefit of this is not clear currently for small and medium suppliers in the context of the market and the number of changes coming over the next few months and years.

R McLoughlin advises that in his view there is a clear benefit.

J Gregory advises that there is a large overhead for suppliers here and in NI to introduce this and will now be an additional overhead for suppliers in ROI. It does make certain processes more efficient but to what end is this needed in ROI, is there a problem with the processes currently? What is the driver behind the introduction of this in ROI?

R McLoughlin advises that no supplier is being asked to contribute anything, it is an automated report that will be provided to suppliers. The regulation on the Balance Scorecard in ROI will differ to what is in place currently in NI. Benefits have been apparent in NI where the reduction of errors has positively impacted the market and supplier by providing a clear picture of areas that need performance improvements.

J Gregory states that the market is designed in a way that errors occur, and they are picked up as the design of the market accounts for that. What will the implications be if a certain standard is not met in terms of the Balance Scorecard?

R McLoughlin advises that there is a marked difference in the way the Balance Scorecard is run in NI versus ROI, the proposal is that there will be no major difference for poor performance, and it will be raised with the CRU as it is now.

J Gregory asks if this is then just another cost that these metrics are being monitored and reporting to the CRU and to what end?

R McLoughlin advises that suppliers should want to improve on processes that are causing issues internally.

J Gregory advises that she believes this is an important conversation that needs to be had and that this will have huge implications for suppliers and the benefits need to be made clear.

R McLoughlin advises that the example of the benefits is the NI Market.

A O'Lachtnain asks if there is a paper available regarding this and the discussion could be picked up after receipt of that.

R McLoughlin advises that he will take that request away.

A O'Lachtnain asks if there is any urgency with this issue?

R McLoughlin advises that from a Version1 perspective it is important and urgent but that may not be the view of all involved parties.

A O'Lachtnain asks what consequences will occur in the coming months if this is not implemented?

R McLoughlin advises that at present there are techniques being used that are not in the strategy and techniques not being used that are currently in the strategy and with New Entrants it is important that a

certain level of service is adhered to and is consistent across all New Entrants and the process that they go through.

A O'Lachtnain asks about the consequences if the Balance Scorecard is not brought in?

R McLoughlin advises that both items are contained in the one document, so it is not possible to separate them.

A O'Lachtnain advises that there are multiple elements to this, and it is a large undertaking for suppliers to review another document if there is no compelling reason for it.

R McLoughlin states that Version1 do not share this view and both documents have been reviewed and the changes are not significant. The bigger changes are the ones that have been outlined.

A O'Lachtnain states that the market is in operation 20 years and no test system is available and this in his view is a larger issue than what has been discussed today. There is no focus on that and yet to change the assurance document is now an urgent issue.

S Hudson advises that RMDS have taken on board all points raised and if any additional concerns or queries could be sent in to rmds@esb.ie. In the meantime, it will be deferred to CRU with the points raised and the document requested by A O'Lachtnain on the benefits of the Balance Scorecard.

A O'Lachtnain states that the document outlining the benefits would be a minimum as the impact of the decision would need to be assessed.

J Gregory asks for clarity on how this will be administered in relation to costs, the implications if suppliers do not perform well, as previously mentioned this is a large overhead for suppliers in NI, that is not to say it does not have certain benefits, but it needs to be understood in ROI. Additionally, it needs to be outlined if this is coming from CRU or as a recommendation from Version1 for this to be added.

S Hudson advises this is coming from Version1 as a recommendation, a few years ago the Balance Scorecard was discussed and at the time was shelved due to other activities in the market at that time. Its inclusion in the ROI Market would be a softer approach than what is in operation in NI currently and the cost would fall under the RMDS Budget.

J Gregory states that she is referring to the cost for suppliers in terms of administering and managing the Balance Scorecard as it will be an ongoing cost. Requesting that this be included in the document requested already.

A O'Lachtnain asks if the version being launched in ROI is a softer version, then what is currently in place in NI will the benefits be the same. The difference between the old and new assurance strategy has not been clearly defined and the assurance document is no longer recommended by the assurance body and is now an RMDS owned document, it is requested that the rationale for these points is also included in the document.

S Melvin advises that she was of the understanding that the assurance strategy was always owned by RMDS, and this is not a change. The previous documents did have Gemserv branding however they were Market Assurance documents owned by RMDS and only managed by the assurance body.

A O'Lachtnain states that they were not commissioned by RMDS and were commissioned by CRU. The assurance of the market is a matter between the assurance body and CRU. With RMDS in a supportive role. The understanding was that there is a privity between the supplier and ESB Networks according to the Meter Registration Agreement. If there is an issue processing all the important issues that have been highlighted, they should be resolved by ESNB and the supplier in question. This appears as though the assurance body is becoming intermingled in the private contract between the supplier and MRSO.

J Gregory states that it is important for the assurance strategy to be updated if continuous evaluation going forward will be a factor because this is a complete step away from how assurance operates now and in the past, for ROI. It is a significant change to the assurance strategy and although this does fall under RMDS it has always been directed and governed by the assurance body who is contracted by RMDS under CRU.

A O'Lachtnain stated that there is room for change in the market, but the concern is why are these changes being prioritised over others that could be made.

S Hudson advises RMDS will take all points raised and we will revert with a response on 28th August 2024 at the next IGG. In the meantime, any additional feedback can be submitted to RMDS.

I Mullins asked if the timescale highlighted is still in place with the document up for approval on August 28th 2024 or if there will be further discussion before this date.

S Hudson advises that due to the level of concern and queries on the document there would be an option to have another call in 2 week's or push the approval to the September IGG.

J Gregory advises that at this time approval at the next IGG does not seem appropriate and there is further review to be undertaken by suppliers, factoring in resourcing issues with the time of year.

V14.00 IPT Workbooks

V14.00 IPT Workbooks will be issued out to suppliers on Monday 22nd July and Suppliers are asked to provide contact details requested by RMDS as soon as possible.

7. MRSO Update

J Long gave the MRSO update.

Small Scale Generators

J Long stated that the slides from the workshop held on July 3rd 2024, have been issued on 16th July 2024 by RMDS to IGG Reps and thanked everyone who attended the workshop on the day and apologies for the delay in the issuing of these.

8. ESB Networks

K Fitzpatrick gave the ESN update.

Update on MCC12 Non-Zero Estimates during Power Outage Scenarios

ESB Networks is in the process of correcting a further cohort of MPRNS impacted by this issue. Data will be corrected via market messages. If any supplier has a query on any of their sites, please contact us via RMDS.

ESB Networks will come back to the IGG when more information is available on the preventative fixes being provided by the vendor. We expect one of the fixes can be delivered by the end of this year and we'll provide an update closer to the time.

Enduring Microgen

ESB Networks are assessing the consultation decision. Our immediate focus is on the changes to the interim solution for 1st January 2025. ESB Networks will come back with an MCR for these 2 changes – changes to data aggregation from month plus 13 to month plus 4 and the second is around deemed data where ESN have not installed a SMART meter within 4months.

Tibco EMMA upgrade/General Tibco planned work.

In previous IGGs ESB Networks flagged that we may require access to MPs EMMAs towards the end of this year. ESB Networks is continuing to investigate options in this space.

Read Issue 27th and 28th June 2024. (Note issued via RMDS 28th June)

This issue has been fully resolved. All impacted interval data have been issued to the market via Market Messages. All Microgen data for these dates has also issued to the market. ESB Networks are still investigating the root cause and we will apologise for any inconvenience caused to the MPS.

DG6 Special Read Requests

At the March IGG ESB Networks presented a slide on Special Read Requests and asked that suppliers to only submit a Special Read Request when the Billing Order is not 'open' and where possible to only submit the request if a scheduled Actual Read is not obtained, particularly for DG6 Max Demand sites. ESB Networks requests that IGG reps share this slide internally with relevant colleagues as Special Read requests are continuing to come through where the Billing Order is open. This has an impact on other Special Read requests and can cause delays particularly when the scheduled Actual Read received satisfies the suppliers requirement for a reading and a Special Reading is no longer required.

PAYG Update - August Bank holiday

Reminder that Monday 5th August is not a credit friendly holiday.

If a customer loses supply on this date the purchase of credit is required to top-up the meter and restore supply.

ESB Networks will process PMP requests submitted via the extranet up to 5pm on Friday 2nd August. Requests submitted after this will be processed on Tuesday 6th August.

Customers can still purchase credit using their old KPN card for their old supplier until the PMP is processed.

ESB Networks will use the contact details provided by suppliers previously. Any updates required for these contact details should be provided to keypadmanagement@esb.ie

C McWeeny asks for clarification on the DG6 Special Read Request update

S Melvin advises that the slides were included at the March IGG and the request is that these slides be shared by the IGG reps with relevant internal teams particularly those dealing with Max Demand sites.

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

S Hudson advised there would be a planned TIBCO Hub and SAP ISU/SAP PO/SAP NGP outage on the 21st of June 2024 to facilitate essential security patching.

10. AOB

Next Meeting:

- IGG 28th August 2024 at 10.30am – this meeting will be held in person at the CRU Offices, [The Exchange, Belgard Square North, Tallaght, Dublin 24](#)

Retail Market Design Service

56 Mount Street Upper, Dublin 2, D02 P406

Email: rmds@esb.ie | Web: www.rmdservice.com